

**Minutes of the Planning Board
Regular Meeting - Electronic
June 13, 2024**

Members Present: Jim Robertson (Chair), Peter Hanley, Tamara Peacock (Vice-Chair), Donna Waters, Barbara Cromar, Laura Flores, Beth Robertson, Chauncey Whiting

Members Absent:

Staff Present: Tyler Morrow, Planner, Matthew Manley, Strategic Projects Manager, Sam Hayes, Planner

I Call to Order. *The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. A quorum was established.*

Ms. Robertson discussed her recent absences with the Board.

II Approval of Agenda. *Mr. Hanley moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Cromar and passed unanimously.*

III Approval of Minutes for the meeting of May 9, 2024. *Mr. Hanley moved to approve the Planning Board minutes of the meeting of May 9, 2024. The motion was seconded by Ms. Cromar and passed unanimously.*

IV Old Business

V New Business

Ms. Waters arrived at 4:05 pm.

V(A) Conditional Zoning District – Rezoning – Felicia Reeves Home (A24-24-CZD). Mr. Morrow gave the following background:

The City of Hendersonville is in receipt of an application for a Conditional Rezoning from Alyce Knaflich (Founding Director and Board Chair) of Aura Home Women Vets. The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property PIN 9569-44-7296 and located at 1744 Meadowbrook terrace from R-10, Medium Density Residential to R-10 CZD, Medium Density Residential Conditional Zoning District for the adaptive reuse of an existing building for a residential care facility on approximately 0.69 acres. This would accommodate 12 veterans and an on-site director. The Future Land Use Designation is Medium Intensity Neighborhood.

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

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

Mr. Morrow stated *Residential Care Facilities* are defined in the ordinance as: *Establishments primarily engaged in the provision of residential, social and personal care for children, the aged and special categories of persons with some limits on ability for self-care but where medical care is not a major*

element. Such facilities include homes for the aged and infirm and other similar residential care uses not otherwise defined in this ordinance.

The existing building and shed are to be renovated and they equal 8,020 sq. ft. There are no proposed additions to the building. Phase I of the development will be 4,846 sq. ft. and Phase II would be 2,424 sq. ft. The entire project will be housed in the existing footprint of the building. Mr. Morrow explained the phases of the project and that would entail.

Sidewalks will be provided. Per a condition, the developer proposes installing sidewalks as part of Phase II. Mr. Morrow explained the parking spaces and this is included in the staff report.

Lighting must comply with the City's lighting standards for multi-family.

Landscaping was discussed along with the property being in the Special Flood Hazard area. This is included in the staff report and presentation. A flood map was shown of the property and is included in the staff report.

Mr. Morrow stated the existing building is approximately 1' 6" below the base flood elevation. If the building renovation costs trigger the requirement to come into conformance with current standards then the building will have to be raised 3' 6" to bring the entire structure 2 feet above the base flood elevation.

The Supplementary Standards are included in the staff report and presentation.

The developer's proposed conditions are as follows: Widen existing gravel access drive to 20'-0" +/- from Meadowbrook Terrace to shed as shown (24' City Standard). Renovation/adaptive reuse of existing commercial building for proposed residential care facility for women's veterans will be completed in phases ultimately providing living accommodations for twelve (12) occupants including on-site director. Support functions to include kitchen, laundry, classroom, exercise room and tv/game room. Reduction in required open space from 60% to 36%. New sidewalk will be provided in phase II.

There were no city proposed conditions.

The NCM for this project occurred on May 1, 2024. Topics discussed were the types of services, flooding impacts, if the VA would play a role in the selection of residents, questions about staffing, security and hours of operation, the need for affordable housing especially for our Vets.

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

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

The General Zoning Standards and Comprehensive Plan Consistency was discussed and is included in the staff report and presentation.

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

Chair asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Whiting asked about sidewalks and if there was one from the bus stop to the facility. Mr. Morrow stated there is not currently. He stated the best placement for that sidewalk would probably be across the street when they do construct it.

Ms. Peacock asked if the shed in the back that is over the setback line, would that be grandfathered? Mr.

Morrow stated since it is existing and is on the site plan, that would be a component of the approval.

Discussion was made on placing the sidewalk across the street the continue the sidewalk portion that is existing. Chair stated the sidewalk is already a condition that it will be installed in Phase II but it does not say where it will be installed. Mr. Morrow explained that the ordinance does allow the City Manager to approve sidewalks on the opposite side of the street under certain circumstances. Staff would look into this to make sure it is the most viable option. Chair stated so there does not need to be a condition about the placement. Mr. Morrow stated correct.

There were no further questions for staff.

Chair asked if the applicant was here and if they wanted to speak.

Eugene Britton with Fisher Architects stated they were contacted by Alyce to initially do the interior work on the space and then they got involved with the rezoning part of it as well. There will be no increase to the existing footprint. The use will be only for 12 occupants. He discussed parking and the fact that the structure is very close to Meadowbrook Terrace and getting the landscaping in there was a bit of a challenge. He showed the aerial of the property on the GIS and stated it was actually built in two phases. Part was built in the 1960's and in 2014 an addition was done. He stated not only was it a nursing home but it was allowed to expand at some point into a larger facility. He stated coming from Asheville Highway you have commercial uses then into the neighborhood you have a multi-family use and this use and he feels it is an appropriate transition to the neighborhood. He stated to get the number of parking he took the two aerial views from 1984 and 2010, which did show cars aligned in front of the building and he took the survey information which shows the spaces projecting out from the building and he came up with a parking arrangement similar to that. They tried to reduce the number of spaces across the front and provide only two ways in and out of the parking area and provide some landscaping in the front. He explained some of the distances with the front and parking and the landscaping.

Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Hanley asked if the parking across the front would be gravel or paved. Mr. Britton stated it is gravel.

Ms. Cromar stated the parking in the front and if you put the sidewalk on the other side will it just be drive and drive out. Mr. Britton stated yes, the entrance is closest to Asheville Highway and you will pull in and come out back toward Asheville Highway. The parking spaces accessed behind the building is by a somewhat improved driveway on the western side of the site plan. There are six spaces in the back. The driveway connects to a house that is behind the property.

Discussion was made on the shared driveway. Mr. Britton pointed out the shared driveway and stated only one house accesses this shared drive. Discussion was also made on the buffer and it was stated that the buffer is a natural buffer.

Ms. Cromar stated she had interviewed some people around the area and the questions that came up in the NCM have they all been addressed included security, the people that will be attending, will he answer that or someone else? Mr. Britton stated someone else.

Alyce Knaflich, Asheville NC stated her name and address for the record. She stated they came to Hendersonville because they could not find a piece of property in Buncombe County. Henderson County has the second highest veteran population in North Carolina. There is not much here for veterans. They found this property and bought it real cheap.

Ms. Knaflich discussed the issue with the driveway there is a survey from 1987 showing that the 15 feet is a right-of-way for the folks behind them. They own the property and they have given them a right-of-way to get to their house. It shows on the survey in 2020 that they own the property and it is also included in their deed description. She also discussed the floodplain issue and stated she was told the zoning has nothing to do with the floodplain. She stated they have owned the property for eight years and have never had any water come into the building, not even close. They have done landscaping to divert the water to that huge ditch to the north of the property. The water also drains off to the construction pond. They are also talking about putting in grids and diverting the water to those spots. They had a FEMA 50 appraiser come out to reassess the property. They appraised the building at 570K not the 123K or whatever the city said it was. They said the building has good bones and is able to be renovated. She passed around the copy of the appraisal to the Planning Board members.

Ms. Knaflich gave a presentation showing Women Veteran Statistics and discussed each one. A copy of the presentation can be found in Community Development Department located at 100 N. King Street. She stated they cover nine counties in North Carolina. Aura Home is all volunteers and she gave a list of the Board members. They meet monthly and are very active.

Ms. Knaflich stated they get their funding through corporation and volunteer groups, volunteer activities. Churches, Veterans groups, businesses and individuals all help to contribute and support them financially. Grants, speaking engagements, sponsorships and in-kind contributions all are ways of support for them.

Ms. Knaflich discussed the Aura Home Women's Vets programs. This was included in the presentation. She stated she counsels each veteran that comes in for help. She gave examples of families that she has helped.

Chair stated there is no doubt in anyone's mind that they are doing wonderful things for vulnerable people that deserve that help but what the Board is here to do is look at a piece of property give a recommendation to City Council on this conditional rezoning. The fact they are doing wonderful things for vulnerable people that deserve the help they understand that. They are far reaching and giving folks the help they deserve and that is a great thing he just wanted to be considerate of everyone's time. It was stated that the Felicia Reeves Home is the name for the project they are discussing today. Ms. Knaflich explained who Felicia Reeves was.

Ms. Cromar asked if this was transitional housing and if people would be there permanently. Ms. Knaflich stated no, it will be temporary housing. She gets most of the women that come to them out in six to nine months and in their own space. Ms. Cromar asked about the live-in house manager and asked if their facility is to be open 24/7? Can people come and go or are there hours when the facility will be locked? Ms. Knaflich stated the normal hours are 8:00 am until 5:00 pm. If they are working second or third shift they will have to be able to come and go. Ms. Cromar asked if each resident will have a key to the door. Ms. Knaflich stated they will have combination locks. They will have their own combination to the locks. They will also have a nighttime security guard that will monitor those doors. They do have a camera system now. They will hire an agency for night staff to come in every evening.

Ms. Cromar stated part of the NCM was discussion on the color of the building. She did not mean to offend but personally she did not think it was attractive and neither do some people that she had spoken with. They wanted to know if they could add some earth colors to mute the color a little because most of the houses there are white or have wood, the trailers across the street are white and gray. If you would consider this it would be helpful. Ms. Knaflich stated the reason they painted it is so people can find it. She got a little carried away with the yellow. Ms. Cromar stated they will find it when they need it and it would fit better into the neighborhood with more earth colors. Ms. Knaflich stated a few neighbors really like it because they can tell people where to find them.

Ms. Cromar stated she had mentioned the number of women vets that live in the county and the state. Because you have brought this up and it is an issue with City Council and it meets our goals and needs, she has two questions. Will you be taking residents from all over North Carolina or all over 14 states? Ms. Knaflich stated their priority is Henderson County, second priority if they cannot fill all of the beds is Western North Carolina. They do cover nine counties in WNC. Their third priority would be the state of North Carolina. Ms. Cromar asked, the residents they will have how will they get to you and will you do background checks. Ms. Knaflich stated they go by the housing rule first. That is the only way they would ever get funding. They bring them in and vet them and if they need any kind of treatment like drug or alcohol treatment then they get clean and then help support them. They are not a detox center. They have rules and they are a drug and alcohol free facility. That is why they will have a live-in house manager and nighttime security. They want to keep the neighborhood safe.

Mr. Hanley asked why they limited it to eleven people. Ms. Knaflich stated because they need space to heal. She discussed having a four year pilot program and what that entailed.

Ms. Cromar asked what the proposed opening date would be. Ms. Knaflich stated if approved they would have Phase I done by the end of the first quarter of 2025.

Chair stated on the site plan it says there will be twelve people living there, anything on the site plan under conditional zoning is binding but it doesn't say on the site plan there will be an on-site director 24/7 and night security. What will bind them to that? Mr. Morrow stated some of it gets covered in the condition that calls out the twelve occupants and the on-site director. He stated there is note on the site plan that states the hours of operation and it states it will be 24 hours. You could ask that the condition be amended to include the on-site director and nighttime security. Chair asked how they would enforce that? Mr. Morrow stated he was not sure.

Chair stated there is a Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance in the City of Hendersonville and if you renovate and spend more than half the value of the building you must meet that ordinance requirement and raise the building about 3 ½ feet. How do they plan to do this or are they planning not to put more than 50% of the value into the renovations in any given year. In his opinion that is trying to get around and there is an ordinance in place for a reason. Mr. Britton stated they discussed that but it is prohibitively expensive to raise the building 3 ½ feet so the reason for the phased approach is to do a modest renovation and to not cross that substantial improvement threshold. With the appraisal that Alyce has and the numbers she has received from contractors the thinking was that would work out and they would be under that threshold. Chair stated it has been depreciated by 83%. The current value is 137,000 on the books. Is that the number the city would use for that ordinance, the 137,000 that is according to the Henderson County tax records? Mr. Morrow stated he is not sure. The 50% and what triggers and what doesn't is outside of zoning and that is a separate ordinance all together. If this use was approved as part of the zoning, they would have to work with Mike Huffman the City's Floodplain Administrator to make sure they are in compliance with this outside ordinance as far as floodplain is concerned. They would work with other city staff directly to come into compliance with that ordinance.

Mike Huffman, Floodplain Administrator stated a professional appraisal is the best way to determine the building value. If they have an appraisal they would review that and make a determination on the value and what 50% of that would be. They do look at all information available to staff and make a determination.

Chair opened the meeting for public comment.

Dr. Debora Meitz. 22 New Leicester Highway, Asheville stated she was a member of the Board of Directors for the Aura Home. She stated there is curfew associated with the residents of the Felicia Reeves Home. This is also a drug and alcohol free facility. They want to maintain a good quality of life for the people who live there and that is also a concern for others who live in the community.

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated they are being asked to reestablish a nonconforming use that has many issues and does not meet the current standards. It is also located within a 100-year Floodplain. There are many issues but there is also an important need. The applicant has presented a clear plan for the project. He asked how the project would function for the proposed use. He discussed the rapid increase of homelessness in the city. He discussed their needs and how the veterans would have serious needs. He discussed the definition for residential care facility and stated this may include medical needs which the definition does not cover. Another concern was the difficulty of funding for this project. Henderson County is overwhelmed and understaffed. He discussed this project setting a precedent. He talked about the floodplain and restricting development in it. He discussed the impacts on surrounding areas due to flooding. To place a care facility with a vulnerable population in the floodplain when there may be a need for rapid evacuation is a huge concern.

Sandra Cameron, 1741 Meadowbrook Terrace stated they are directly across from the project. She stated they did not receive any notification for this meeting (staff pulled the properties list after this meeting and determined they actually had received notification). She stated there are six homes on their block and 15 residents. Rezoning this property will double the residents living on this small quiet block and completely change the living environment for all families residing here. She has three young children that have enjoyed growing up on the block. This greatly effects them. She stated the number of vehicles on their block will increase from approximately seven to over 20 daily. Over the last decade the block has returned to a nice environment, this proposal will move them backwards to an overcrowded eyesore with safety hazards. While the Aura family has empathy for all fellow living creatures, the proposed residents will arrive with difficult issues requiring specialized management and assistance and guidance. She discussed drug addiction being a problem for the homeless. She talked about not having the proper staffing and stated the residents may be recovered but they are still addicts and will be near their children. She was concerned about the amount of workers and others that will add to the traffic of the neighborhood. She stated her and her disabled husband had been stalked by someone affiliated with the facility. She discussed the circumstances surrounding the man and the fear they felt from his actions. She discussed the residential area and how the area had become quiet and serene since the closing of the rest home that was previously run on the property. Increased traffic was a concern due to her small children. She was concerned that her property value will decrease from this project. She discussed the safety of her children if this were to be approved. She also was concerned about the floodplain and flooding issues. She stated the water does come up to the building. This will completely destroy the neighborhood and the improvements that has been made over the year. The property is not fit to house these women in it. She has been in knee deep water in the street from the flooding. This will make this block in Druid Hills the worst one in the area. They love their family home and neighborhood. If the rezoning occurs this will take them back to the situation they were in 20 years ago and she would ask the city to decrease the taxes or purchase her property for what it is worth. She could then find a home that is 2000 sq. ft. and walkable to schools and grocery stores. She is the sole caretaker for her family since her husband was severely injured from the doctors wrong choices in chemotherapy treatment for his stage 4 cancer. They are firmly against the parties and such that has taken place across the street and they are fearful due to the interactions with some of the people affiliated with the project. She asked the board to consider her children and vote no to the project and she stated another thing to consider is the lack of funding that they have. There are other locations along Spartanburg Highway where this could go and not in a residential district. She stated the issue of the value of the building and raising the building three feet should be discussed first and not the rezoning. She thinks this is a nice idea trying to help the women vets but it is the wrong location. Why do they need night security if issues will not arise? Her final question was would anyone of you want this in front of your home or your children's home?

Joan Brooks, 1734 Clairmont Drive stated she is a female veteran and clinical social worker and she retired last year after working 40 years in the military. She has great compassion for this. They purchased the house in 2022 and she was excited about the opportunity to volunteer with something she is very passionate about however after two years she walks out on her porch and looks at a property in dereliction

and dilapidated and is an eyesore. She is not surprised there is a lot of criminal activity at the house because it has been boarded up. She has spent 17,000 in the last six months on putting in a fence and a security system and landscaping in the hopes that in three or five years she will create a blockade. She discussed the value of property and having homeless shelters in neighborhoods. She stated the property is much worse off now than it was eight years ago when they purchased the property. She does not have faith in the organization to properly maintain this property nor properly manage it. She asked the Board if they as part of their decision making process ask for information in regards to the organizations ability to complete the project? Will you require they meet the floodplain ordinance before any more money is taken for this project. She was very concerned that there is not enough money to fund this project. Chair stated they do not ask if the applicant has the funds to carry out their project. She stated her primary concern as a neighbor is the impact of her property taxes, the impact on the safety and security and as a veteran and a woman that works with female veterans and having an organization that is receiving a lot of money, it sounds like a pipe dream and a lot of the grants and monies will be given to this property when other organizations could use it and this one will never get completed. She thinks people should be giving to a viable concern.

Tricia Gearity, Horse Shoe stated she has been in support of this program for 10 years. The concern about the color of the house is a concern that she shares. She stated they will take care of that. She talked about running a shelter for abused and battered women and also discussed funding for this project. She felt like if the project is approved it will open up avenues and funding for this project. She discussed the effects of having vacant buildings.

Alyce Knaflich stated they are planning to hire seven full time employees to be there. She explained what the positions would be. She also stated this is not a shelter. This is a place for the veterans to live while they get their life back together. They have to be clean first before coming to the house. She discussed what they would be doing and trying to get the women to be independent. She discussed being broken into at least 16 times in the past. They are trying to stay within the 50% requirement for FEMA and that is why it is taking longer on this project. She stated it was built in 1960 and it was there first. It was built by a Korean War veteran that wanted to help people and that is what she wants to do. She wants to help her fellow female veterans that are in need of housing. The funding for the project will come when they are approved to make it happen. It has been a struggle for them because they did not have a building but now they have a facility. She discussed the clean up process for this building. She talked about the security of the building. She stated they have not exceeded the 50% on the flood requirements.

Wanda Schwerer, 300 Winding Meadows Drive, Flat Rock stated she is a veteran and is also on the Board for Aura Home. She stated a comment was concerning the windows being boarded up and they worked with the city on this and that was a requirement. They have gotten permission to put in new windows and received a grant for most of the cost. They do have support from the community and support from other organizations. They do have plans to make the building more presentable and more secure.

Joseph Cameron, 1741 Meadowbrook Terrace stated when cars are parked over there it looks like a car park. There are so many vehicles over there. He stated Ms. Knaflich stated she wanted to make this work and this was her dream and she was determined but this sounds like another domineering attitude. He doesn't know what will happen when this pipe dream falls through the floor. He discussed the leeway being given for the 50% requirement. He asked why they don't sale the building for the amount it was appraised for and find an appropriate location. This all seems to be coming down from Asheville where there is a significant heroin issue. Heroin issues don't just go away. People with these kinds of addictions are not what you want transiting through the neighborhood, especially in front of your house and in front of your children going to school every morning. It all sounds great but it will significantly hurt him and his family. He discussed cleaning up the neighborhood. He discussed his medical condition and leaving his children if he passes with this to deal with. He would be willing to make the building his garage and not some place for people to live. The building is dilapidated.

Judy Moolten, 415 Rose Street stated she has been on the Board for Aura Home Vets for a few months now and she is also a realtor and understands a lot of the different aspects of what is going on. She lives half a mile from S. Main Street and she has all low income housing around her and she loves where she lives. She is also a retired behavioral health specialist and she has worked as a social worker in different inner cities. Veterans were her specialty when she worked in San Francisco. She knows a lot about trauma and addiction. She no longer has a private practice since Covid. She is here in support of Aura Home and she realizes there is a lot of "not in my back yard". She stated they have wonderful insightful plans and they have tried to address everything that has been brought to their attention. They want to be part of the neighborhood.

Chair closed public comment.

Ms. Peacock stated she has formally worked for Aura as an architect but has not worked for them in the past year. She has no financial conflict with them and can still vote but she has had discussions with them and currently has advised them. She is not under any financial relationship with them at all.

Ms. Cromar asked Ms. Knaflich if she has created one of these homes somewhere else. Ms. Knaflich stated she did a four year pilot program in Asheville. They worked out all the kinks with what could happen. She has developed a five phase program for success. They had a 75% success rate with that program. It was a three bedroom apartment in a residential neighborhood. When Covid hit they had to close. This is their first big project.

Ms. Cromar asked how opposed would they be to putting in a high fence where they did not have bushes and trees. There was discussion about not being able to do that in the Floodplain. Ms. Cromar was trying to comprise. Mr. Morrow stated asking for landscaping and fence would have to be a condition. Conditions cannot be forced upon the applicant or the city. They must be agreed upon. This could be a city proposed condition but the applicant would have to agree to that at the City Council meeting.

Discussion was made on the required buffering. Type A buffers were discussed.

Ms. Knaflich stated she would look into the fence.

Ms. Robertson asked about the comment that was made that Ms. Knaflich would keep out the riff raff. She asked if they were anticipating riff raff. Ms. Knaflich stated right across the street there was a drug dealer and she reported this to the police. Ms. Robertson asked about having therapy, medical and other help for the residents. Ms. Knaflich stated the help the residents need would be outsourced. Ms. Robertson stated so you plan to have these types in the facility Ms. Knaflich stated they would need to detox. Ms. Robertson stated she understood. Ms. Knaflich stated they would be monitored and parties would not be allowed.

Chair stated the funding has not been there and after eight years they are just now getting the project approved. Ms. Knaflich stated it has taken years to clean the facility out and getting rid of the medical equipment in there. Because of Covid their paperwork never got signed and sealed. They had issues with the architect. They did get approval to put the roof on by Susan Frady. It has taken some time to get things moving.

Mr. Hanley discussed Covid and the funding and having only volunteers and there is a lot of rationale for the time it has taken.

The Board discussed the project.

Chair discussed the flood regulations and the applicant putting the work in phases to get around the ordinance requirements.

Mr. Morrow explained that if this project is approved they will have to meet the Floodplain Prevention Ordinance. He stated these are two separate items. This is looking at the use and if this is approved there will be more requirements that have to be addressed. The 50% trigger is a separate item where planning and zoning does not get involved in that determination. If it is approved and they do this development and renovations that will be approved through another department. The Comp Plan does talk about development in the floodplain and how that works as well as the zoning ordinance. He stated this Board is looking at the use and the use in the floodplain rather than the 50% requirement.

Discussion was made on what would happen if this is approved and someone else comes along and buys it. Chair stated if that happens they would have to use the property for what it is approved for under the conditional zoning.

Mr. Morrow explained vested rights and development approval. He stated the zoning runs with the land. Mr. Morrow also explained what would happen if the rezoning was not approved.

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 subject property (PIN: 9569-44-7296) from R-10, Medium Density Residential to R-10-CZD, Medium Density Residential Conditional Zoning District, for the adaptive reuse of an existing structure for the use of a residential care facility based on the master site plan and list of conditions submitted by and agreed to by the applicant, [revision dated 6-3-24] 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. Adaptive Reuse 2. Residential Care Facility 2. Permitted uses and applicable conditions presented on the site plan shall be amended to include: fencing and landscape buffer at the front of property, six-foot in height and on the west side. 3. 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 supports the City's 2030 Comprehensive Plan goals by adhering to the Preservation/Enhancement Area designation for the subject property. The proposal enhances and renovates a long-vacant and decaying structure without expanding it, promoting compatibility with the surrounding area. 4. 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. The petition addresses a critical need for housing and services for local female veterans. 2. The petition proposes to renovate and repurpose an existing structure that has contributed to urban blight for the past decade. 3. The petition proposes to reduce the residential intensity of the previous use on the site (rest home). 4. Given the building's size and scale in the R-10 zoning district, there is no reasonable likelihood that the property will revert to a use permitted in the R-10 zoning district. Chair discussed adding to the condition and being more specific. He asked about adding that they meet the requirements for the landscape buffering and fence such as Day Centers are required to meet. He stated the City Attorney had asked that the conditions be more specific in the past. Ms. Peacock added that the condition for the landscape buffer and fencing be similar to the Type B buffer as required for a Day Center. Mr. Hanley seconded the motion. The vote was five in favor and three opposed. (Those opposed were Chair, Robertson and Flores) Motion passed.

VII Adjourment – *The meeting was adjourned at 6:24 pm.*

Jim Robertson, Chair

DRAFT