Minutes of the Planning Board
Regular Meeting
September 10, 2026

Members Present: Jim Robertson, (Chair), Betsey Zafra, Lauren Rippy, Kyle Gilgis, Donna Waters, Bob Johnson, Mark Russell

Members Absent: Tamara Peacock (Vice-Chair), David McKinley, Laura Flores

Staff Present: Matthew Manley, Long Range Planning Manager, Lew Holloway, Community Development Director, Sarah McLaurin, Planner II, Angela Beeker, 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. Discussion was made on moving the two administrative items together since they are of the same nature. Item "C" was moved to Item "B". ***Ms. Gilgis moved to approve the amended agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Waters and passed unanimously.***

III Approval of Minutes for the meeting of August 13, 2026. ***Ms. Gilgis moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of the meeting of August 13, 2026. The motion was seconded by Ms. Zafra and passed unanimously.***

IV Old Business

V New Business

V(A) Administrative Review – Preliminary Site Plan Approval and Plat Approval – Drakewood Minor PRD -Subdivision (26-51-SPR & 26-54-SUB). Mr. Manley gave the following background:

Chair stated this is development by right, but the Planning Board and city staff have to review the site plan to make sure there's no setback infractions, height restriction infractions, things of that nature, parking, the parking codes have been met, things of that nature. So, if the ordinance has been met, it is incumbent upon this board to approve the site plan. Chair stated he had purchased a property in Saddlebrook but has not moved to this location yet, however, he did receive a notice from the city about this project which means he is within 400 feet of the project, and he would like to recuse himself.

Ms. Gilgis made a motion to recuse Mr. Robertson, Chair from this item. The motion was seconded by Mr. Russell and passed unanimously.

Chair left the room and Ms. Gilgis became acting Chair.

Matt Manley stated this is both a preliminary site plan and a preliminary plat, so just going over some background rules and understanding for baseline information. Mr. Manley explained the preliminary site plan and preliminary plat process and that is included in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Manley gave the project background which is included in the staff report and presentation.

DRAFT

Mr. Manley stated in this case, they're proposing a Planned Residential Development for 20 single-family homes and that coincides with a major subdivision for 20 residential lots. It's on 1.88 acres, so just under two acres. That comes out to 10.6 units per acre.

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

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

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

Mr. Manley stated while there are those minor tweaks that may need to be made for the driveway locations, the site plan is compliant with the zoning standards, and it does incorporate some of the requirements from the subdivision ordinance as well. So, staff finds it compliant.

Mr. Manley noted he wanted to highlight the ordinance, the language in our ordinance, we've talked about this a lot, but it's underlined there that residential units under 1,200 square feet in gross floor area shall count as one half unit for the purposes of calculating density allotments in all zoning districts which regulate density. So, R-10 is not a density-based zoning district. It's a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. Every lot has to be 10,000 square feet. But R-10 allows a minor PRD, so you can choose to do a development under minor PRD. Once you shift over to minor PRD, it does become a density-based, type of development. And so, in this case that doubles the allowances, so it's five and a half units per acre permitted under a minor PRD for R-10.

The preliminary plat was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation. Mr. Manley stated this preliminary plat is found to be compliant with the requirements of the subdivision ordinance.

Mr. Manley stated there are both approval motions for the site plan and the plat as well as motions for denial for both.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

It was asked if this was consistent with the Comp Plan. Mr. Manley stated because this is not a rezoning, it does not have to be. It is essentially a by-right development. There is not a legislative consideration.

Ms. Zafra stated do you know about any grading or retention that's going to be done to buffer any runoff from any potential flooding in the future? Mr. Manley stated they will meet the city's requirements for stormwater. They will be disturbing over an acre, so they will be required to meet that stormwater quality and quantity. They will have to meet the planting requirements for street trees and common space under common space and open space plantings.

Mr. Manley stated the floodplain ordinance also has to be met, so we have a natural resource protection standards in the zoning ordinance, which limits how much disturbance can be done in the floodplain, so that retains that area for flood storage. It remains undisturbed. And so, you cannot grade more than 10%, can't, impact that area more than 10%. So that area is being left alone as much as possible. Then, also, we have a flood damage prevention ordinance which is in the city code, and that's governed by our floodplain and stormwater administrators, and they review that and make sure that it's built at least two feet above base flood elevation, and whatever requirements we have for preventing property damage in the event of a flood. So, they have to meet those standards if they're in the floodplain.

Ms. Zafra asked if any buffers or barriers would be required concerning the farmland beside this project. Mr. Manley stated there were not any requirements for that.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair opened public comment.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated he just wanted to recognize that there is a floodplain here, and this area has experienced major floods in the past. The other thing about the sidewalk. Does that connect to sidewalks beyond that property?

Chair closed public comment.

Ms. Waters moved the Planning Board grant preliminary site plan approval, based on the requirements of the City of Hendersonville Zoning Ordinance for the Drakewood Minor Planned Residential Development. Ms. Rippy seconded the motion which passed with five in favor and one opposed (Zafra).

Ms. Rippy moved the Planning Board to grant preliminary plat approval, based on the requirements of the City of Hendersonville Subdivision Ordnance for the Drakewood Major Subdivision. Mr. Russell seconded the motion which passed five in favor and one opposed (Zafra).

Mr. Robertson returned to the meeting.

V(B) Administrative Review – Preliminary Site Plan – 1910 Haywood Road (26-46-SPR). Ms. McLaurin gave the following background:

Ms. McLaurin stated similar to the last one, this is a preliminary site plan review, so it's being reviewed based on if it's meeting the requirements or not. Just to highlight that this will be also reviewed as an expedited subdivision, it's three lots, so staff will review that administratively at a later date, so you won't have to motion or review a subdivision plat today, just the preliminary site plan.

Ms. McLaurin gave a project background which is included in the staff report and presentation. She stated they are proposing a minor PRD for this site. It'll have a total of nine units, four single-family homes, and three duplexes.

The half-unit double density was discussed. Ms. McLaurin stated essentially units that are under 1,200 square feet can be calculated as half units for density calculations, but for things like the level of review or parking requirements, those will be full units, which is why it's coming to you since it's nine units. There are two existing single-family homes and three duplexes, and they're proposing the addition of two single-family homes. So, this is four full units and six half units, which will total seven units for density. The site is permitted under the PRD for R-15 zoning, four units per acre, which is nine units for the site. So, with that seven-unit density calculation, they'll meet that.

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

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

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

Ms. McLaurin stated again that it's about two and a quarter acres, with a total of nine units being proposed. There are sidewalks on the opposite side of the street, so they're meeting sidewalk requirements without having to build additional sidewalks. Based on our review, it's meeting the preliminary site plan requirements of the zoning ordinance for minor PRD and site plan review.

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Ms. Zafra asked if there would be a tree survey and if they could put that as a condition. Ms. McLaurin stated for the preliminary site plan, they're not required to show planting plans, a full detailed landscaping plan. We will review that for final site plan review. It's unclear on this one what trees are being preserved. They're not triggering our tree preservation requirements, but some of those trees that you see, we might encourage them to preserve for, and they can use those for tree credits. So, they're not triggering that requirement, and we'll review that for compliance with the landscaping ordinance before we do final site plan approval.

Discussion was made on nine or more units triggering site plan review.

Ms. Zafra stated Canary Hollow Lane, I'm not sure you can see it there, but it's pretty narrow, so if there's already existing houses back there, how would these construction trucks and everything impact the residents? Ms. McLaurin stated they have a staging area proposed. I think it's where the parking will be for additional vehicles, so they showed that on the site plan for their equipment.

Chair stated I am surprised that it's not triggering sidewalks, because there is, I guess the city required it. Gann Village, when they developed put a sidewalk to nowhere. It basically starts at Gann Village and ends at the end of their property. And it just stops. And this would continue it toward the convenience store, and I could see folks wanting to walk to that convenience store safely. I'm really surprised that it's not triggering a sidewalk, because there is a sidewalk that goes nowhere at Gann Village. Ms. McLaurin stated it's my understanding that this street is only requiring sidewalks on one side of the road, based on the classification of the street, and there's sidewalks on the opposite side, so they're not required to build them. Mr. Holloway discussed not being able to require them to construct a sidewalk even though there is one at Gann Village. He stated the city has no authority to leverage the additional sidewalk.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Alex Ward, Land Surveyor stated I really don't have anything to add. I think Sarah knows more about this at this point than I do. Just hearing her presentation. I'd be happy to answer some of your questions about, trees and construction staging that you had. At face value, my response to that would be, there's a current proposed driveway that comes off of Canary Hollow Lane, and there's a proposed widening to happen at the entrance of Canary Hollow Lane, as it meets the existing paving to widen the entrance, essentially. And, we are planning to improve, the entrance apron to meet NCDOT codes in that area, and then essentially the new two units are being proposed, a shared driveway is coming off of Canary Hollow Lane, so an additional area of parking is being added for the existing units, along with new parking for the two new units. Construction staging is being proposed in the vicinity of the two new units, so the folks that have existing units that are currently living there won't have any kind of spilling out into their front yard. There'll be clearly defined silt fencing and construction barriers around that area. They will have to drive past, a construction zone on their way into new and existing parking inside the existing condo complex. And as far as tree preservation, we don't have a landscape plan yet that'll be required. In my understanding, it's a phase two after site plan review and approval that landscaping plan along with dedication of common units and meeting all of the shrub and tree, either existing or planting credits, are in the staff review phase of this, but at face value, we're not proposing to take down any major trees. He stated they do not plan to take out any of the large oak trees.

Chair opened public comment. No one spoke.

Chair closed public comment.

Mr. Russell moved Planning Board grant preliminary site plan approval, based on the requirements of the City of Hendersonville Zoning Ordinance (with primary consideration of sections 5-14-4. Development Standards for PRD Planned Residential Development and 7-3-3. Review of Preliminary Site Plans) for the 1910 Haywood Road Minor Planned Residential Development. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

V(C) Zoning Map Amendment – Standard Rezoning – 101 S Grove Street (26-56-RZO). Ms. McLaurin gave the following background:

Ms. McLaurin gave a brief explanation of the standard rezoning process. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

Ms. McLaurin stated the applicant is Jared DeRidder, and the property owner is Henderson County, which is represented by Chris Todd. It's about .77 acres. It's currently zoned C-1SU Central Business Special Use. And the applicant is requesting a return to base zoning of C-1 Central Business. This is in the Downtown Future Land Use area.

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

Comp Plan consistency was discussed.

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

Ms. McLaurin stated I'll note that South Grove, East Allen, and First Avenue, all of the streets surrounding this property are all city-maintained streets, and staff found C-1 zoning to be compatible with the surrounding land uses, and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Guiding Principles.

Ms. McLaurin discussed Special Use districts. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

Ms. McLaurin compared the C-1 zoning and the C-1 SU zoning. This is included in the staff report and presentation.

The C-1SU site plan was shown and discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

Ms. McLaurin stated looking at the other factors, nothing really of note for change conditions, public interest, public facilities, or effect on the natural environment. There's some additional language in the staff report, and I'm happy to answer any questions about that, but we found these to be fulfilled by the rezoning request.

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

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

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

DRAFT

Ms. Rippy asked about the height of the proposed Building II. Mr. Holloway stated the applicant is asking for that proposal to be wiped from the plan and if they did come back with another building proposal it would have to be reviewed all over again.

Chair discussed having the special use zoning revert back to the original zoning after a certain amount of time. Then they would not have to go back through this process. Angela Beeker, City Attorney stated there is nothing in the zoning ordinance that says that currently, as you're aware. As to whether we could, I'd have to give that a little bit of thought. The statute did just get updated for the vesting period. Site plans are now good for five years, up from two. I just would have to think about if we could put in the ordinance that it would automatically revert. We have traditionally, just staff has initiated the rezoning to put it in a general zoning district.

Chair asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Jared DeRidder, WGLA Engineering stated I don't have anything else to add to what was presented by staff. I think, as she mentioned, we're compatible with the zoning districts surrounding us for the C-1 zoning district, and we're wishing to make improvements on the property that would be in line with the improvements allowed in the C-1 zoning district.

Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant. There were no questions.

Chair opened public comment.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated Henderson County is the property owner. And one is aware that the county has a need to provide facilities for various county uses. And clearly, the availability of an existing county property for serving such uses would be a benefit for county taxpayers rather than acquiring another property at added expense. And the primary issue here might be traffic that a use might generate, and adequate parking.

Chair closed public comment.

Ms. Gilgis 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 9568-87-7059 and 9568-87-6293) from C-1SU, Central Business Special Use to C-1, Central Business based on the following: 1. The petition is found to be consistent with the City of Hendersonville's Gen H Comprehensive Plan based on the information from the staff analysis, and because the proposed zoning of C-1 aligns with the Gen H 2045 Comprehensive Future Land Use and Conservation Map and the character area description for downtown. 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 a return to the previous base zoning of C-1 Central District restores potential development opportunities on this property by permitting the same uses available to other adjacent C-1 properties, and C-1 zoning is designated to promote development in the downtown district which the subject parcels are within. Ms. Waters seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Mr. Holloway and Ms. Beeker explained the administrative review process.

VI Other Business – None

VII Adjournment – ***The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.***

_____
Jim Robertson, Chair

DRAFT