

**Minutes of the Planning Board
Regular Meeting
March 13, 2025**

Members Present: Tamara Peacock (Vice-Chair), Donna Waters, Kyle Gilgis, Jim Robertson (Chair), Bob Johnson, David McKinley, Mark Russell

Members Absent: Laura Flores, Peter Hanley

Staff Present: Tyler Morrow, Current Planning Manager, Sam Hayes, Planner II, Matthew Manley, Long Range Planning Manager, Lew Holloway, Community Development Director, 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. *Mr. Johnson moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Waters and passed unanimously.***

Chair confirmed a quorum was present.

- III Approval of Minutes for the meeting of January 9, 2025. *Ms. Gilgis moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of the meeting of January 9, 2025. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peacock and passed unanimously.***

IV Old Business

V New Business

- V(A) Conditional Zoning District – Henderson County Courthouse and Detention Center (25-06-CZD). Mr. Morrow gave the following background:**

Mr. Morrow stated this project is located at 200 N. Grove Street. The applicant and property owner is Henderson County Government. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property to PID CZD, Planned Institutional Development Conditional Zoning District. The property is approximately 14.78 acres and they are proposing to construct a 90,859 sq. ft. courthouse addition and a 53,443 sq. ft. detention center expansion.

Mr. Morrow stated a Neighborhood Compatibility meeting was held January 23, 2025. Topics discussed were impacts from increased traffic, the need for expansion, if a TIA would be required, concerns about the public drop-off area being an issue, visual aesthetics of the courthouse structure and how to make it more welcoming, whether the project proposed any sustainable aspects.

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

A brief rezoning history was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A site plan was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation. The site plan was discussed. There is a blueline stream on the property.

Mr. Morrow stated the proposed height of the courthouse will be 92.75 feet and the proposed height for the detention center will be 25.5 feet. The max height allowed in the PID zoning district is 50 feet. The applicant has requested a condition to allow for the proposed height.

Mr. Morrow showed the downtown height limitation map and discussed the session law concerning the height. He stated the subject property is outside of the area outlined in yellow and is not included in the session law height restriction of 64'.

Mr. Morrow stated a TIA was done and there were no major mitigations recommended.

A city proposed condition was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. The developer has not agreed to this condition.

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

Height comparable buildings in downtown were shown and discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

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

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

Gen H Public Realm guidance was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

The Current Land Use and Zoning map was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

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

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

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

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair asked if Henderson County allowed for conditional zoning. Mr. Morrow stated they do have conditional zoning.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Christopher Todd, Assistant County Manager stated he would turn things over to the consultants but wanted to thank the Planning Board.

Steve White, Fentress Architects stated that was a very good summary of the project that was presented. He would move through the presentation rather quickly. He explained the site plan in detail. He stated parking would be expanded to the impound lot and the impound lot would be relocated to another spot in the county. He pointed out the secure parking for staff on site and stated parking for the judges would be

under the building. He showed a blow up of the ground floor for the courthouse and explained the first floor plan. He pointed out the connection to the 1995 building.

He showed the elevations for each side and explained those to the board. He explained the “stepping” of the building and how the height drops off at each step. He stated he believes this project will be both vehicular and pedestrian friendly. They have a very solid group of professionals working on this from the civil side and the landscape side as well as the parking and engineering side to make this a safe comfortable environment. This will be an improvement for the courthouse and the city. He showed the front elevation and stated Main Street has a higher elevation and this really diminishes the scale of the building from Main Street. He discussed the materials that would be used and the colors. Mr. Johnson asked about the colors they are proposing and what is currently there now and if they would match. Mr. White stated they had made a decision to not try to match because inevitably you don't quite hit it. The building is 35 years old and it has aged. The building is actually a light gray and they are making a complimentary pallet that works well with that.

Mr. White showed a site plan diagram. He discussed the area. He stated they plan to take down the grand staircase and recapture that space for greenspace. He pointed out the buffered connection to the parking lot. He also pointed out the barrier free parking spaces in the front along with the fire lane in the front.

Greg Bassiely, McMillan Pazdan Smith Architecture stated there are several additions to the detention center. He pointed out the area “A” where there would be inmate housing. It is a new addition. He pointed out another addition “B” that would also have inmate housing and a third area for inmate housing “C”. He pointed out area “D” that would be the new booking area for the detention center. The main entrance would be relocated and he showed that on the plan. He showed two renderings of the proposed facility. He discussed the materials.

Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicants.

Ms. Waters asked about the handicap spaces and if they would be expanded or if there would be spaces on the first level that would remain open. Mr. Bassiely stated he hopes with this new facility there will be an expanded number of spaces. He pointed out the area where the spaces would be and they would be at grade level.

Chair asked concerning the sidewalks, is the reason they are asking for a fee in lieu because they do not want to have to deal with the railroad.

Will Buie, WGLA Engineering stated they are working on the project from a civil perspective. He stated he worked on the project in 2010 for the Sheriff's Office and the county had agreed to improve the sidewalk through the Martin Luther King Jr Park rather than build the sidewalk down to the property line. The property line terminates right in the middle of the railroad and it seemed to them at that time that it was dangerous to have that sidewalk that would be extended to the property line and end in the middle of the railroad. The county has offered the alternative condition of a fee in lieu of which allows them time to figure what will happen with the rail line and the Fourth Avenue corridor. They could build the sidewalk but feels it would be a shame if it was built on the Henderson County side and the other side is not where the extension into Jackson Park continues. That is the logic behind the condition.

Chair stated at the neighborhood meeting there was concern about the need in the detention center for more beds. Can someone from the county address that?

Kenny Burns, Burns Architecture stated he is an advisor to both the design team and the county, He stated there is really no one here from the county that can answer that. Chair stated he thought Mr. Todd could do it. Chair stated he just wanted to make sure the concern was addressed from the NCM. Mr. Burns

stated originally there were studies done that told them how many beds to put in and so they designed the original concepts for that. As they got closer to moving forward, the needs went down a little bit, the actual need for beds and they looked at that and because of the cost and things they actually decided to split what they show as Area B and that was where the main expansion would take place and they have eliminated half of it. It can be built in the future but because the need wasn't there right now, they have taken that out. The addition they are putting in right now is 110 more beds, 24 for females and 78 are on the male side, which based on the studies and the projection on when they will need those beds, that will be adequate for at least 20 years.

Chair asked why they would design a building that is 42 feet taller than what is allowed. Mr. White stated the program is really what is pushing them to build a taller building. They looked at all different kinds of scenarios on how to organize the building and they determined that the most efficient, effective way to do this is with a single stack. When you design courthouses you always design them in pairs and the prisoners are kept in holding cells between the two court rooms and there is a prisoner elevator that is in that middle court. If they were to expand horizontally they have now doubled the number of elevators for that. To make the building the most efficient and effective as possible that drove them to a stacking scenario where they stacked the courts. The second issue they were addressing by doing that was that it freed them to utilize the site more to get the number of parking spaces they needed without having to build a deck. The deck was on the table in the beginning and they just could not afford it. Right now that was something that the county could not do.

Discussion was made on the Third Avenue drop-off. Mr. Morrow explained what staff was proposing.

Mr. Buie stated there are a few things that drive the need for what they are showing. He explained the Fire Department connection and pointed out the location. The truck turn would have to come in and move back again so simply carving this off and ending it here is not possible from a firefighting standpoint. They need a "T" for the trucks to be able to get in and turn around. The team felt that it is important that they needed to provide the at grade accessible parking, they could extend it a bit further but the goal with what you see here is that this is all plaza area which transitions into greenspace and blends into the MLK Park area which is existing. He thinks through signage it will be very clear and it is a one way in and it will be very clear that the right lane is for accessible parking and the left land is for drop off and they believe that can work well.

There were no further questions for the applicants.

Chair opened public comment.

Diana Byrd spoke and stated if the entrance is from First Avenue at the detention center then she is concerned about there being more traffic on Pine Street which goes into that part of Allen Street in front of their building which is considered a private road and the wear and tear on that road. She just thinks the city should start helping them with that part of Allen Street. In inclement weather the city refuses to plow that area. She thinks it is not fair and with the change with the detention center there will be more traffic on it.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street (zoom) stated the project is an essential public facility and it has gone through a long process of design and redesign. The key factor here has been the budget. We must consider functionality and compatibility. A major issue is the drop off and handicap parking at the main entrance. He talked about people having to use the stairs and if that was ADA compliant. For a big budget project like this there should be easier access. Another issue is the number of parking spaces. Are the lots adequate for the parking required? The search for parking will become a traffic issue as well. If you do not have adequate parking you will have other issues. Another issue is the height. This is a massive building and it will have a major impact on the cityscape. It would be important to see other views from this location.

The stair issue is a major issue to deal with. He does not think it is functional or practical at the present time.

Chair closed public comment.

Discussion was made on the concerns about First Avenue and Pine and Allen Street. Mr. Holloway felt like staff could work with her on terms of whether it is a city street. Chair stated the traffic will enter the parking lot from Fourth Avenue and will not be from the First Avenue side. The detention center will be from that side which it already is on and nothing will change there as far as traffic he wouldn't think. Ms. Byrd stated when they do this redesign the main entrance will be from First Avenue. Mr. Morrow stated that entrance to the detention center is already on First Avenue. Chair stated on that side of the facility nothing is really going to change. Chair stated eight handicap spaces does not seem efficient especially with the stairs and there is no other way to access the facility. Mr. Buie discussed the number of parking spaces. There will be accessible spaces that will be provided for staff as well. Those spaces on top are only for visitors coming to the courthouse. Mr. Buie stated they have heard the concerns and can look at the number of spaces that are provided up top. Chair discussed having a condition for handicap spaces.

Ms. Peacock moved 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 (PIN: 9568-97-1859) from PID, Planned Institutional Development to PID-CZD, Planned Institutional Development Conditional Zoning District, for the construction of a 90,859 square foot courthouse and 53,443 square foot detention center based on the master site plan and list of conditions submitted by and agreed to by the applicant, [dated 3-6-25] 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 Permitted Uses: 1.Public & quasi-public buildings 2. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville Gen H 2045 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 Chapter IV of the Gen H Comprehensive Plan. 3. We find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis and the public hearing, and because: 1. This expansion would give the County the additional space needed to improve operational efficiency and enhance the services currently provided to its citizens. 2. The proposed expansion of the detention center and courthouse builds upon a longstanding use established at this site for over three decades. 3. Expanding the courthouse is a long-term investment in the community, ensuring that the infrastructure is capable of handling future needs without requiring another expansion in the near future. Ms. Gilgis seconded the motion. Chair discussed having a condition concerning the parking spaces. Discussion was made by the Board members on having more spaces or having a ramp and more spaces. Mr. Buie stated building a ramp like that would be challenging and they can certainly look at the area and see where they can increase parking up top. Ms. Peacock amended the motion to include that City Council consider additional handicap parking. Ms. Gilgis seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(B) Zoning Map Amendment – Standard Rezoning – 23 Brevard Knoll Drive (25-07-RZO). Mr. Manley gave the following background:

Mr. Manley stated this is a standard rezoning for a parcel along Signal Hill Road. The property address is 23 Brevard Knoll Drive and the applicants are Lamott and Meghan Cowan. It is a .43 acre lot and is currently zoned R-20. The initial application was for a rezoning to C-2 which would be following an adjacent property that was rezoned from RCT to C-2 however based on some feedback from staff and discussing this further with the applicant it was agreed on by the applicant to amend their application to CHMU. Staff finds that better aligns with the Future Land Use Designation of Innovation.

Site photos were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation. He stated the property is split and a portion is on the other side of Brevard Knoll.

The Comprehensive Plan Consistency Future Land Use map was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

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

The Current Land Use and Zoning map was shown and is 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 consistency statement was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

A reasonableness statement was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Rationale for approval and denial were shown and included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair asked the applicant to come up and speak. The applicant was not in attendance or on zoom.

Chair opened public comment.

Dwain Haynes, 150 Brevard Knoll Drive stated they live at the end of the road past this property. They have an ongoing concern with the development that has been going on Signal Hill Road. They built their house there in 1995 and there was no Signal Hill Road they lived on Linda Vista and it was all gravel going almost back to Four Seasons Boulevard. There has been a lot of change in the past 30 years. They see a lot of truck traffic on Signal Hill and it is hard to get in and out of the driveway. His primary concern is their driveway bisects this property and it is .42 acres. If it is used as some commercial property where people are coming and going then that will interfere with their ability to use the driveway. Adjoining that piece of property to the north which is roughly two acres. The property is a contractor and has said he is thinking about putting three homes on it and has cleared some of the property and that will add more traffic to it. They also have a vacant parcel next to them. It is a possibility in the next 15 to 20 years to have a dozen or more houses using a single lane gravel driveway. He doesn't have any issues right now but if you add a commercial property that will increase traffic and cause other issues. His third concern is he does not see how there could be a sewer connection there and he doesn't see how it could be developed if you can't have water or sewer. Mainly it is just the congestion and the construction of the right-of-way there. Because it is right off of Signal Hill Road and people pull into that property, it really restricts them being able to get in and out of their property.

Ester Padula, 167 Brevard Knoll Drive stated Brevard Knoll is a tiny road. It is a very narrow private drive. There are only seven lots on that road and five of them have homes on them. What she understands is that they are trying to have 23 Brevard Knoll Road a commercial lot and her understanding was that the people who purchased this lot want to put in a storage warehouse. They are telling them that they do not need a septic system they just want to put up this big building to store their commercial products. She was wondering what piece of that property are they going to do that on. She also agrees with what Mr. Haynes has to say it is their road. They are the ones that are responsible for this little piece of road and if all of a

sudden there is a commercial building there who is going to be responsible for any damages or additional wear and tear on this road. Their mailboxes are all lined up on that corner there. It is a very small piece of property because it is cut in half. She has major concerns about that. Since the hurricane she lost most of her trees and she can look out and now see Home Depot, which she never could see before. If they put up a warehouse there, that is going to be in her backyard. That will like looking at commercialism where it was once very peaceful and residential. The traffic on Signal Hill Road is horrible and this was a concern of hers as well. It is going to get so much worse the more commercial buildings that are there.

No one else spoke.

Chair closed public comment.

The right-of-way was shown on the map. It was stated the Brevard Knoll Road is a one lane gravel drive. Ms. Peacock asked about the access. Mr. Manley stated his understanding is they would have a cross access easement that is shared access along that road for any property that abuts it. Ms. Peacock asked about the front setback. Mr. Manley stated he believes the front setback would come off of Signal Hill Road. The narrowest of the property line is considered the front. Mr. Manley stated there would be side setbacks on the private road. He stated it is one parcel and is .42 acres.

Mr. Haynes stated it was a 20 acre farm at one time but the property was divided and sold off.

Discussion was made on the requirements for the side setback for CHMU.

Ms. Waters asked if the easement was recorded with the county. Ms. Beeker stated what is shown in red is just what is taxed and that is not the legal boundary she imagines if a survey has been done it would close those gaps and show it as an easement. It would have to be looked at during site plan approval when they come in to get their zoning compliance permit. Ms. Waters stated so that could never become a public road. Ms. Beeker stated she does not know what could happen in the future but right now it is just an easement that would be shown on a survey.

Ms. Peacock stated there is no survey showing the easement. Mr. Manley stated no, there is no development proposed so there is no requirement for them to submit anything. Ms. Beeker's recommendation was to close the gap on the zoning boundary to make it all the way to the center line of Signal Hill all the way over and close the gap on the zoning. Mr. Manley stated it is closed. If you take the parcel lines away the district is all one. Ms. Beeker explained bringing the zoning to the center line like they did for the adjacent C-2 zoning.

Ms. Beeker explained there are private property rights that would not play into the rezoning. Rezoning the property would not change the road at all.

Mr. Manley stated they will look into the easement to clarify for City Council.

Chair had concerns about putting commercial properties all along Signal Hill Road and it being used as a cut through. He stated a lot of people use this road to get from Asheville Highway to the interstate without having to get on a major thoroughfare.

Virginia Haynes, 150 Brevard Knoll Road stated she leaves her house to go to school around 7:00 am and on top of the cut through traffic, the I-26 construction had led thousands of 18-wheelers down that road. It is hard for bus stops on that road now, it's hard to pull out on that road and the accidents occurring at the mini-storage because it is in a blind spot coming across the road as they turn into the mini-storage, it is a daily thing. Then they will have a subdivision between Lafollette and Amazing Grace that First Victory is

building that will be hundreds of more vehicles. All the growth on Clear Creek cuts up through there. That road wasn't built to have that much traffic on it. It is falling apart and is a pothole disaster now.

Ms. Waters concern was if this becomes commercial and there are no setbacks because it is not a road, they could go in there and put in anything they wanted to right up to the property line. That would make it where that road could never be developed into a road for the people living behind it. Mr. Manley stated it is speculating that there is no right-of-way and there is no setback requirement currently other than on the side and the rear and it is speculating there is no right-of-way if it was rezoned and there would be no setback other than the side and rear. The condition does not change based on the rezoning. What would change is the ability to put in a commercial use and multi-family is also another use and that is the primary difference between the two.

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 property (PIN: 9579-06-3217) from R-20, Low Density Residential to CHMU, Commercial Highway Mixed Use, based on the following: 1. 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 because: The proposed zoning of CHMU aligns with the Gen H 2045 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use & Conservation Map and the Character Area Description for 'Innovation'. 2. Furthermore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis, public hearing and because: 1. CHMU Zoning would allow for greater economic use of the subject property given the wide range of permitted uses. 2. CHMU Zoning along this corridor could lead to additional opportunities for needed housing in close proximity to Commercial uses. 3. CHMU Zoning ensures some level of compatibility through application of Design Standards. Ms. Gilgis seconded the motion which passed 5 in favor and 2 against. (Mr. Robison and Mr. Russell opposed the motion)

V(C) Zoning Text Amendment – Reforms for Housing (25-01-ZTA). Mr. Manley gave the following background:

Mr. Manley stated this is a city initiated zoning text amendment that is hitting on a number of different chapters. In the zoning ordinance it effects a range of zoning districts and it is primarily focused on the residential zoning districts.

Mr. Manley gave a background of the project which is included in the staff report and presentation. There are two phases to this text amendment. Phase I relates to dimensional requirements, permitted uses and definitions. Phase II relates to PRD and minor PRD, ADU's and density.

The proposed amendments for Phase I were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

The proposed amendments for Phase II were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

A Zoning Districts Distribution Table was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Future Land Use and Conservation map was shown along with the a table showing the relationship to the Gen H Comp Plan. These are included in the staff report and presentation.

General rezoning standards for Comprehensive Plan Consistency was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Relationship to Gen H Comp Plan guiding principles including compact development, missing middle housing and desirable and affordable housing were discussed and are included in the staff report and presentation.

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

Draft rationale for approval and denial were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked about Greenville Highway Mixed Use apartment units and Mr. Manley stated if it was 51 units it would trigger a CZD. Chair stated they would not be able to do it by right. Mr. Manley stated they could not do 100 units by right. Mr. Manley stated Greenville Highway has no density cap. Mr. Holloway stated once you get to 50 units it triggers a CZD. If you did have a minor PRD and the base was 12, they could go to 24 units without that triggering anything but they would have to meet all the other standards.

The Board discussed the density. Different scenarios were discussed. "Missing Middle" and affordable and attainable housing was also discussed.

Chair opened public comment. No one spoke.

Chair closed public comment..

Ms. Gilgis moved the Planning Board recommend City Council adopt an ordinance amending the official City of Hendersonville Zoning Ordinance: Article IV. Establishment of Zoning Districts, Article V. Zoning District Classifications, Article VI. General Provisions, Article VIII. Exceptions & Modifications, Article XII. Definition of Terms, and Article XVI. Supplementary Standards as presented by staff, based on the following: 1.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 public hearing and because: The proposed text amendment aligns with the Gen H 2045 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use & Conservation Map and the Character Area Descriptions. 2. Furthermore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis, public hearing and because: 1.The proposed amendment creates an opportunity to address the need for additional, dispersed, "attainable" infill housing. 2.The proposed amendment allows for property owners to better utilize their property and earn additional revenue. 3.The proposed amendment will incentive the construction of smaller, more affordable dwellings ("starter homes"). Ms. Waters seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(D) Zoning Map Amendment– Standard Rezoning – LBH Property Holdings LLC (Lyndon Hill) – (25-10-RZO). Mr. Hayes gave the following background:

Mr. Hayes stated this is a lot off of Upward Road and it is going from Henderson County Community Commercial to the City's zoning of Commercial Highway Mixed Use (CHMU). The city initiated this zoning and the property was annexed into the city in February. The property owner did not request a zoning district so the city has proposed CHMU and initiated the zoning. The property is only .08 acres and is very small.

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

A Comprehensive Plan Consistency Future Land Use map was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Hayes stated staff did find this to be consistent with the Comp Plan.

A current Land Use and Zoning map was shown and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Hayes stated the CHMU district was established in 2011 and was established for the purpose of the properties along Upward Road.

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

A draft reasonableness statement with rationale for both approval and denial were shown and are included in the staff report and presentation.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Ms. Gilgis asked how this property was missed. Chair stated it was just recently annexed.

Chair opened public comment. No one spoke.

Chair closed public comment.

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 (PIN: 9577-89-9886) from Henderson County CC to City of Hendersonville Commercial Highway Mixed Use and designating the Future Land Use classification as "Mixed Use – Commercial" based on the following: 1.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 because: The proposed zoning of CHMU aligns with the Gen H 2045 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use & Conservation Map and the Character Area designations in the areas adjacent to the subject parcel. 2. Furthermore, we find this petition to be reasonable and in the public interest based on the information from the staff analysis, public hearing and because: 1.Commercial Highway Mixed Use is the zoning district established for the Upward Road Planning Area. 2.The Commercial Highway Mixed Use zoning district is well suited to achieve the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for this area. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

VI Other Business. Chair discussed having a quorum and having a Special Called Meeting to rehear items from February.

VII Adjournment – *The meeting was adjourned at 6:43 pm.*

Jim Robertson, Chair