



PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION
RONAN AT HENDERSONVILLE (P24-33-CZD)
MEETING DATE: MAY 8TH, 2025

PETITION REQUEST: Rezoning: Commercial Highway Mixed Use-Conditional Zoning District (CHMU-CZD)

APPLICANT/PETITIONER: Paul Aiesi, manager of Graycliff Capital Development, LLC [Applicant] & Robert O. Camenzind, Peggy C. Cabe, John T Fleming, Enno F. Camenzind, Paula Camenzind Carter [Owners]

PLANNING BOARD ACTION SUMMARY:

The Planning Board voted 7-1 to recommend approval of this petition and adopted the following motion:

PLANNING BOARD MOTION:

Mr. Russell 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: 9588-22-1126) from CHMU, Commercial Highway Mixed Use to CHMU-CZD, Commercial Highway Mixed Use Conditional Zoning District, for the construction of a 192 unit multi-family development based on the master site plan and list of conditions submitted by and agreed to by the applicant, [dated 4-25-25] and presented at this meeting and subject to the following:

- I. The development shall be consistent with the site plan, including the list of applicable conditions contained therein, and the following permitted uses:
 - a. Permitted Uses:
 - i. Residential dwellings, multi-family.
 - ii. Accessory uses & structures.
2. Permitted uses and applicable conditions presented on the site plan shall be amended to remove condition 4 (Removal of S. Allen frontage sidewalk) and condition 6 (Installing 1.5" caliper trees instead of 3" caliper trees for common space).
3. 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.
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:
 - a. The proposed development further supports the growth of this area as a multi-family node along the I-26 corridor, placing residents in close proximity to I-26, Blue Ridge Community College, a bank, and other commercial amenities.
 - b. The proposed development adds needed housing to help address local demand.

Ms. Waters seconded the motion which passed 7 in favor and 1 opposed (Ms. Gilgis).

OVERVIEW OF BOARD DISCUSSION FROM MEETING MINUTES:

The Planning Board convened on this project for 1 hour and 5 minutes.

Mr. Johnson asked about buffering from the interstate. Mr. Morrow stated the city does have some buffering requirements for any public roadway. They are providing street trees along I-26 and shrubs in some places. As proposed most of the buffering will be from those street trees and not a sound wall.

Ms. Gilgis asked how soon would it be before the residents requested sound walls. Those trees are not going to provide the kind of buffer that would provide any kind of quality of life. She asked who is responsible for sound walls if the residents want them. Mr. Morrow stated NCDOT is doing some additional upgrades to I-26 and he does not believe sound walls are in that current contract for them to do those so if there were sound walls it would be between the developer and NCDOT to work out. It would not be anything the city would require. She stated the buildings are three stories high, correct? Mr. Morrow stated correct. She stated and the trees are 1 ½ inch caliper. Mr. Morrow stated yes, usually. Ms. Gilgis stated it would take a long time for them to grow and have any kind of a buffer.

Warren Sugg with Civil Design Concepts stated they are a civil engineering group here in Western North Carolina. He stated their main point of connection is off of Upward Crossing. He also explained the site plan and pointed out the clubhouse and the garage units. He also pointed out the amenities. They have a dog park and they also have a playground area, fire pits and a pool. They will connect to city water and sewer. He discussed stormwater and pointed out the drainage areas. They are trying to catch the run-off in several different drainage areas. They go through all the details and design for stormwater control. He pointed out the open space areas where they will be saving some of the trees. There are not a ton of trees there because it is kind of an open field. They are aware that there are some streams and wetlands on site. They are going through a field review which will be sent to the Army Corp of Engineers for their review. They will determine what are streams and wetlands on the site. He discussed the fire access.

Ms. Gilgis stated let's talk about public safety, let's talk about fire trucks, let's talk about ambulances, sprinklers aren't going to do it. She also stated can a fire truck, a ladder truck get in there. Mr. Sugg stated yes. Ms. Gilgis stated how? Mr. Sugg stated they are able to drive up Upward Crossing and they are able to turn into the main intersection and they are able to make any kind of connections within. Ms. Gilgis asked him to show her. Mr. Sugg pointed this out on the site plan. Discussion was made on the sprinklers. Ms. Gilgis asked about the rectangular area on the plan. Mr. Sugg stated that is a stormwater pond.

Vice-Chair asked the logic was on the tail piece of property that was supposed to get a roadway on it and you did not agree to that condition. Mr. Sugg stated he thinks that is just residual property from the sale. Vice-Chair stated it is supposed to be a road actually and it shows a lot of exhibits as a road. Mr. Sugg stated they will have some other folks speak to that.

Ms. Waters stated if this is workforce housing it will be the age where a lot of children could be living there. Has he considered the effect on the Henderson County School System and have you thought about an impact study or offered to help the school system? Mr. Lee stated they would be more than willing to help. Having school age children in the development is another reason they have concerns about this road extension.

OVERVIEW OF BOARD DISCUSSION FROM MINUTES:

Jay Lee representing Graycliff Capital and their development team stated Graycliff has been active in the area for about 10 years, having done seven workforce housing developments. He discussed housing in the area and what is needed. When city staff first made it apparent a few months ago that they would be including the road extension from Upward Crossing Drive down to South Allen as a condition of approval for their rezoning, they did have their general contractor price the existing road construction plan that the landowners had drawn years ago. He knows their budget and financial feasibility is not necessarily a concern of the Planning Board but he does think it is a major part of this story especially for a market that according to the study needs 60,000 more units in the next 3 ½ years. Their general contractor came back and determined the road would cost about 2.3 million dollars to extend it from where it currently terminates at the rear entrance to the Summit of Hendersonville and all the way to South Allen. A lot of the cost comes from clearing out the two extensive tree groves on site and filling in paving and the existing wetlands on the property those of which we are proposing to remain undisturbed and as natural amenities for our community. Another thing that was brought up is how the road extension has been shown on past plans and past submissions for the adjacent property. The really important and missing context behind this being shown on their previous site plans is at the time they were entitling the Summit at Hendersonville, the landowners of the Ronan site were pursuing selling this land to a retail developer. He had a site plan that the landowners sent to him years ago while working on the Summit project that shows a retail development going on one portion of this site and the land being subdivided to offer further retail. This site plan was shown to the Board. That is why on their initial submittal for Summit at Hendersonville, the road extension is shown as proposed to be designed and built by others. It was their understanding if retail developers were coming in here and developing store fronts along this road, they would absolutely be extending the road all the way through in order to get more vehicles in front of their stores every day. Now that this has been proposed as an entirely different use, this is a fully residential neighborhood and they have concerns about building a cut through road through the middle of a residential neighborhood. Given how close they are to I-26, they have concerns about truckers and students of the Blue Ridge Community College bypassing the existing infrastructure of Upward Road and South Allen to take their neighborhood as a short cut instead of the existing roadways. He stated the Traffic Impact Analysis which has been finalized and approved by NCDOT and the city, determined that no traffic control improvements have been identified. The city's third party engineering review of their TIA which determined that adding 192 housing units to this area, the expected increase and traffic delays at the intersection of Upward Road and Upward Crossing Drive at peak commute hours in the morning would increase by one second. So they are asked to build a 2.3 million dollar road in order to save commuters one second in the morning. He stated they have several conversations concerning fire and life safety with the city Fire Marshal who has confirmed they will fully comply with the state fire code by having full sprinklers and alarm systems and one entry point where they are located on Upward Crossing Drive. He pointed out the entrance and the connection to the Summit on the site plan and also pointed out the proposed road extension and where it would be.

Vice-Chair asked if they had any issue with staff's alternate request that they have a private easement through the original site. Mr. Lee stated they have no issues there.

OVERVIEW OF BOARD DISCUSSION FROM MINUTES:

Vice-Chair asked the developer to discuss the developer's proposed conditions. Mr. Lee discussed these conditions. Discussion was made on the sidewalk and the impact to the wetlands. As long as there are no serious impact to the wetland they are willing to put the sidewalk in.

Discussion was made on the trees and the highway. Mr. Morrow explained the street tress and pointed out the common open space area. The larger caliper tree is only specifically for CHMU and it is only specifically from the common space tress that are required as part of that area.

It was stated there are 54 street trees provided along the interstate and another 21 along Upward Crossing, there is vehicular use which provides another 38 trees along with 76 shrubs and on the street buffer they have 36 shrubs, open space they have 560 shrubs and they have some tree credits and trees required. They have a credit of 108 so 42 trees, common open space they are 63 trees provided and another 375 shrubs.

Craig Justus, attorney representing the applicant stated the access question that was asked about, just a reminder there is the easement through Summit. There is interconnectivity to those two residential neighborhoods. There is access availability through Summit. In terms of the noise variable, obviously these folks are not going to put in a product where the people will not be excited about living there. As you heard they will be looking further on how to deal with it. There is a lot of housing along I-26. He discussed workforce housing and the cost of living today. He talked about the extension of the roadway not being needed and the cost.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ken Fitch, 1046 Patton Street stated the future use of this parcel was a mystery. He discussed the road extension and the wetland. The sidewalk is an issue. There should be some kind of creative solution on this. He talked about the impact of a road at that location. The talked about having three entrances right together. The caliper issue was also a concern of his.

Glenn Lange, 625 Ferncliff stated he is with the Hendersonville Tree Board and he would be glad to talk with you about the caliper of the trees. He stated the 3 and 3 ½ caliper requirement has been in the zoning ordinance for a while and is not anything new. It is related to the common space. It is there to create quicker tree canopy cover for the enjoyment of the residents. They see no reason that sticking with the code is problematic. They recommend that they stick with the 3 or 3 ½ inch caliper just for the common open space trees. All the other trees they plant can be the smaller ones.

BOARD ACTION:

Motion:

- Mark Russell

Second:

- Donna Waters

Yeas:

- Tamara Peacock (Vice-Chair), Donna Waters, Bob Johnson, David McKinley, Mark Russell, Laura Flores, Lauren Rippy

Nays:

- Kyle Gilgis

Absent: Peter Hanley, Jim Robertson (Chair),

Recused: None