

# PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION THE LOFTS AT CHADWICK (P24-04-CZD) MEETING DATE: MARCH 14<sup>TH</sup>, 2024

PETITION REQUEST: Rezoning: The Lofts at Chadwick- Conditional Zoning District (GHMU-CZD)

#### APPLICANT/PETITIONER: Stephen Drake (President) – Broadcraft Construction & Development Inc (applicant) Brett Barry (Manager) – Gordon Dooley Holdings LLC [Owner]

#### PLANNING BOARD ACTION SUMMARY:

The Planning Board voted 4-2 to recommend <u>denial</u> of this petition and adopted the following motion:

PLANNING BOARD MOTION:

Mr. Whiting moved Planning Board recommend City Council deny an ordinance amending the official zoning map of the City of Hendersonville changing the zoning designation of the subject (PIN: 9568-92-1924) from GHMU-CZD, Greenville Highway Mixed Use Conditional Zoning District to GHMU-CZD, Greenville Highway Mixed Use Conditional Zoning District based on the following:

- 1. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville 2030 Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the staff analysis and because: The petition aligns with the City's 2030 Comprehensive Plan's Goals because it encourages infill development in an area planned for high-intensity development, as indicated by its "Priority Infill Area" designation and because multi-family residential of 8 or more units per acre is a primary recommended land use for the High Intensity Neighborhood Designation.
- 2. We do not find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis, public hearing and because:
  - a. The proposed development proposes to remove 48 mature trees from the site while only maintaining 12 mature trees.
  - b. The project is not providing all required stream buffer and transitional area protections measures for a blueline stream identified in the most recent USGS seven-and-one-half minute quadrangle topographic maps

## **OVERVIEW OF BOARD DISCUSSION FROM MINUTES:**

The Planning Board convened on the project for **<u>I hour and 38 minutes</u>**.

Mr. Hanley asked if there was any way to modify the traffic situation that will make it easier to transition to Greenville Highway. Mr. Drake stated they don't own Chadwick Avenue and they don't own Greenville Highway. They are the jurisdiction of the City and NCDOT. The more room they provide for right of way on the property, the less room they have for the building. They have pushed that to the limit with the 25 foot right of way provided. He thinks they might be one of the only developments along Greenville Highway that has offered a right of way because he thinks this is a new request that NCDOT has started asking of developers. You have many properties along Greenville Highway where there is no right of way granted for the widening of Greenville Highway. He stated less than 20% of the residents living here will not be working so they will not be driving at am and pm peak hours. There's not much traffic that comes in and out of these developments.

Ms. Robinson asked about loading and unloading areas and she discussed living in a community with elderly people and the ambulance being called one or two times a week. She feels like they will have a real hard time getting an ambulance in. Mr. Drake stated all the accessways meet the requirements of the Fire Marshal, which is 26 feet. An ambulance is going to pull up right there and not be looking for parking and try to get as close as they can to that entrance.

Jeff McCluskey, Civil Engineer stated they are trying to maximize the parking and they are over the code required minimum. They had to have 60 parking spaces and they are providing 70 parking spaces. They would rather not take three or four parking spaces and make it a loading zone. He understands the loading zone requirement, but normally those are stuck in the back of a site and not used at all. The ambulance will use the front of the building for access. The same goes for Amazon, FedEx or anyone else. The intent was they were trying to stripe as many parking spaces as possible because he knows in general with these types of projects there is a large concern with neighbors for having adequate parking. That was why they were trying to request to not have a loading zone to maximize their parking. Chair stated so it is feasible you just lose a few parking spaces. Mr. McCluskey stated yes, they would just not stripe it as a parking space.

Chair asked why they wouldn't build what has already been approved. Mr. Drake stated the North Carolina Finance Agency is very particular about the dwelling units and that the design of the dwelling units be ADA accessible. We have six that are designated exclusively for those that are mobility impaired or handicapped but in case there was a seventh or eighth or fifteenth person that comes in that needed accommodations all of these units are already designed to accommodate folks that need additional help. It is a very specific design. They looked at it, but they have to build their buildings right to the needs of seniors.

Chair asked him to talk about storm water management and asked if it was underground. Mr. Drake stated yes. Mr. McCluskey stated stormwater management will meet all of the City of Hendersonville's stormwater requirements.

Chair asked about the blueline stream and making the parking spaces pervious. Mr. McCluskey stated that would be an option they could look at doing. There is some maintenance to it and he is familiar with this type of concrete. Mr. Drake's concern was the maintenance cost of it and the cost not being in their operating budget. Mr. Drake stated it was a condition they would be open to looking at.

## **OVERVIEW OF BOARD DISCUSSION FROM MINUTES:**

Chair stated affordable housing is needed so badly he really feels like some of these conditions could be met but he would like to see the pervious concrete on all those east parking spaces, and he really feels like they need a loading zone. But they are already talking about a deficiency in parking spaces because of the two-bedroom units.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Nancy Polluck, Carousel Lane stated the only comment would be when she moved from Charlotte to Hendersonville about ten years ago. She lived in Charlotte in 1985 and saw it explode. She loved Charlotte, but the first time she came to her home on Carousel Lane she went Greenville Highway and she loved it. The second time she came in on Spartanburg Highway and it was so ugly. She is curious why Hendersonville does not steer developers to those big empty spaces on Spartanburg Highway and make it look presentable.

Lynne Williams, Chadwick Avenue stated this Planning Board recommended denial of a similar project on this exact site. The Tree Board voted this site incompatible for the previous development. This property directly abuts the floodplain and increase impervious surfaces, and removes many mature trees. The last storm event caused flooding and blocked all emergency access to the hospital. Placing 60 seniors in such a high flooding risk zone creates public safety hazards and concerns. She asked that the stream buffer ordinance be complied with. She was concerned with the parking and the developer not having a loading and unloading zone. She felt like the 50 foot ROW that NCDOT requested should be agreed to.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street (Zoom) stated affordable housing is a major need for the city, however it is important to realize there will be issues with the functioning of the project in this location. Traffic backs up on Chadwick at the traffic light even at non rush hour times. For the residents of this project entrance and exit will be difficult. Traffic on Chadwick will inevitably increase. Parking with 30 units being two-bedroom could easily exceed the 70 spaces. Seniors pose a greater risk of having emergencies which will bring fire trucks and EMS vehicles to the parking lot. Emergency access is critical.

## **BOARD ACTION:**

#### Motion:

• Chauncey Whiting

## Second:

• Peter Hanley

## Yeas:

• Chauncey Whiting, Peter Hanley, Donna Waters, Yolanda Robinson.

## Nays:

• Jim Robertson (Chair), Laura Flores

## Absent:

• Barbara Cromar, Beth Robertson

## Recused:

• Tamara Peacock