

**Minutes of the Planning Board
Regular Meeting
March 12, 2026**

Members Present: Jim Robertson, (Chair), Lauren Rippy, Donna Waters, Betsey Zafra, Bob Johnson, Mark Russell, David McKinley, Tamara Peacock (Vice-Chair), Laura Flores

Members Absent: Kyle Gilgis

Staff Present: Sam Hayes, Planner II, Matthew Manley, Long Range Planning Manager, Lew Holloway, Community Development Director, Hannah Slyce, Planner II, Angela Becker, City Attorney

- I **Call to Order.** *The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. A quorum was established.*
- II **Approval of Agenda.** *Ms. Waters moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. McKinley and passed unanimously.*
- III **Approval of Minutes for the meeting of January 15, 2026.** *Ms. Rippy moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of the meeting of January 15, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mr. Russell and passed unanimously.*
- IV **Old Business**
- V **New Business**
- V(A) **Conditional Zoning District – Laurel Meadows (26-14-CZD)** Mr. Manley gave the following background:

Mr. Manley stated this is low-income housing project and the applicant is Woda Cooper. It sits on a 3.32-acre site on Michelle Drive at the end, and along a cul-de-sac, that runs off of Four Seasons Boulevard and adjacent to I-26. It's two parcels currently zoned C-3, and the proposal is for Urban Residential Conditional Zoning District.

A Neighborhood Compatibility Meeting was held in early February. Moderately attended, good, healthy discussion, lots of good insights from the neighbors, mainly around traffic concerns and potential for impacts or the interrelationship between this proposed use and the neighboring camp, Camp Pinewood, as well as acknowledging the need for affordable housing that this project would provide.

Site photos were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The site plan was shown and discussed in detail and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Manley stated it is 77 units on 3.32 acres, that comes out to a density of 23.2 units per acre. That breaks out into 13 one-bedroom units, 48 two-bedroom units, and 16 three-bedroom units. The building is a total of 110 square feet of gross floor area. That's a 27,500 square foot footprint, and it would be four stories tall. Also, per the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency, which is the state agency which governs the low-income housing tax credit, that process has its own parking standard, and for 77 units, their typical requirement would be for 135 parking spaces for this project. The developer requested and was granted a reduction of that to 109 parking spaces. So, there is, on the site plan 109 spaces, and there's a condition, to address, how that exceeds the maximum allowed per zoning.

Elevations were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The developer proposed conditions were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Manley stated there was also the public comment that you received from the neighboring camp related to concerns about changes to the water supply impacting the spring on the subject property. There's not enough information to say definitively whether that would or would not happen, and so, Mike Huffman, the City Stormwater and Floodplain Director, has proposed a condition that the developer would evaluate that, while they're doing the construction, make sure that no impacts are made that would result in that creek drying up, or that water source going away. So that would be added to the conditions as well, from the city, and then it would be up to the developer to determine whether they would agree to that.

City proposed conditions that have been agreed to were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Manley stated Mr. Huffman offered that to limit the impacts downstream, on the camp, with the increase in impervious surfaces that are proposed, that they increase their minimum stormwater system from a 10-year storm event to a 25-year storm event, to hold more of the water during those events, and release it at the same rate that it would be as it is today, the pre-development rate of flow from the site. And so the developers have not agreed to that. There's been some discussion of that, and they can respond to that during their presentation.

The Future Land Use map was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for Comp Plan Consistency were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft Comprehensive Consistency statement was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft reasonableness statement for approval and denial was included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Johnson stated the road in front of Starbucks has always been a disaster, no man's land and that's just an amazing mess. And I wonder if, you've kind of alleged we might have something we could say about that, or not. Mr. Manley stated so what would happen is a TIA would have to be performed, and the traffic impact analysis would find what impact the proposed development would have on the existing street network, and then it would attribute to that specific impact from that development the portion of which is being created by that development could be offset with some mitigation, some improvements. That's what TIAs do, and so they're requesting that the TIA be waived. So, you could say the existing situation is far from ideal, right? But would the addition of 569 daily trips, or 50 peak hour AM and PM trips, impact that existing condition to the point where the project should be responsible for the improvements that need to be made. In discussing this, what I've concluded is that there's, the way to fix this is really with a roundabout. And that roundabout should not be attributed to, it'd be hard to justify attributing that to the subject development. You're more inclined to work with DOT and advocate for improvements at this location. Now, we know those are long-term fixes. Those things don't happen overnight. But the sooner we identify the need, and start advocating for it and getting it in the hopper with the MPO and in that process for identifying Infrastructure improvements, the sooner it will happen. And we have received a grant to do a Four Seasons Corridor study. And that's going to include these areas off of Four Seasons, Orr's Camp, all the way to

Signal Hill, and all the other side streets, because we really wanted to look at circulation throughout that whole area. How can we utilize some of these other streets to take some of the pressure off? How do we identify needed improvements in this area to help the flow of traffic over time? That is promising that we're going to be doing that study. That study will help identify project needs that we can then try to get funded. Long answer, but, that's really what's put before the Planning Board, and what will be put in front of City Council is, should the TIA be waived? Do we think the TIA is going to have any findings that would result in some type of improvement that could be attributed specifically to this project. Or do we not? And then if we don't think that's the case, then why would we make them do the TIA? If we do, then we should require it, but maybe we require it later in the process. If they don't get the tax credits, it would be a waste to do the TIA, so I think that's part of it, is saying, alright, well, we could defer it, but not eliminate it entirely, or we just don't see a need based on the traffic count that it's going to generate.

Discussion was made on Urban Residential requiring a TIA.

Chair asked in the packet, it refers to a perennial stream. What does that mean? Mr. Manley stated a perennial stream is a stream that has water in it year-round, and not just based on rain events. Chair asked about the blue line stream running through the map.

Mike Huffman, Stormwater Director for the City of Hendersonville stated his name and title for the record. Mr. Huffman stated the blue lines are shown on the USGS maps, which are topographic, mainly topographic maps, and we've dealt with this issue in the past, so I'll try and make this brief, but the USGS, they basically are making topographic maps, and they put features on those maps, and they determine where blue line streams could potentially be based on computer analysis, and they don't go out and ground truth these things, which means they don't go out and verify that there is an actual stream where their topographic map says there is a stream, and oftentimes the maps don't take into account the various development that occurs in between them producing the maps. They produce them on a few year interval. And so the issue that we've run into on multiple projects, is that a blue line will show up on the topographic map, and our zoning ordinance references blue line streams as the trigger for enforcing a buffer requirement. In reality, sometimes there is not a stream where it shows a blue line on the USGS map, but there is not another good data set that we have available to reference in the zoning ordinance, I think, in staff's opinion. Beyond that, there are three, what we would classify types of streams, if you're looking at, stream determination, and there are courses and certifications on being able to do stream determination, so myself and our other stormwater technician have taken those courses, and when you look at streams, there are perennial streams, which, as Mr. Manley mentioned, are streams that flow year-round. There are intermittent streams, which are streams that flow based on the seasonal high water table, so they could flow in the winter and not flow in the summer, or if there's a drought, they won't flow. And then there are ephemeral streams, which is just a nice way of saying it's a ditch that would have water in it when there's a rainstorm. And there are characteristics of all three of these streams that in other parts of the state of North Carolina, there are other state-enforced buffer regulations, and so people actually have to go out and say, this is where the perennial stream starts, and the intermittent stream starts, and the ephemeral stream section starts, and then the state enforces much more stringent buffer regulations in various watersheds around the state, related to those stream determinations. We don't do that here, but, what we do is that in a situation where a developer comes to the city and says, I want to develop this parcel, and if we look, our first step is to look at the USGS map, and if it shows a blue line stream, we will then go out and field verify if there is a blue line stream there. In this case, there is not a blue line stream that bisects the property. The stream kind of what you would call a perennial stream starts at the culvert that goes under the road where there is currently a stormwater pond that is treating runoff from Mitchell Drive and Outback. Chair stated so you're saying the blue line stream pretty much starts at that property line, right where that kind of cuts in off the main road, where the current road comes across to access the pump station. Mr. Huffman stated correct. Chair stated below that retaining wall. Mr. Huffman stated that's reflected in the buffer on the site plan.

A board member asked what happens to the existing ponds that manages the stormwater. Mr. Huffman stated I believe that the proposed plan is that they would construct a new stormwater control measure to treat the volume of water that is currently being treated by the pond that's there now, so they would replace it with a new stormwater control measure.

Chair asked about Mr. Huffman wanting a 25 year storm system instead of a 10-year system. Mr. Huffman stated the condition was that the developer, evaluate the feasibility of putting in a 25-year system because of concerns to impacts downstream.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to address the Board.

Tommy Lowmon. Ackworth, Georgia stated his name for the record and introduced his colleague, Nick Pak from Ohio. He gave a background of the company. He stated they are proposing the development of multifamily for affordable housing here in Hendersonville, and are requesting the current zoning of C-3, Highway Business to be changed to allow for the use of multifamily in the CZD zoning. He gave a background of the Woda Cooper Company and discussed the developments they currently have.

Mr. Lowmon stated they have their one development over here in Western North Carolina, which is Hawkins Pointe, here in Hendersonville. They won an award last year from the Affordable Housing Finance Reader's Choice Award for the Best Rural Development. They take pride in the work they do. They do, like he said, all of their construction, our management, so they build with quality products, and they build to last.

Mr. Lowmon stated he did concerning the water concerns, Mr. Levine and I spoke just a minute ago, and he clarified where the spring head is because he was looking, thinking it was on the site itself, on that particular parcel, and so he tracked looking all over for that site, but he went by there today because the current stormwater retention pond, this is what it is right here, he just wanted to show it and highlight it, because we do care, and we've had some conversations with Camp Pinewood, and if you guys approve this and we're allowed to build this development, we want to make sure we're good neighbors. We've agreed to build a fence, because there was some concern about our residents maybe going over to tennis courts. They have some nice tennis courts, so we agreed to put a fence on their property to try to stop some of that.

Mr. Lowmon stated the current stormwater system is not collecting much water as it stands. The proposal that we had was going with the underground retention system. That current one at the 10 years is roughly, half a million dollars, roughly \$500,000 to do that. If we were to go to the 25 year, that cost is going to be substantially more, and we're trying to bank this in. Affordable housing is built with debt and equity. If we don't get equity from the tax credits, we have to get debt. The debts cause the rents to go up. Whatever the max rents that HUD allows are, we try to fall under those. We try to keep the houses affordable that we build, and so we don't want to increase the rents, so we try to do everything we can to keep the site cost down on the site. There was concern about sediment control while we were doing development. We didn't know there was a control or a concern about the storm water, because we were going to have pervious surfaces now. I think everything we do and everything we've discussed with our engineer, is going to improve. A lot of what's there right now is not working and he thinks it's going to improve what's there and we will put in all those extra measures. There's some costs associated with that, but we do want to be good neighbors, and we don't want to affect that stream head. We will do all the things that are necessary to make that, and we'll study that 25-year system and he will explain the budget later on. At some point, we run out of being able to do affordable housing, just because the costs keep going up.

The concept design was shown and discussed and is included in the presentation.

The preliminary site plan was shown and discussed and is included in the presentation.

Mr. Lowmon stated they just got the market studies back from North Carolina Housing Finance, and so that is their proposed rents right now. One bedroom is \$360 to \$950, two bedroom is \$415 to \$1,095 and three bedroom is \$440 to \$1,200. The reason there's a range in the one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedrooms from one bedroom, \$360 to \$950 is because we like to serve a mixed income communities, so we don't like to just do 60% AMIs all the way down. It's not a true representation of the affordable need in your community. There are some people who need to pay less than that, and some people who can pay more than that in the workforce. The blend is below 60% AMI, but we like to do average income. It's just a better fit for the community.

Mr. Lowmon stated there were some concerns raised around parking. The state did give them a waiver on the parking so they are asking to meet in the middle with the city what the property can support, and then what the state would allow, for the tax credit development.

The income and rent limits were shown and discussed and are included in the presentation.

Mr. Lowmon showed a timeline for the project and discussed this. If we get awarded, we would put an application in, in May. If we would get awarded, we'd be notified in September. We have about 8 to 10 months of going back with the city to make sure our plans and stuff align, and we've done all the studies that are required, and can seek all those necessary approvals. Construction, we like to say 14 months. Our owners like to see it in 12 months. They check in with us every single meeting to see how far along we are on everything and then hopefully place the property in service, and get COs in 2028. And that's provided everything got approved and moved forward.

The capital stack was discussed and explained and is included in the presentation.

Mr. Lowmon stated the recreation plan calls for more use of the recreation space. They originally had the building set back a little bit more, and the playground kind of squeezed in and left some of the retention pond. They were told that they need more recreation space. They doubled the recreation space. They do, when they build something, it has to be visible from the office. That is a state requirement from our management office, they have to be able to see the area. Now, going back into the city, they are trying to come up with something that would work. He pointed out the back area on the site plan. They also want to make sure that they are considering the safety of their residents. If we put something back there, you got trees back there, and then there's the road. We want to make sure we're not doing something that's not safe, but also we have to comply with NCHFA.

Nick Pak discussed the disaster recovery funds.

Mr. Lowmon stated he would say they are committed to being good neighbors if we're able to get this rezoned. We want to invest in the community. We do know the need is great here for affordable housing. We know the impact was great for Helene.

Chair asked if anyone had any questions for the applicant.

Chair asked about the fence. Mr. Lowmon stated they are agreeable to building the fence. Chair asked about the affordability or feasibility of the 25 year stormwater. If they could not afford to build the 25 year stormwater then if it becomes so expensive that it would no longer be affordable, then it's not feasible. Lew Holloway, Community Development Director stated staff was generally in agreement with that.

Chair stated and what about the, the traffic impact analysis. In other words, if this goes through this process, goes to City Council, gets approved, and you get the tax credit, would you, at that point, be willing

to have a condition placed on this saying that you would do the traffic impact analysis, and if any mitigation was found necessary, obviously you'd have to take care of that. Mr. Lowmon stated he is hesitant to just answer that with a yes. He would say this, we did the traffic generation report to see, because there are right now multiple zoned uses that are currently zoned that wouldn't have to come through rezoning, that would generate much more of an impact and it could potentially create much more congestion there. My owner would probably get rid of me if I said we will take accountability for a problem that existed and agree to pay for it, because there's just no way we can know what it would cost.

Mr. Pak explained the scoring system in North Carolina for tax credits.

Chair asked what they are planning to do to preserve the creek. Mr. Lowmon stated when the camp brought this up at the public meeting, we went back to our engineer, and we banked that into the budget to put additional, he explained it to me, and he works, he's in this area, but it's a containment system. It's the regular containment, right? You're going to put your silt fences up, you're going to do all that. You'll do a whole lot more than that, but there's a system you put in place to catch the groundwater and any of the off-site water that runs. It busts it up so it does all these other things. I don't know what it is, it costs us a pretty good bit of money, but he explained all of it to me to mitigate any potential risk to the stream head there. But we have put in the budget to put in not just your extra measures, but actual systems to stop that. Chair asked Mr. Huffman to speak to this. Mr. Huffman stated he doesn't know what the system is, he hasn't seen it, so he can't speak to it. If it's part of their erosion control plan, then it would be under the county's purview, through their erosion and sediment control program. Mr. Huffman stated he has not been out to the site to look at it. He would be happy to go out and look at the stream. One potential part of the condition was that they provide documentation of the stream source, or evaluate that, so we don't have that information. He can't, with the information he has, he can't make a determination on whether or not the project as proposed would have an impact on the base flow of the stream as it is currently.

Chair stated certainly, though, if this runoff, mud, sediment from the construction were to fill in that little area, it would have an impact. Mr. Huffman stated yeah, so if there was a failure of the erosion and sediment control system, that sediment would most likely end up in the stream channel, and that would have an impact to the stream.

Ms. Zafra stated in regards to the parking, is 109 spaces adequate for a 77 unit, when you have 16 three bedrooms? What's going to happen if you have no space? Do you have overflow parking, or anything else available? Mr. Lowmon stated we bring our property management team in when we're looking at sites. They evaluate our sites, we bring our construction team in, they evaluate our sites. If there's any issues with parking and stuff, they find out what it was. Was there too little parking? Is it the way the parking was laid out? Like, what's going on? And so we track all that. We feel like we have a pretty good handle of what that specific unit can go to, and that's why we only requested that down to the 109, but from what was originally 1.75 is what's required by NCHFA, and I think you guys have a maximum of 1.5, and we tried to blend those two based on what we thought we could achieve there. But it was in consultation with our management team.

Chair opened public comment.

Crystal Schroeder with Schroeder's Honda stated this is just not in the best interest of this area. Commercially, it's not the highest and best use. It looks like he did his due diligence and research on it, and, they posted up here that it wasn't the highest and best use of the property. The road, Michelle Drive, is basically a one-lane road. We have motorcycles, customers come in, in and out, and there's a blind curve there. And so, it's already difficult for our customers and motorcycles, side-by-sides, we have employees who test drive motorcycles up and down that road, and if you're adding 100-plus vehicles a day to basically a one-lane road, that's pretty dangerous. And I would advise all of you to go out there to Schroeder's and try to pull out of there to see how far you can see around that curve. And 109 spots, for

this many units? They've tried to purchase some of our land because they know that they don't have enough room for parking. And, like she questioned, 109 spots, they don't have the space. And he had mentioned parking on the road. It's a one-lane road. You can't have people overflow parking on a one-lane road. That doesn't make any kind of sense to me whatsoever at all. As for that five intersection, where all five streets come out. You know, pulling in and out of there daily, I have never seen any accidents there. I don't think it's much of an issue, because most of the traffic is looking, because there's not a lot of traffic pulling in and out of where the Mexican restaurant is, the bank, usually people are looking. And it sounds like they don't want to do the research, because they don't want to have to pay for a cul-de-sac. They want to put it on the taxpayers. And, I mean, I don't really think that's okay either. But as to pulling into there from Four Seasons, that lane coming from the interstate is not wide enough. That whole intersection will have to be redone. There's accidents right there pulling into Starbucks all the time. Three weeks ago, there was a car that was turned over, and you want to add an additional 100-plus vehicles pulling in and out of that intersection? The wastewater, I would be concerned with the camp down there, with the wastewater, like they were saying. And, we're totally against it. We're not okay. I'm sorry we weren't able to come to the other meeting that they had, but, you know, this is, it's too much traffic for that road, and it's commercial. There's plenty of other properties in Henderson County that could be residential, that could be used for residential and I think they need to look elsewhere, and that's just my opinion.

Jack Levine stated his family, they own and operate Camp Pinewood, and we've had the camp since 1967. He stated our main concern is the spring head, and also there is some flooding, and that's why I think Mr. Huffman brought up the 25-year stormwater plan. But mainly, it's protection of the spring head. We've had development on that property many, many years ago, and it did affect the water volume through the spring head and onto our lake. We have no idea what will happen if this construction continues. But we do know that they're going to be disturbing the land once again. And there's going to be concrete replacing all of the acreage that's there now. Not concrete, no asphalt, that's there now. And that adds to the flow to the spring. We were a little bit surprised, that you were considering rezoning to begin with because it is a commercial area, and you're now putting a high density housing development in the middle of a commercial area. There's 77 units, where will all of these people find recreation? And their kids? They might find recreation at our camp, they might find recreation at the spring and the stream that's on their property. But then we would also like to ask that if you do move ahead with this, that spring on their property and that spring head is protected in some way. Once again, it's residential rezoning in a very commercial area.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated affordable housing, especially for our workforce and low-income families, has become a priority need and concern. So any project or proposal to address this need gains our attention. However, we should not be blinded and suspend consideration of critical issues of health and safety, both for the adjacent and larger community, as well as attention to environmental sustainability and economic and community impact. The project would apply for the low-income housing tax credit program, which we know is highly competitive, and in the past, worthy local projects have failed to receive approval. The location here presents many serious issues, both for future residents and adjacent communities. The project will be located on two parcels that present awkward issues. The project would be unable to fill the required parking requirement and fail to meet several standards and code requirements. And the street infrastructure presents serious issues, as you have heard. In proximity to a high injury network and traffic and pedestrian safety issues that the Council is now confronting and issues which are not contributory to a favorable approval of this project. Clearly, another location might increase approval possibility and public support. There's a question here, that has been raised. If you would approve this rezoning and then the project would fail to receive tax credits, would then a market rate project become permissible? If so, this would be contrary to the purposes desired. Which are very important. The neighborhood compatibility meetings minutes. They presented a troubling possibility for a 30-year rehab situation. That would certainly be unsustainable for residents with or without the alternative resources for relocation if rehab seems to be a possibility. But despite the insurances from the developer, the numerous issues with environmental conditions raised concern. The applicant is requiring relief for some stream buffer protections. That is an important city mandate and has impact here, with major uncertainties about potential stream and hydrology

impacts on-site and beyond. Trees, which are essential elements of concern for any major project, face uncertain existence. The developer states that some code requirements would not be met. Because compatibility on many levels becomes a very serious, larger issue here, as adjacent to these properties is a camp. Camps are important defining cultural and economic entities in our region. And camps have provided important summer employment for generations, and many retirees were once campers locally. And camps are important environmental anchoring properties, as this one is. Look at the maps with that green area, and adjacent to this camp, they would construct, over 2 years and establish a four-story building and exacerbate uncertainties about the qualities of the waters. The viability of this camp is at risk. The ultimate question may be personal here. Would you send your child to a camp that would present the uncertainties that this camp confronts.

Glen Lange, 623 Ferncliff stated he is a member of the Hendersonville Tree Board. He stated the Tree Board hasn't formally reviewed this project yet, but they will before the Council meeting, because I think there are some concerns that the Tree Board will have with not following the tree preservation requirements. The tree canopy, in this case, is more than 30,000 square feet. And so, regardless of the size of the trees that make up that canopy, it's still 31,000 square feet of canopy. Regardless of what the arborist has said, and we have two arborists on the Tree Board, and the arborist said that it didn't contain any significant trees. Well, you don't get significant trees until you allow the younger ones to grow. And so, just because some of the trees here that are in that tree canopy are smaller, they will grow over time and become better tree canopy over time. And so, I personally have a problem with setting a standard that was developed along with the council's assistance, and lots of input from development folks, we set that particular standard that we have in the ordinance. They're over the standard. To me, that should... require them to go along with the tree preservation requirements. Those requirements are preserving 20% of the total tree canopy, and then another 10% they can pay in lieu or plant trees to work with that requirement. I don't think we should set precedence that because trees are small, that we should not count them toward the tree canopy on the existing site. The ordinance requires tree canopy preservation to be on this site, according to the ordinance, and I'm sure the Tree Board will want to speak for that formally at Council meeting if this project goes forward. Keep in mind that if the tree preservation requirements are waived, there will be no requirements. The developer can take off every single tree on that site under this, if you waive those tree canopy requirements. Yes, certainly, the developer will plant some trees, but that is in addition to the ordinance requirement for tree preservation. And we understand that if it's below 30,000 square feet, they can take off every tree that they want to, and that would be the case here. I would recommend that we not waive the tree preservation requirement. Or, if you wanted to compromise, have them not be able to produce the Tier 2 trees, there are two tiers in the ordinance that are required. And if you're willing, have a condition that they at least preserve 20% of the trees, which is the Tier 1 requirement of the ordinance. If you want to waive the ordinance, that's fine, but if the developer agrees, and you agree, and the council agrees to 20% requirement, to me, that would be a compromise. That might be sufficient in this particular case so this development can go forward. From my own personal opinion, it looks like you're shoehorning a big development into very little space, and we see that more and more as we travel around Hendersonville, and so that reduces any natural resources that might still be available. And that was the reason behind the tree ordinance.

Chair closed public comment.

Discussion was made on the right-of-way on Mitchell Drive.

Chair asked if market rate housing could go here if the developer did not get their tax credits. Mr. Manley stated no.

Ms. Waters asked do we know what the traffic count is that's generated by the Red Roof Inn and or the Outback Steakhouse? Mr. Manley stated no. The sit-down restaurant does generate a good amount of traffic. You could reference what's in the trip generation memo that was shared for a sit-down restaurant

and that would be comparable to what the Outback produces. The Red Roof, I'm not 100% sure on. It was stated that Mitchell Drive is a state maintained road. It does transition into a private drive. The property owners maintain that portion.

Tax credits, the intersection, and C-3 uses by right were discussed.

The Board discussed the conditions.

Ms. Peacock moved the Planning Board recommend City Council adopt an ordinance amending the official zoning map of the City of Hendersonville, changing the zoning designation of the property (PINs 9579-45-0556 and 9579-45-2846) from C-3 Highway Business to Urban Residential Conditional Zoning District for the development of a 77-unit low-income housing tax credit multifamily project based on the preliminary site plan and list of conditions dated (March 10, 2026) submitted by and agreed to by the applicant, presented at this meeting, and subject to the following: 1. The development shall be consistent with the site plan, including the list of applicable conditions contained therein, and the following permitted uses. 1. 77-unit multi-family residential. With the developer proposed conditions: 1. The proposed development is LIHTC (low-income housing tax credit). All 77 units shall be made available at or below 80% AMI. The proposed development will provide family affordable housing as governed by North Carolina Housing Finance Agency requirements. 2. Based on the existing pavement width of Mitchell Drive there is not adequate room to delineate on-street parking therefore the developer is requesting relief from the requirement to add on-street parking per 5-25-5.16b. 3. Developer is requesting sidewalk along Mitchell Drive to remain "as-is" versus widening to 7', as required under Section 5-25-5.15b. 4. The developer is requesting relief from Section 5-25-5.15 for the width of the internal sidewalks. Internally the development is proposing 6.5' sidewalks (0.5' curb + 6' sidewalk) in locations that abut a parking space and 5' sidewalk for all other pedestrian connections. 5. Based on downstream neighbor concerns about sediment the developer is committed to providing enhanced erosion control devices during construction. Such devices could potentially include extended sediment times and flocculent devices to remove additional sediment from leaving the site. 6. Minimum number of parking spaces required by NCFHA is 109. Therefore, the developer is requesting relief from Section 5-25-5.16a on the maximum allowable parking. 7. Developer has supplied a trip generation letter and is requesting relief from needing to complete a TIA as required under Section 5-25-5.3.1. 8. To better address Urban Residential Zoning District standards, to better achieve the Gen H Plan Guiding Principle for Conserved and Integrated Open Space, and to assist the goals of the Parks and Greenspace Master Plan, the developer shall install active or passive recreational amenities in available open spaces on the site. 9. The City requests that the proposed SCM be evaluated and, if feasible, resized to provide storage and peak flow attenuation for the 25-year storm event. Increasing capacity would help reduce peak discharge to a downstream system with known limitations and minimize potential flooding and erosion impacts to receiving infrastructure and adjacent properties. 10. Work with the ownership of Camp Pinewood to put up a fence at your expense that's agreeable to you. 2. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville Gen H Comprehensive Plan based on the information from staff analysis and the public hearing, and because the petition for the low-income housing tax credit multifamily project is consistent with the future land use and conservation map designation of mixed-use commercial. Additionally, the petition is consistent with a range of the goals and guiding principles, including those supporting affordable housing, compact development, and the mixing of land uses. 3. We find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from staff analysis public hearing, and because, 1. The proposed development is compatible with the surrounding residential and non-residential land uses, 2. The proposed development allows for a mix of uses within a focused intensity node, and 3. The proposed development serves to address the city's need for additional subsidized affordable housing. Ms. Rippey seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(B) Conditional Zoning District – Osceola Lake Inn Redevelopment (25-102-CZD). Mr. Hayes gave the following background:

Mr. Hayes stated the address is 159 Osceola Road. This is located in the ETJ. The applicant is Joey Burnett and Fiona McColley, and the owner is Green Horizons Property Group, LLC. The acreage is 3.49 acres, and there's a current conditional zoning on this property. It's an R-15 CZD. This was done in 2023. It utilized a similar part of our ordinance, to what they are requesting today, which is our adaptive reuse ordinance. And what was approved is part of the binding plan that was approved in 2023 and it was for the adaptive reuse of the existing historic inn on the property. They'll have a 20-room hotel. They were also approved for event conference space and a cafe. And then there were also 26 residential units that were proposed to be one to two bedrooms. All of that was proposed in the existing structures on the property, so I'll talk about the changes that are being proposed in the new, requested R-10 CZD.

Mr. Hayes stated there was a neighborhood compatibility meeting held for this on December 9, 2025. There were four people in person and one online. There were a variety of topics discussed, but some of the main topics were impact of the project on neighboring properties, concerns over the density of the residential component. Now, I will note that the proposal at the time was for 26 units. That has since been revised. There was actually an additional property that was part of the initial proposed application that has since been removed from the current iteration of this application, and then the total number of residential units has been decreased to 14 units. So, just for context, there were some concerns over that density, and the developer has reacted to that. And then questions pertaining to improvements of the roads, given that this is in the ETJ, all of the roads are NCDOT maintained roads.

Site photos were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The site plan was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes pointed out the new construction on the site. Mr. Hayes noted that this site does not trigger tree canopy preservation.

Mr. Hayes discussed the different phases of the project.

The developer proposed conditions were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The city proposed conditions were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The Future Land Use Map was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for comprehensive plan consistency were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for compatibility were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft comprehensive plan consistency statement was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft reasonableness statement for approval and denial was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there was any questions for staff.

Chair asked about the elevation for the accessory structure. Mr. Hayes stated they can pull it up. It is not in the staff report.

Discussion was made on the historic preservation and the Secretary of Interior Standards.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Fiona McColley, 159 Osceola Road stated the historical structure itself really isn't being changed any more than it has been through past applications. We're really done with what we're doing there, it's just the uses that we can put inside the building that we're putting in this petition. So there won't be really any needs that I could see where the historical preservation side of things needs to be really sort of considered or debated, because we're at that point where this is how it's staying.

Ms. McColley showed a photo of the Wellness Center and stated it is not in front of the primary structure but off to the side and rear.

Joey Burnett stated he lives at 511 West Chestnut, which is on the south side of the lake. He showed the elevation that gave the height differences of the buildings.

Ms. Flores asked if they could speak to the units, the 14 units, and what those are going to look like? Mr. Burnett stated the site is terraced, so the inn sits at the highest level, and then this sits at the lowest level of the site. Currently, there's a, like, a recreational yard in this place, like a fenced-in tennis court. It's essentially a kudzu farm right now. So we are rehabbing that existing recreational level of the inn, so we're not disturbing a lot of area, because it's already kind of re-greening a lot of that original courtyard. But, we have six duplexes and then two single-family residences. So the duplexes, there's four models that make up the bulk of the duplexes. One of the units is a one-bedroom, and then the other side of that duplex is a two-bedroom. And then we have two duplexes that are built into the hill, to kind of maximize our area. They have green roofs to kind of alleviate the impervious considerations there, but each of those duplexes have two bedrooms. And then those single-family detached units to the north and south are three-bedroom units and then they're kind of centered around that central courtyard to kind of facilitate more of a community feeling. And then the clubhouse component is up the hill a little bit and that's what we're calling the Resiliency Center. They are trying to squeeze out some of the square footage of those units in order to make them more affordable and put some of those shared amenities in the resiliency hub. So, if you need to entertain your guest, you can go to the Resiliency Hub if you have families staying, they can stay in the inn, those type of things, and make those houses a little bit more efficient. Mr. Burnett stated there will be greenspace all around and in between. There will be no garages.

Chair opened public comment.

John Titus, 203 Vance Street stated a lot has changed in that area since that time. Helene didn't really do us any help, and across from this property, there are a couple new homes. One new home has gone in, and another neighbor took down probably 15 trees that were all 42 inches in diameter, scraped his yard. So, we have a little bit of a better view of the inn than we would like. If my wife were here, she's not a fan of the food truck. I think that what is proposed is, I wasn't able to come to the neighborhood meeting, so I apologize for that. You've done a lot of work since then, I can tell, and I appreciate the quality of where it's headed. I do have some issues with some things. I think it's an aggressive plan. We're adding 19,000 square feet over what it had, according to what I have read. I did go through all of this, and the staff recommendations and so forth. I do think, albeit it's not a historic building, to put that other building out front, the Wellness Center. I think for those of us who live in the community, who come up Osceola, that's a big impact. It'll be there visually, it's not far from the road. No matter what landscaping they do, even though

it's a single-story building, it will block out a bit of the view of the inn itself. And if you were actually in the spirit of the interior design standards, they don't like buildings, the site itself is a part of the standard, and they don't like buildings that are out in front of, or that aren't compatible. They don't want it to look historic, they want it to look different, but they want it to be compatible with the architecture. If you look at the concepts that have been done so far, I don't know that that's necessarily the case. The scale is compatible, but not necessarily the architecture, and I'm an architect by training, I've practiced for 40 years in all different areas along the East Coast in historic districts. I'm concerned that what they might become is something that's more intense, require more parking. I think overall the potential's there, but I'm not necessarily a fan of the developer's condition of having a building out in front of the principal structure, I think there's other places it could go. When you put all the residential parking down the side, and put in lighting that's adequate to light those up. That's going to light up the night sky, where right now we have great stars at night. And visibility, I'm worried about that. Construction traffic, which way are they coming in? The noise, so the more that it can be contained behind the existing structures that are there, the better it will be.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated this ambitious, visionary project arrives before us in a three-phase plan. Phase 1 calls for adaptive reuse of the historic inn, and this has broad public support. Guidelines to ensure its preservation are appropriate. One question is whether the artist studio units will be adaptably converted in Phase 1 and would these be considered historic and retain their current exterior character? Phase 2 would introduce new structures. One structure would be a wellness center. Question is, is this a support entity for the inn, or is it a separate entity with separate management? If the Wellness Center operates as a public amenity. Then the question is, what is the estimated capacity and the parking availability? As you've heard, is the parking adequate for that use at that location? Regarding the office building, is that an adaptive reuse or a new structure? And the compatibility of the Phase 2 structures with the historic scene of the inn becomes important, as you've just heard from the previous speaker. It is a concern because the historic character of the inn is an attribute that people, value and support. Phase 3 is definitely the more visionary element of this project, and in concept, it could become an artist community entity with housing and studios on-site. It would have enormous cultural impact on our area. But during the neighborhood compatibility meeting, neighbors raised many issues and concerns about the functionality of this Phase 3 of the plan, with the issues of traffic and compatibility, as the previous speaker has mentioned. There was suggestion at that meeting of further dialogue, and one hopes that there has been some resolution of some very serious and specific issues that must be addressed. Clearly, there are major issues regarding utilities, fire access, and NCDOT issues that are unresolved, and parts of the plan are vulnerable to required changes. But the purposes here are admirable, but compatibility and functionality must also be addressed for Phases 2 and 3.

Rhea Burnett, 511 West Chestnut Drive, stated she lives just down the road from the proposed plan, and I love this idea, and I am an avid tea drinker of North Carolina, and know many people that are, and think it would be a great asset. I took some notes during different parts of this that I just wanted to address while having the floor. The words adaptive reuse of this site were used, and I believe that with the proposed plan, this can add great value to the neighborhood and increase the adaptive use of this site. I think that this is going to just make everything so much better on this site, and I'm all for it.

Virginia Tegel, 418 Midway street stated she has had the good fortune to travel and live in places where we've had a much more dynamic mixed-use development. So, people lived in mixed-use for thousands of years, until the last hundred years, when we focused on the single-family subdivision model. And I am perfectly excited to see something in the future that goes back to what we've all enjoyed and experienced. I love the idea of a village with necessities and amenities close by. Personally, I have spent a good deal of time on the property, and when you talk about traffic again, looking forward to a less car-centric society. I live about a mile away, and most of the time I'm able to ride my bike when I go to participate there. So, I really appreciate the fact that the city, on a practical sense, says that this is compatible with the comprehensive plan, and if you look at the dreamer sense, especially right now, I'm sure you've all noticed

the price of gas. This is a village that we could all enjoy living in. In fact, in my times visiting there, I've said, in another maybe 15 years, I would love to be there when I'm not able to maintain my own property like I do now. I'm also kind of shocked that no one yet has remarked on the dramatic improvement that this project would bring to this site. So, I commend the development of this project, I look forward to approving it, and I look forward to living there someday.

Chair closed public comment.

Chair asked if this project would have to comply with the lighting ordinance. Mr. Hayes stated yes. He also asked if the parking was found to be adequate. Mr. Hayes stated yes.

Chair asked if the current CZD allowed for residential. Mr. Hayes stated yes, they're approved for 26 residential units. They were in the existing wings of the building, but yes, 26 one to two bedroom units.

The condition for historic preservation was discussed. Chair asked would you be willing to make the new structure that's going to be in front of the building, which is currently not allowed, but you're asking for a condition, would you be willing to make it architecturally compatible with the existing historic hotel? Ms. McColley stated currently, when you stand on the road and you look at the building, there is a row of decimated old pine trees that got absolutely annihilated by the hurricane. They've been topped, they're full of three invasive species of vines, and you can't see the entire building anyway. So, what I believe would be a good compromise would be a new row of trees that grow up and help disguise what we put behind it, and it wouldn't change anything outside of actually making the front view look a lot better than it currently does. The Wellness Center came, it evolved from the idea of you go to a place and you have a spa, right? And you can do wellness stuff at an inn where you stay there. And we have no elevator to get to the second floor, to the third floor, so if you're feeling a little bit stiff and tired after driving, you don't want to climb up three flights of stairs to go and get a massage. So, we came up with the idea that it would be a much more accessible space to be able to have a wellness center instead of expecting people to climb up a multitude of stairs to feel better and not fall all the way back down after they're all relaxed from their delightful massage. So, in the big picture of what we're planning, what we're trying to do, to answer your architectural side of things, if you look at the plans that we proposed for the individual dwellings at the back of the property, they also have turrets, so that that matches the nature of what we're trying to create to have a mini version of a turreted building in front, I think would look tacky and not very appealing. So, I truly believe that it is a very nice-looking building that would be an asset to the view that you would get driving up Osceola Road versus the current version of dead trees.

Mr. Burnett stated the design intent is to make it appear like a garden structure. Ms. Peacock stated the Secretary Standards states that you do not mimic.

Angela Beeker, City Attorney stated the zoning ordinance is really not the place to deal with the historic nature. As it is worded, it is really an encouragement, it's not mandatory as worded. And so I think that's a nice balanced place to be, because it's encouraging that they preserve the historic centers, but we do have a mechanism in place to regulate that. If they chose to apply to be a landmark, then they would have to comply with certain standards to preserve the architectural compatibility. So the way that staff is suggesting it is just we'd really like for you to preserve the historical character to the extent that you can, but this isn't, like I said, the place to deal with that, really. Our zoning ordinance is not a place to do that.

Mr. Johnson moved the Planning Board recommend City Council adopt an ordinance amending the official zoning map of the City of Hendersonville, changing the zoning designation of the subject's property (PIN number 9568-31-5964) from R-15 CZD, Medium Density Residential Conditional Zoning District, to R-10, CZD, Medium, Density Residential Conditional Zoning District based on the site plan and list of conditions submitted by and agreed to by the applicant, (dated 2-12-26) and presented at this meeting, and subject to the following: 1. The development shall be consistent with

the site plan, including a list of applicable conditions contained therein. Adaptive reuse, Hotel and accessory use of cafe, bar, retail, offices, wellness. Artist Studio, 14 residential units. 2. Permitted uses and applicable conditions presented on the site plan shall be amended to include: 1. The project must be in compliance with all applicable fire, utility, NCDOT, and stormwater standards upon final site plan approval. 2. The renovation of the historic structure should be done in the spirit of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. 3. The resiliency hub shall be constructed as part of the residential construction phase of the plan. 3. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville Gen H Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: the petition is consistent with a range of Goals, Guiding Principles, and the Future Land Use Designation of Family/ Neighborhood Living as defined in Chapter IV of the Gen H Comprehensive Plan. 4. We find the petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis, public hearing, and because: 1. The petition proposes to adaptively reuse an important historic structure. 2. The petition provides needed additional housing on a portion of the property. 3. The petition provides a number of sustainability features that align with the goals identified in the comprehensive plan. 4. The petition seeks to revitalize an outdated commercial area. Ms. Zafra seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The Board took a three minute recess.

V(C) Conditional Zoning District – 109 Florence Street (26-13-CZD). Ms. Slyce gave the following background:

Ms. Slyce stated this is an application for a conditional zoning district application, submitted from Alan Sowers of ALSCO Inc, and it's for 109 Florence Street. Those PIN numbers are listed above if you'd like to look at those. The total property is about 2.46 acres, and it's located at the end of Florence Street off of Brooklyn Avenue. The property was previously rezoned to C-2 CZD, Secondary Business Conditional Zoning District, in order to allow the church to use the undeveloped parcels, which you can see, here in the aerial. I've got in the blue that are listed there, so the three that are kind of closest to Florence Street were, residentially zoned. In order to have the church enough parking for their need, they wanted to combine this within a CZD to allow the parking, and then, of course, some other accessories that would be approved along with the application. The previous, C-2 CZD application included limited uses, to include, the religious institution, the parking uses, and offices of public, professional, and private use as well. So, as I mentioned, the subject property is the current site of Grace Blue Ridge Church.

Ms. Slyce stated the applicant is requesting that the parcels be rezoned as a major modification to allow a laundry service use. No additional uses other than what is currently permitted in the existing C-2 CZD zoning would be approved in addition to this request, the applicant would like to take the existing 10,000 square foot warehouse structure at the end of the church, and convert that into a storage facility for uniforms and linens in between operations, serving as the collection center for the business's Hendersonville operations. No laundry services will be conducted on-site, only drop-off and pickup by company vehicles. The existing parking lot that is adjacent to this suite, is also proposed to be designed, organized in order to, support the use, and we'll look at that on the site plan. If approved, this project would be limited to the stated uses, and then the design and considerations that are shown on the site plan.

A neighborhood compatibility meeting for this project was held on January 13, 2026. There were four folks in person, there was one person online, and then there were some city staff and three members of the applicant crew. So the discussion was mostly focused on clarification of the exact use, as we've had a little bit of confusion, because it does say CZD to CZD. We discussed the use that would be limited to storage of linens, and there was also some discussion about noise to the residential areas and the truck traffic entering the residential street.

Site photos were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The site plan was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The developer proposed conditions were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The city proposed condition was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The Future Land Use Map was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The Current Land Use Map was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for comprehensive plan consistency were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for compatibility were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft comprehensive plan consistency statement was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A draft reasonableness statement for approval and denial was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there was any questions for staff.

Chair asked if the existing buffer was a berm or just trees. Ms. Slyce stated she believes it is just trees.

Chair stated the Comp Plan says that the current designation would allow for a neighborhood-serving commercial service. Ms. Slyce stated yes and explained the C-2 zoning and changing the Comp Plan designation to Innovative District.

Discussion was made on the operation hours. The applicant can answer that.

Ms. Zafra asked how the traffic would operate. Ms. Slyce explained the traffic pattern on the site plan.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Corey Reider, 4700 Dwight Evans, Charlotte, North Carolina stated his name and address for the record. He stated this will just be a storage unit. It would take a lot more space if we were ever to even consider a laundry facility, boilers, wash machines, things like that. So it's just like using it as a storage unit. We provide linen to hospitals, restaurants, country clubs, resorts, first aid, AED systems. They would basically have three or four trucks that would come in and out of this facility. We work Monday through Friday. They normally start at 6 am, get back 5 or 6 in the afternoon. He stated at one o'clock in the morning, if a customer calls that late, they get called back the next day. The only time we really work weekends, if an emergency hospital was to run out of sheets or something like that, they would call us, and we would come run to the facility and just grab any extra at the storage warehouse, then we would take them from there. If not, we would actually have to come back to Charlotte to grab it and service the customer. No dirty linens would be kept at the facility overnight. We would have a shuttle every evening when the four trucks got

back. Right now, it's only three, but we hope to have four. But just shuttle the dirty back to Charlotte, where we process it, and then the clean would get brought back to this warehouse, and then the next day the guys or girls would load up the truck and just go service the accounts. And then our hope was just to have a little small office space in there, so we could hold any kind of route meetings, safety meetings, so forth. sales meetings that we may have, but it's just Monday through Friday, 6 a.m. until 5 or 6 in the afternoon. Our trucks are the size of a FedEx, step van, like a little bread truck. We do have one box truck that we use, it's kind of like the size of a U-Haul that we use during peak season to go to these resorts and the hospitals that require a lot of linen.

Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Johnson asked if the work would be done in Charlotte. Mr. Reider stated yes, they have two facilities in Charlotte. Alsco has 80 something plants.

Ms. Waters asked if it would require parking lot lighting to be installed. Mr. Reider stated no.

Chair asked if he would be agreeable to removing the gravel from the landscape areas that you're going to have to put landscaping in? Mr. Reider stated yes, we would have to hire somebody to do that, but yeah, us and the church would partner together to make that happen.

There no further questions for the applicant.

Chair opened public comment.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated the modification as presented is straightforward and perhaps non-controversial, and the applicant has addressed the concerns the Chair has raised about the use. In terms of the specifications here. The role of the church here is something, because the church owns the facility, is that correct? And, like, what does that mean? But would other entities be able to rent out their space for a use that might not be appropriate. That's a tricky thing. What is the role of the church here? Because sometimes the church needs to do things to supplement their expenses, and so forth. The developer condition with a specific description of storage as uniforms and linens. That's very important because if you did not have that specification, in the condition and it's not in the motion then perhaps other items might be permissible, and some would be concerned it's laundry and cleaning, are we going to have toxic materials and substances on site. This condition that's specific to linens and uniform becomes very important here, to allay any fear. But it's not in the motion, and so is that something, is that clarity necessary?

Chair closed public comment.

The Board discussed the motion and conditions.

Ms. Zafra asked if they would ever expand the operation. Mr. Reider stated no, not at all.

Ms. Waters moved the Planning Board recommend City Council adopt an ordinance amending the official zoning map of the City of Hendersonville, changing the zoning designation of the subject property (PINs 9578-21-5868, 9578-21-4924, 9578-21-4699, 9578-21-5614) from C-2 CZD Secondary Business Conditional Zoning District to C-2 CZD, Secondary Business Conditional Zoning District for the use of an existing structure as a dry cleaning and laundry establishment limited to storage only based on the site plan and list of conditions submitted by and agreed to by the applicant, (dated February 20, 2026) and presented at this meeting, and subject to the following: 1. The development shall be consistent with the site plan, including the list of applicable conditions contained therein, and the following permitted uses: 1. Religious institutions. 2. Office, business, professional, and public. 3. Parking lots and parking garages. 4. Dry cleaning and laundry

establishments (limited to storage). 2. Permitted uses and applicable conditions presented on the site plan shall be amended to include: 1. Applicant to remove the gravel from the landscape areas to maximize success of the new vegetation. 3. The petition is found to be inconsistent with the City of Hendersonville Gen H Comprehensive Plan, based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: The petition for C-2 CZD zoning is inconsistent with the Future Land Use and Conservation Map Designation of Multi-Generational Living. 4. We find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis, public hearings, and because: 1. The proposed zoning is compatible with surrounding residential and non-residential uses. 2. The proposed zoning allows for secondary business uses, including the proposed laundry service limited to storage use. 5. Furthermore, we propose to amend the character area of the subject property on the Gen H Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use and Conservation Map to that of Innovation. Ms. Flores seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI Other Business – None

VII Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 pm.

Jim Robertson, Chair