

These minutes are a summary of the discussion. The audible recording is available at the following website: <http://bit.ly/T3S7CB>

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Minutes of May 4, 2016
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall

Present: Chairman Jeremy Goldstein, Vice-Chair Kristy Carter, Jim Edmonds, Tony Hauser, Laura Berner Hudson, Karl Koon and Guillermo Rodriguez

Absent: None

Pre-Meeting - 4:30 p.m.

The Commission briefly discussed the wording amendment on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and staff provided them with an alternative motion for the Commission's convenience. Vice-Chair Carter noted that she would have a conflict of interest on the Level II site plan for 257 and 263 Long Shoals Road due to her company performing the Traffic Impact Analysis. There was also a brief discussion on the Skyland Exchange conditional zoning request (55 Miami Circle and 70 Allen Avenue) with some explanation on the manufactured housing rules and unit replacements.

Regular Meeting - 5:00 p.m.

Chairman Goldstein called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and informed the audience of the public hearing process.

Administrative

- Mr. Koon moved to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2016, mid-month meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Edmonds and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

Agenda Items

(1) A wording text amendment to Article 14 and Article 16 of the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of amending standards for homestays. Planner coordinating review- Shannon Tuch

Chairman Goldstein disclosed that he owns a lodging facility in downtown Asheville but after discussing with the City Attorney, he has no conflict of interest.

Principal Planner Shannon Tuch oriented the Commission to the site location and said the proposed ordinance would expand the options for a homestay operation by allowing the use of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) for guest accommodations when the property owner or resident manager resides on the same property and would clarify the current residency requirements.

Over the last two years, the City of Asheville has been engaged in a long and public conversation over the proliferation of short term rentals in the city's jurisdiction, and how best to regulate these rentals. Following a great deal of public input, the City Council has decided to retain its longtime prohibition on unoccupied, whole house (or dwelling unit) rentals in residential districts. However, on November 17, 2015, Council approved an ordinance amending standards for Homestays. This amendment removed several barriers and made it easier to establish a Homestay as a form of short-term rental that requires a full-time resident (resident-manager) of the property, who lives in the home on a permanent, full-time basis, and who is present when

lodgers are present. This is reinforced in the *Unified Development Ordinance* (UDO) definition for Homestay which is as follows:

Homestay means a private, resident occupied dwelling, with up to two guest rooms where overnight lodging accommodations are provided to transients for compensation and where the use is subordinate and incidental to the main residential use of the building. A homestay is considered a "Lodging" use under this UDO.

While the amendment successfully expanded the opportunity to obtain a Homestay permit, it did not allow the use of an ADU on the property to be used as part of the Homestay operation since these units were, by definition and by design, separate units and could not be occupied by both the resident(s) and guests. On December 8, 2015, the Asheville City Council requested that staff reexamine the use of ADUs as part of a Homestay and share its findings with the Planning & Economic Development Committee (PED).

A report was shared with the PED Committee on January 26, 2016, and Committee members reviewed draft text that could be considered to allow ADUs to be used as part of a Homestay. In addition to this review, committee members requested that staff provide more research and information and specifically asked for:

- 1) Data on the impacts this change could have on (affordable) housing and neighborhoods,
- 2) Feedback from neighborhood groups regarding their concerns, and
- 3) Benchmarking practices from other cities.

Additionally, related to Homestay regulation but not included in the original request from Council, staff has identified the need to clarify the resident-manager requirement in the Homestay standards and has included this clarified language in the same draft ordinance. This amendment does not change the existing resident-manager requirement. It is intended to more clearly explain what is required to meet this requirement, by clarifying what is considered i) a full time resident; and ii) being present when lodgers are present.

Data & Metrics - In reviewing the request from the PED, staff looked into the ability to collect specific metrics related to housing and ADUs. Unfortunately, much of this data proved unavailable including the total number of historic ADUs in Asheville. It is known, however, that ADUs have been a development option in Asheville's single family neighborhoods since 1997 when the UDO was adopted and that there are numerous ADUs that pre-date any restrictions. While it is difficult to identify the total number of ADUs in Asheville, 37 permits were issued in the last two years.

Asheville also has access to various statistics and metrics from the recently completed *Asheville, North Carolina Region, Housing Needs Assessment* report which was updated in 2015. Basic metrics on affordable housing and related issues were gleaned from this document and are listed below:

- Between 2015-2020 the Asheville population is projected to grow 7.1% with household growth projected at 7.6% (p. Asheville-49)
- Asheville's rental housing is operating at an overall 0.9% vacancy rate with no vacancy among the tax credit and subsidized housing (p. Asheville-49)
- 43% of Asheville households will have incomes below \$35,000 (p. Asheville-5)
- A household that is considered cost burdened spends over 30% of its income on housing (30% equals \$875/month for a household earning \$35,000/year) (p. Regional-7)
- Multi-family rents range from \$832-3,300/month for the region (p. Asheville-8)
- The rental rates for vacation rentals are at least four times higher than conventional units (p. Asheville-28)
- A subleased room in a home rents for \$300-710/month (p. Asheville-29)

- Over half of the Asheville population rents and does not own property (*p. Asheville-9*)

In addition, the following statistic was recently pulled from a news story on housing in the City of Asheville:

- The median rent for a two-bedroom unit in Asheville is \$1,180/month, the highest in the state amongst the 10 large NC cities studied (*Asheville Citizen Times, April 12, 2016, Mike Cronin*)

Feedback from Committees and Neighborhood Groups - In addressing these items, staff met with a number of different stakeholder groups, city appointed committees and other community groups. The following is a summary of those meetings:

Affordable Housing Advisory Committee – Staff summarized the Council's request at the Committee's February 5, 2016, meeting. Committee members explained that the group had previously voted to not endorse the expansion of the Homestay ordinance to allow the use of ADUs citing that the support to allow accessory dwelling units by-right came from recognizing the need for housing, especially smaller more affordable units. The proposal to allow ADUs to be used for Homestays was felt to be contrary to that previous policy support and would have the effect of diminishing the availability of housing. Additionally, several members noted that loans will not be issued for the purpose of constructing an ADU and that individuals who are able to construct one are doing so through other resources such as savings, refinancing a mortgage or obtaining a home equity loan. In all instances, it was noted that these are households with resources not available to many community members.

Neighborhood Advisory Committee – This committee received a summary report on February 22, 2016, from staff and expressed support for the idea of soliciting feedback from residents and offered to help spread the request through their contacts. At least one member of the group questioned how the information would be used by Council in their decision.

Housing & Community Development Committee – Staff provided an update at two separate meetings of the HCD Committee. In the first meeting held on February 16, 2016, a summary of the Council's direction was presented along with ideas for input gathering. The HCD supported the outreach but recommended that staff consider developing a survey tool to make it easier for individuals to respond. This recommendation was followed and resulted in the *Open City Hall* survey discussed later in this report (see **Survey #1** below). During the second meeting held on April 12, 2016, the committee members heard an update from staff regarding the community input and other survey results. A motion to not support the expansion of the Homestay ordinance to allow the use of ADUs was made and passed unanimously (3:0).

Other stakeholder groups - In addition to the city appointed committees, staff also met with the Coalition of Asheville Neighborhoods, Grace Neighborhood Association and the Asheville Board of Realtors. In all instances, staff provided a brief summary of the Council's request and answered questions about the process and current ordinance.

Prior to the creation of the *Open City Hall* survey, individual members of the community emailed their thoughts on the subject. These individual responses overlap, to some degree, with the responses received through the on-line survey. It should also be noted that one neighborhood association, Grove Park – Sunset Mountain, voted as an association to not support the opportunity to allow the use of ADUs as part of a Homestay operation.

Surveys - Recognizing the interest and value in data and community input, staff performed three separate surveys in an effort to understand: 1) community sentiment; 2) how

other communities regulate ADUs as a short-term rental option; and, 3) how ADUs are currently being used in Asheville. She said this survey is for information only, is not scientific, and is limited in scope.

Survey #1 – Using the city’s new communication and public engagement tool, *Open City Hall*, the city invited stakeholders to respond to a short four-question survey that gauged community support for the use of ADUs for guest accommodations. The survey remained open for 17 days and it received 489 responses. Those who responded strongly supported the use of ADUs as a Homestay (76.3% v. 27.3%), but also disproportionately represented property owners as opposed to renters (89.6% v. 8.8%). The survey also asked respondents to identify potential impacts that may be experienced with the five most common responses being:

- Parking problems
- No impacts
- Noise
- Loss of housing
- Increased traffic/turnover

Survey #2 – This survey sought to benchmark how other cities regulated both ADUs and Homestays/short-term rentals. This survey includes responses from a number of North Carolina cities as well as other cities across the country that were of a similar size to Asheville and/or had been identified as having a relatively strong tourist economy. Of the 16 communities surveyed, only three did not allow ADUs. Of the 13 cities that did allow ADUs, six cities allowed them to be used for short-term renting and all included some special standards such as: minimum stay, a limit on the number of people and separation requirements. The special standards for three of those cities included a requirement that the owner reside on the property.

Survey #3 – Staff contacted 13 Asheville property owners who were recently issued permits for an ADU that asked about their use or intended use of the ADU. Of the 13 individuals surveyed, seven were renting with one of those rentals being a Homestay – the rental rates ranged from \$600-\$800/month. The remaining six units were reserved primarily for friends and family (four respondents) or were being personally occupied (two respondents). When asked if they would consider a Homestay in the future seven respondents indicated “yes” while six replied “no”.

This wording amendment complies with City’s Comprehensive Plan as it relates to Economic Development Goals and Strategies (Goal II) by reviewing and amending city development regulations and incentives to meet the technological and social changes of the local economic development situation.

If this amendment is adopted and ADU’s are found to be problematic, we do have the ability to repeal it with another text amendment. Homestay permits are issued on an annual basis and if the ordinance is repealed, when the permit comes up for renewal, it would not be issued.

The wording amendment aligns with the 2036 Council vision in the following areas: (1) A Thriving and Local Economy. This amendment seeks to expand an economic opportunity to Asheville residents that allows them to benefit from, and support, the existing tourism industry; and (2) A Connected and Engaged Community. Consideration of this amendment includes community input that was gathered through various tools and outreach efforts.

This proposal is consistent with goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and City Council Strategic Plan, and because allowing and regulating Homestays is a reasonable response to a social and economic phenomenon that effectively seeks to balance a variety of city

adopted goals, staff recommends approval of the wording amendment as proposed, modifying the standards regulating Homestays.

In response to Ms. Hudson, Ms. Tuch said that special standards were considered during the homestay ordinance in general last year. For different reasons, many were not recommended.

Mr. Edmonds initiated discussion about a person spending money building an ADU and then if the ordinance is repealed, they could chose to rent it long-term, use it for their personal use, or turn it into a homestay.

Ms. Tuch responded to Ms. Hudson when she asked about parking requirements for long term renters, ADU and homestays.

Discussion surrounded nuisance complaints. The current ordinance does not include any method for not issuing an application permit for complaints, if at the time the dwelling meets the requirements from a land use perspective. If the dwelling meets the requirements, the City must issue the permit. However, there are other enforcement mechanisms to deal with issues like noise. City Attorney Robin Currin also responded that the ordinance could be amended to say a certain number of violations during one year would mean that you could not get a homestay permit for the next year, but violations must be actual violations of the homestay ordinance itself.

Ms. Tuch noted that City Council has asked for 4-6 month reviews of the homestay ordinance, including the number of complaints filed.

In response to Vice-Chair Carter, Ms. Tuch said that homestay safety inspections basically consist of basic building safety requirements for sleeping spaces.

Ms. Tuch responded to Ms. Hudson regarding full-time resident and their responsibility.

In response to Mr. Rodriguez, Ms. Tuch said that after Council discussion, the standard for a cap on the number of people that can stay in the homestay was not adopted, mainly due to the difficulty in enforcement.

Ms. Tuch responded to Mr. Hauser regarding stacked parking in driveways.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 5:36 p.m.

The following individuals spoke in support of the wording amendment for various reasons, but mainly for the economic opportunity to Asheville residents benefit from, and support, the existing tourism industry:

Jackson Tierney
John Farquhar
Helen Powell-Busch
Brandee Boggs
Anne Doherty
Timothy Sadler
Wendy Dean

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the wording amendment to expand the options for a homestay operation by allowing the use of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) for guest accommodations when the property owner or resident manager resides on the same property, for various reasons, some being, but are not limited to: commercial intrusion into neighborhoods, parking problems; noise; trash; loss of housing:

John Sterling
Jane Mathews
Mike Lewis
David Rodgers
Barber Melton, Co-President of Coalition of Asheville Neighborhoods, member of the
Neighborhood Advisory Committee and member of the Affordable Housing
Advisory Committee

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 6:13 p.m.

Ms. Hudson felt that since we are already allowing homestays, adding ADU's just changes the transients' location on the property.

Chairman Goldstein's concern is the commercial intrusion into the residential neighborhoods, along with taking affordable housing units off the market. He did not support expanding the options for homestays to allow the use of ADU's for guest accommodations; however, he did support the amendment to clarify the resident-manager requirement for a full-time, permanent resident to be present and residing during the homestay period.

Mr. Koon felt that and ADU is a free-standing commercial operation.

In response to Vice-Chair Carter, City Attorney Robin Currin said that violations must be actual violations of the homestay ordinance itself (e.g., not noise ordinance violations). The ordinance might read that if there is a certain number of homestay violations that the homestay permit for the next year would not be granted.

Vice-Chair Carter agreed that this is a commercial activity and agreed with people that said people with ADUs work hard to keep their ratings high but when complaints are lodged, chances are by the time the complaint is investigated, the tenant is long gone.

Mr. Edmonds felt that not all residential lots can accommodate an ADU and the person will have to go to the expense of getting a permit to build one. He didn't think it would be fair for a person to build an ADU and then the City repeal the ordinance in one year.

Mr. Rodriguez was not comfortable with the level of enforcement for homestays.

Ms. Hudson moved to recommend approval of the wording amendment modifying the standards regulating Homestays and find that the request is reasonable, is in the public interest and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans in the following ways: (1) by expanding an existing economic opportunity to more residents of Asheville, (2) by developing zoning standards that regulate activities that promote harmony and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods, and (3) by supporting the tourism industry through the supply of alternative lodging arrangements. This motion was seconded by Mr. Edmonds and failed on a 2-5 vote, with Chairman Goldstein, Vice-Chair Carter, Mr. Hauser, Mr. Koon and Mr. Rodriguez voting "no."

Chairman Goldstein then moved to recommend (1) denial of the wording amendment modifying the standards in Section 7-14-3 (b) (3) (a) (3) and find that the request is not reasonable, is not in the public interest, and is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in that (a) it introduces a potential disruptive use/activity in single family neighborhoods; and (b) will likely result in the reduction of housing in a market where housing is in scarce supply; and (2) approval of the wording amendment modifying the standards in Section 7-16-1 (c) (9) (c) and find that the request is reasonable, is in the public interest, and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans by clarifying zoning standards that regulate activities in order to promote harmony and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods. This motion was seconded by Mr. Koon and carried on a 5-2 vote, with Mr. Edmonds and Ms. Hudson voting "no."

At 6:34 p.m., Chairman Goldstein announced a short recess.

(2) Review of a Level II site plan for the development of a self-storage facility contained in a 3-story, 72,450 square foot building with associated parking and site-work on a portion of 2.50 acres known as 1292 Hendersonville Road and PIN 9656-04-3807. The property is owned by Azalea Limited Partnership and the project contact is Jesse Gardner. Planner coordinating review – Sasha Vrtunski

Urban Planner Sasha Vrtunski oriented the Commission to the site location and said that the applicant is requesting review of site plans for the construction of a self-storage facility with 600 units in the Highway Business (HB) zoning district. This project is considered a Level II review pursuant to Section 7-5-9 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

The project site consists of a portion of a single parcel that is 2.5 acres, for a project size of 1.44 acres (according to submitted plans). The project site is located at 1292 Hendersonville Road and is zoned Highway Business (HB). Adjacent zoning to the north and south is Highway Business. The area to the east is under Buncombe County zoning and is zoned R-2. The area to the west of site is a part of the Town of Biltmore Forest and is zoned Residential Single-Family Medium Density (R-4). The Blue Ridge Parkway is 0.4 miles south of the site.

The project proposes to construct a 3-story building with 600 self-storage units and parking spaces. The total building square footage is 72,450 square feet (sf). Building height is 35 feet 7 inches with an overall height of 43 feet 9 inches. Plans show the lower portion of the parcel being subdivided for future development which will be reviewed as a minor subdivision.

A reduced parking standard for self-storage projects was approved in the last year. Nine (9) spaces are required for this project and are provided. A handicapped space and two bicycle parking spots are also provided. A six foot sidewalk along Hendersonville Road is indicated on the plans; this is a pre-existing sidewalk.

Street trees are required for this project and the applicant is proposing six street trees along Hendersonville Road. Building Impact and Vehicle Usage Area (VUA) landscaping is also required. Plans show this being provided for a total of 41 trees and 114 shrubs. For this development, fifteen percent open space is required. Plans indicate 10,066 sf of open space provided.

There is a retaining wall at the rear of the site; plans indicate that it will be under 8 feet. Because the height is lower than 8 feet and it is located more than 35 feet from a public right-of-way, it is not required to have landscaping, per Section 7-10-5 of the UDO.

This project was reviewed at the April 18, 2016, meeting of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and has been approved with conditions. As this is a Level II review, it will not be reviewed by the Asheville City Council.

Staff has not received any public comment about this proposal.

Staff recommends approval of the proposal as shown on the submitted plans based on the ability of the project to comply with the minimum technical standards.

Mr. Jesse Gardner, representing the applicant, was present for questions.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 6:44 p.m. and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 6:44 p.m.

Mr. Hauser moved to recommend approval of the Level II site plan review for the self-storage facility at 1292 Hendersonville Road subject to the conditions in the TRC report. This motion was seconded by Mr. Rodriguez and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

(3) Review of a Level II site plan for the construction of 45 residential units on 1.85 acres known as 3, 5 and 99999 Atkins Street and PIN (s) 9654-09-5055, 9654-09-3180 and 9654-09-5138. The property is owned by Reasonable Development, LLC and the project contact is Mike Lovoy, P.E. Planner coordinating review – Vaidila Satvika

Urban Planner Vaidila Satvika oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting review of site plans for the construction of a new 45-unit residential housing project in a one- and two-family layout style in the Highway Business (HB) zoning district. This project is considered a Level II review pursuant to Section 7-5-9 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

The project site consists of three parcels that together total 1.85 acres. Currently, the site contains two driveways and two homes with accessory structures (garages and storage sheds). All existing structures will be demolished as will most of the existing vegetation on the parcel. Adjacent parcels are also zoned Highway Business.

The project proposes to build 45 residential units in a mix of single-family detached and attached structures. A mix of housing sizes will be provided from 480 to 960 square feet. Structures will all include a garage with two stories of living space above.

Vehicular access to the site will be provided at Atkins Street, a city-maintained public road, which will include one driveway into the site that will lead to two internal streets. The access road and the private internal streets will be named. Sidewalks are proposed along Atkins Street and within the main entrance drive aisle. A total of 90 parking spaces will be provided for vehicles, which meets requirements.

The project is required to comply with street trees, building impact, open space, and tree save area standards. Nine street trees will be provided. Twenty trees and forty shrubs will be provided for building impact. Fifteen percent of the parcel will be dedicated for open space (approximately 12,000 square feet). Tree save area will be provided for thirty percent of the lot area, or 0.56 acre, and will include 15 trees and 28 shrubs. Some existing trees are expected to be retained for the project, which has shown that it can or will be able to meet these requirements.

The site is zoned Highway Business (HB) and surrounding parcels are zoned HB. The maximum residential density in HB is 35 units per acre. The maximum allowable density for this site is 65 dwelling units, and 45 dwelling units are proposed.

Following the review process specified in Section 7-5-9 of UDO for Level II development review, this project is considered by the City's Technical Review Committee (TRC), which reviews the project for technical compliance. This project was approved with conditions by the TRC on April 18, 2016. As this is a Level II review, it will not be reviewed by the Asheville City Council.

Staff has not received any public comment about this proposal.

Staff recommends approval of the proposal as shown on plans because the project meets, or will meet, the UDO requirements as noted above.

Mr. Barry Bialik, Chairman of the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee, developer, spoke in support of his project.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 6:51 p.m. and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 6:51 p.m.

In response to Mr. Hauser, Traffic Engineer Jeff Moore explained how emergency vehicles will maneuver back into the different bays to leave the development.

Ms. Hudson moved to recommend approval of the Level II site plan review for the 45-unit housing project located at 3, 5, and 99999 Atkins Street subject to the conditions in the TRC report. This motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Carter and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

(4) Review of a Level II site plan for phase II of a planned commercial business center on 7.08 acres known as 257 and 263 Long Shoals Road and PIN(s) 9644-48-8171 and 9644-47-6934 owned by Long Shoals Development BOJO, LLC and the project contact is Marty Kocot. Planner coordinating review – Shannon Tuch.

Ms. Hudson moved to recuse Vice-Chair Carter from participating in this matter due to a conflict of interest in that her company performed the Traffic Impact Analysis. This motion was seconded by Mr. Hauser and carried unanimously.

Principal Planner Shannon Tuch oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting review of site plans for the new retail/restaurant/office/service development with six separate buildings ranging in size and height for a total of 56,500 square feet of new commercial space. This project is considered a Level II review pursuant to Section 7-5-9 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

The project site consists of two parcels with a combined area of 7.08 acres, located at 257 and 263 Long Shoals Rd. on the northern shore of Lake Julian on the edge of the city's jurisdiction in south Asheville. The site has mild-moderate topography dropping approximately 50 feet from the road to the lowest point on the property next to the lake.

The subject property is zoned Community Business II (CB-II) which allows a range of community based commercial uses along with residential. The property is bordered on the east and west by more CB-II zoned property, to the south by County zoning of R-2, and to the north by Residential Multi-family, High Density (RM-16). The proposed uses include office, retail, restaurant and automobile service station which are all permitted uses in the CB-II zoning district.

This project proposes to construct six new commercial buildings that will support a mix of retail, restaurant, office, and service uses. Four of the six buildings will be one-story buildings, two of which will be multi-tenant buildings while the other two are proposed to be stand-alone restaurants. The remaining two buildings are proposed to be 3-story office buildings. The buildings will range in size from approximately 4,000 to 15,000 square feet.

An earlier phase of the project included a single, high-turnover fast food restaurant (Bojangles') and was recently completed. Per Sec. 7-5-9(a)(1)(c) of the UDO these two projects become combined for purposes of establishing the level of review. Specifically, this requirement states:

- (c) Properties located within 500 feet of each other, under the same ownership and/or developed by the same developer over a period of three years or less shall be considered to be one development and reviewed as such.

When combined these two phases are approximately 60,000 square feet and the level II of review for the current project is not impacted and does not change.

Access to the property is from Long Shoals Rd. through a shared driveway entrance between the Phase I (Bojangles') restaurant and the Phase II commercial village. This shared drive turns into a private right-of-way named "Julian Shoals Dr." that will extend to the edge of the property to provide future access to adjacent property. A five-foot wide sidewalk along the entire property frontage on Long Shoals Rd. already exists and new sidewalk will be added along Julian Shoals Dr. The project will also include internal sidewalk connections throughout the project area.

Off-street parking requirements are satisfied with traditional surface parking throughout the development in separate lots around each building. The proper number of handicap accessible and bicycle parking is also provided.

The project requires street tree, street buffer, parking lot and building impact landscaping along with dumpster screening. A 450-foot long wall runs along the western edge of the property but does not exceed five feet in height and, therefore, does not require screening.

A suburban open space standard is applied to this project with a minimum 15% of the total site area set aside for open space. The proposed plans demonstrate compliance with this standard.

This project was reviewed at the April 18, 2016, meeting of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and has been approved with conditions. As this is a Level II review, it will not be reviewed by the Asheville City Council. No public comment has been received regarding this proposal as of the writing of this report

Staff recommends approval of the proposal as shown on the submitted plans based on the ability of the project to comply with the minimum technical standards.

Mr. Marty Kocot, civil engineer for the project, was available for questions.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 6:58 p.m. and when no one spoke, he closed the public hearing at 6:58 p.m.

Ms. Tuch responded to Ms. Hudson when she asked if we typically want to encourage building along the street in these type zoning areas.

Mr. Koon moved to recommend approval of the Level II site plan review for the Long Shoals Village development located at 257 and 263 Long Shoals Road subject to the conditions in the TRC report. This motion was seconded by Mr. Edmonds and carried unanimously by a 6-0 vote (Vice-Chair Carter was recused from voting).

(5) Review of a Level III site plan for the construction of a two story 75,000 square foot retail building and a one story 8,000 square foot retail building on 53.70 acres located at 800 Brevard Road PINs 9626-86-3724 and 9626-76-8165. The property is owned by Asheville Retail Associates, LLC and the project contact is Chris Day. Planner coordinating review – Shannon Tuch.

Principal Planner Shannon Tuch oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant Asheville Retail Associates, LLC, is requesting review of site plans for the construction of two new retail structures totaling 83,000 square feet along with related parking and other site improvements. This project is considered a Level III review pursuant to Section 7-5-9(a) and 7-5-9(a)(1)(c) of the city's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), which designates a Level III review for projects with more than 100,000 square feet of gross floor area. Level III projects are reviewed as Conditional Use Permits.

The project address is 800 Brevard Rd. and includes two parcels. Building 3A (75,000 s.f.) is located on PIN 9626.76-8165 which is approximately 8.9 acres in size and also includes

the recently constructed Field & Stream building. Building 3B (8,000 s.f.) is located on PIN 9626.86-3724 which is approximately 44.8 acres in size and supports the majority of the recently renovated outlet mall. A third parcel supporting the retail anchor Dillard's is owned separately and not included in this application. The site has been previously developed and is relatively flat with good visibility and access.

This project constitutes the third phase of the Asheville Outlets mall development and includes the construction of a new two-story, 75,000 square foot retail building along with a smaller 8,000 square foot single-story retail building on a separate parcel. Both buildings are proposed where surface parking currently exists and will result in the reconfiguration and reconstruction of those parking areas.

The 83,000 square feet of new construction is in proximity to a recently constructed 52,000 square foot retail building (Field & Stream) and the UDO combines these projects for purposes of review (Sec. 7-5-9(a)(1)c). Specifically, this requirement states:

(c) Properties located within 500 feet of each other, under the same ownership and/or developed by the same developer over a period of three years or less shall be considered to be one development and reviewed as such.

When combined all three buildings result in 135,000 square feet of new construction, meeting the review threshold for a Level III, Conditional Use Permit application.

Access to the mall can be achieved from one of four access points. The main entrance and a secondary entrance are located off of Brevard Rd. while the other two entrances are located off of Ridgefield Blvd. Internal sidewalks are provided as part of the project, however, the developer chose to pay a fee-in-lieu for sidewalks required along street frontages (Brevard Rd. and Ridgefield Blvd.) so no sidewalk is proposed in these areas.

The new construction will remove a number of existing parking spaces resulting in a net loss of off-street spaces. Despite the removal of spaces, the total parking count will remain well above the minimum number of spaces required. When evaluated as one large retail center, the overall parking numbers will continue to fall within the min/max range for off-street parking requirements based on the entire mall area. The project also complies with off-street parking when evaluated per individual parcel. Bicycle parking requirements are reduced given the net reduction in vehicular parking spaces so the project remains in compliance from the previous phases of development.

The developer had previously worked with Transportation staff on identifying an appropriate location for a new transit shelter and recently constructed the one that is currently in use; however, the location of the new shelter has not proven to be as efficient as desired resulting in route delays. Transportation staff and the developer will continue to explore a more suitable site and will relocate the shelter if a mutually agreed upon alternative is identified, however, this is not a condition of this project.

Landscaping for the new construction will be required and includes building impact, street trees and parking lot landscaping. The proposed plans demonstrate full compliance with these requirements.

The previous two phases of the mall development were exempted from open space requirements, however, because Phase 3 is new construction it will require open space which is assessed based on the existing parcel area. Given the Regional Business zoning and the suburban style of development, the open space requirement is 15% of the total lot area which results in 1.33 acres of open space required. This requirement is satisfied through a mix of perimeter landscape areas as well as the open-air courtyard areas that meander through the

mall.

This project is classified as a multi-tenant retail structure and per UDO section 7-16-2(d)(10)(c) this project must be reviewed for compliance with the city's Supplemental Development Standards for Large Retail Structures (Appendix 7-F). This information has been supplied by the applicant and verified by staff and demonstrates the ability to meet a number of building design requirements selected from a menu of design options including elements such as: landscape buffering; window fenestration; roof features; façade articulation & relief; building materials; entrance features; and pedestrian and transportation amenities.

The site is currently zoned Regional Business (RB) and the use proposed is permitted by-right and the applicant will meet the standards of the District with this development proposal. The majority of the surrounding properties are similarly zoned RB along with some Commercial Industrial (CI) zoned property to the southwest and county zoning to the east across the interstate.

This proposal was approved with conditions by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on April 4, 2016, and requires a **quasi-judicial** review by City Council and a Final TRC review prior to final zoning approval or the issuance of any permits.

Section 7-16-2(c) of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) states that Asheville City Council shall not approve the conditional use application and site plan unless and until it makes certain findings based on the evidence and the testimony received at the public hearing or otherwise appearing in the record of the case. The applicant has provided a statement on these findings.

Staff finds that the relevant standards of the City have been met or can be met with this application.

Mr. W. Louis Bissette, attorney for the applicant, spoke in support of this redevelopment project. He said that over 1,000 employees are working at the Asheville Outlets.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Mr. Timothy Sadler suggested a condition that the buildings be built to net zero standards.

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Ms. Hudson moved to recommend approval of the conditional use permit for Asheville Outlets, Phase 3 located at 800 Brevard Rd. because it meets the seven conditional use standards as demonstrated by the applicant. This motion was seconded by Mr. Rodriguez and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

- (6) Review of a Conditional Zoning from Residential Multi-Family High Density (RM16) and Institutional (INST) to Institutional Conditional Zone (INST CZ) for the development of 290 multi-family units contained within 4 buildings totaling 294,812 square feet on 11.39 acres known as 55 Miami Circle and 70 Allen Avenue and PIN (s) 9645-80-9504 and 9645-90-3375 and including conditions modifying landscape standards. The property is owned by Miami Made, LLC and the project contact is Warren Sugg, P.E. Planner coordinating review- Jessica Bernstein**

Urban Planner Jessica Bernstein oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting review of a conditional zoning request from Residential Multi-Family High Density District (RM-16) and Institutional (INST) to Institutional Conditional Zone (INST-CZ), in accordance with Section 7-7-8 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), for the construction

of a multi-unit residential development.

The project site consists of two parcels with a combined area of approximately 11.39 acres in South Asheville, just north of Long Shoals Road. The larger parcel (55 Miami Circle, 4.66 acres) is zoned Institutional and the other lot (70 Allen Avenue, 3.73 acres) is zoned RM-16. Nearby zoning includes Institutional, RM-16, RS-8 and RS-2.

The area is developed with a mix of uses including apartments, single-family homes, educational and recreational uses (TC Roberson High School and the Zeugner/Skyland Recreational Center to the east and north) and commercial uses along Long Shoals and Hendersonville Roads. There are approximately 55 mobile homes currently occupied on the Miami Circle parcel, which will be removed. A sewer line and vacant single-family home are to be removed from the Allen Avenue parcel. There is a stream and associated buffer running across the northwest corner of the Allen Avenue lot.

The applicant is proposing to construct a multi-family development consisting of 290 residential units in eight separate buildings. Plans indicate 258 one and two-bedroom units and 32 three-bedroom configurations. Two buildings are shown as four-stories (maximum height 42 feet); four as three-four splits (maximum height 33 feet) and two with two-stories (maximum height 20 feet). There is also a clubhouse building and pool.

There are three vehicular access points into the site; one is off of Miami Circle, which connects to Long Shoals Road; the second access is from Allen Avenue, which connects to Hendersonville Road; and the third is through the southern end of the site to Long Shoals Road and is intended to be the project's primary access point. The applicant is proposing for the Miami Circle access point to be restricted to emergency vehicles only and would include a siren-activated gate.

A network of internal sidewalks and walking paths are proposed throughout the site and a public sidewalk is proposed along the short stretch of Miami Circle frontage. Additionally, there is a sidewalk proposed along the primary entrance driveway to Long Shoals Road. A suggested condition from staff would be that the applicant partner with the Buncombe County School System to provide a sidewalk along Miami Circle to Long Shoals Road along the school-owned property; however, the applicant has not agreed to this condition.

Due to the number of units proposed, a range between 322 and 612 parking spaces is required; 420 are proposed. Parking is distributed around the site and also includes a minimum of 13 accessible spaces and at least 21 bike parking spaces.

The project is required to comply with landscaping standards, including a Type A (20 foot wide) property line buffer along the eastern edge of the site where properties are zoned RM-16 and a Type B (30 foot) buffer against RS-2 to the south. Additionally, the proposal includes street buffers, street trees, parking lot and building impact landscaping, dumpster screening and tree save area (3.417 acres). There are several proposed encroachments into the property line buffer as detailed in the conditions for the project, resulting in a request to provide a reduced buffer along a portion of the project boundary. Additionally there is a stream buffer that will be maintained through the center of the site.

Fifteen percent of the project area is required to be dedicated as open space, which is approximately 1.71 acres and is shown on plans.

There are several retaining walls shown on site plans; additional information will be provided at Final Technical Review Committee (TRC) review regarding wall heights to determine the extent of screening compliance needed.

Building height in the Institutional District is limited to forty feet within 100 feet of a

residentially-zoned property; this project appears to comply as the taller buildings are outside of this area.

Conditions - This project includes a number of recommended conditions found in the B1-Conditions list. Modifications and special conditions to note include:

1. Small portions of the community building, pool and driveway encroach into the 30 foot property line buffer along the southern end of the project area.
2. A sidewalk will be provided along Miami Circle to link the project site with the Buncombe County School property's driveway into the TC Roberson High School campus. Staff recommends that the applicant extend the sidewalk into the TC Roberson school campus along the extent of the driveway. The applicant has agreed to this enhanced condition (with the exact location to be coordinated with Buncombe County Schools).
3. Staff recommends that the applicant extend the sidewalk along Miami Circle southwards to connect down to Long Shoals Road. The applicant has not agreed to this enhanced condition.
4. The project shall contain at least 10% affordable units at rent standards not to exceed 80% Area Median Income (AMI) as published in the 2016 Affordable Housing Standards. This commitment will stand for a time period not less than 15 years. Staff recommends that the project will contain at least 20% affordable units. The applicant has not agreed to this enhanced condition.

This proposal was approved with conditions by the TRC on April 18, 2016, and requires review by the City Council and Final TRC prior to zoning approval.

Staff has met with many current residents and members of the public regarding this project; primary concerns are related to the displacement of the families currently occupying the approximately 55 manufactured houses on the site and the approximately 63 school children within these families. Concerns have been raised about the ability for relocation of the manufactured housing units (which is unlikely due to the age of the units and related HUD restrictions) and the impact on the permanent housing situation for these residents.

Regarding density, under the current zoning on the sites, a total of approximately 198 units would be allowed (approximately 139 on the Institutional parcel and 59 on the smaller RM-16 lot). By conditionally zoning both parcels as a combined project, 341 units would be allowed by right and the project. The applicant is proposing 290 apartments or approximately 25 units per acre.

A proposal for a major subdivision creating 29 single-family lots on the Allen Avenue parcel was approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission in April 2015 (BP 15-02454 PZ); this application effectively replaces that approval. There is a Level I application currently under review for a Pizza Hut at the corner of Miami Circle and Long Shoals Road (BP 16-01283).

The multi-family residential development is considered compatible with the surrounding uses and zoning in the area. Institutional zoning anticipates and allows for a higher-density residential component and this location places families and residents within walking distance to schools (K-12), recreational uses, commercial uses and transit (Hendersonville Road). Staff's suggested condition to extend sidewalks along Miami Circle to Long Shoals Road and within the TC Roberson school campus would further the positive integration of the proposed project into the area, provide protection for pedestrians against the increased vehicular traffic, and provide a safer route for school children that walk to school.

Several elements of this proposal are directly aligned with the *Asheville City Development Plan 2025* including "higher-density residential infill development"; density above the minimum necessary to improve and enhance transit; and the proposed inclusion of dedicated affordable housing.

Staff suggested conditions would improve compliance with the *Plan* with sidewalk extensions to improve pedestrian safety and access and to connect residential uses to shopping, employment options, the high school and transit, while the recommended increase in the affordable housing set-aside, from 10% to 20%, would better align the project with the affordable housing policies of the *Plan* due to the project's proposal to remove the existing 55 mobile homes.

Regarding other adopted plans and the dedication to affordable housing, the City's recently completed *Housing Needs Assessment* (2015) contains a section on mobile home rental units and indicates an average rental range per unit of approximately \$595-795 in Buncombe County (the rent in this existing mobile home park is approximately \$225 per month). The rental range on manufactured housing in the area is significantly lower than the rental range that will be offered once the development would be completed (according to affordable housing standards at 80% AMI). This considerable disparity between what is considered to be "affordable" versus the low rents which serve a specific population of City residents that will be lost through this development demonstrates the concerning displacement of a population that will not be easily re-served and re-housed.

The proposal aligns with the 2036 Council vision in the following areas: (1) *A Well-Planned and Livable Community* – The project is ideally situated, placing higher-density residential development proximate to complementary uses; and (2) *Transportation and Accessibility* - Sidewalk connections to the school campus and Long Shoals Road will create safe pedestrian routes to school, recreation, transit and shopping.

Considerations:

- Appropriately sites higher-density residential development proximate to educational, recreational and commercial uses and within one-tenth of a mile to transit.
- Provides sidewalk connections to adjacent uses along Miami Circle and to Long Shoals Road.
- Project will contain at least 10% affordable units at rent standards not to exceed 80% Area Median Income (AMI) as published in the 2016 Affordable Housing Standards. This commitment will stand for a time period not less than 10 years. **Staff suggests raising this amount to at least 20% of the units to more closely mirror the number of existing units that are being removed.**
- Development displaces residents in mobile home units that have been in place for several decades, with residents paying rents significantly below even the current standards for 60% AMI.

Based on policies stated in the Comprehensive Plan and other plans, such as *the Housing Needs Assessment and City Council's 2036 Vision Considerations*, staff does not find this request to be reasonable and within the best public interest and does not recommend support of the proposed conditional zoning as proposed.

When Chairman Goldstein asked if staff would be supportive of the conditional zoning if the two staff conditions were met, Ms. Bernstein said that staff would have a more favorable recommendation.

In response to Chairman Goldstein, Ms. Bernstein noted an error in staff's report on the number of units that can be allowed under the current zoning. She explained that on the RM-16 parcel they propose 44 units (65 allowed under current zoning) and on the Institutional parcel they propose 246 units (230 allowed under current zoning). If the zoning is not changed at all, they would be below the number allowed on the RM-16 parcel but on the Institutional parcel there are more units proposed than would be allowed.

Chairman Goldstein noted that if the project is not approved, the developer can still develop 295 units and remove all of the mobile homes.

When Ms. Hudson asked what the benefit of the conditional zoning is for this development, Ms. Bernstein said that the benefit is the additional units with this layout. Some of the parking and open space can be distributed throughout both parcels.

Mr. W. Louis Bissette, attorney representing the applicant, said the developer is asking for a conditional zoning because he believes it would be a better project to spread the units out over both parcels. He briefly explained the sidewalk constructions. They are working with Buncombe County Schools to construct a walking path into the TC Roberson campus from Miami Circle following the existing driveway. The other sidewalk connection will be along primary entrance driveway to Long Shoals Road. The new plan is for the Miami Circle access point to be restricted to emergency vehicles only with a siren-activated gate. Buncombe County Schools has not asked for a sidewalk on their property along Miami Circle southwards to connect down to Long Shoals Road. The main issue is the existing mobile home park. Approximately 50 mobile homes are occupied and they need to be helped with relocation. His client has met with the residents, City staff and Homeward Bound to find a way to help them relocate. His client is prepared to do two things (1) commit 10% affordable units at rent standards not to exceed 80% Area Median Income for a period of not less than 15 years; and (2) contribute \$250,000 to the City, which would be used by the City in conjunction with Homeward Bound, in relocating the remaining people from the mobile home park. He guessed there would be approximately 30 families that would need significant help to relocate because every resident in the mobile home park has a different need. If any money is left over from the relocation efforts, it would go to the City's Housing Trust Fund.

When Ms. Hudson asked if the displaced mobile home owners could be put on a high priority list for these units, Mr. Bissette felt the rents would not be comparable. Another point is that it will probably be two years before the units will be available for rent.

Mr. Edmonds liked the concept and location of the project but was concerned about displacing the mobile home residents. He was not sure if the \$250,000 will be enough to compensate the owners for the trailers and still relocate them to a place that they will have to pay more.

In response to Mr. Edmonds, Mr. Eddy Dewey, representing Miami Made, said that 53 of the 54 units are owned by the mobile home owners. There are some leases in place, but most are on-going. They are working directly on door to door surveys to understand the needs of each mobile home owner. He said 40 of the mobile homes are old and pre-date 1976 and can't be moved. He said they have met with the community three times and have found out that everyone's needs are different. The underlying lot rent is approximately \$225 a month. He said that initially they offered \$1,000 to help with relocation but due to the level of realization of the level they are dealing with, led to this additional conversation.

Mr. Chris Eller, representing Miami Made, said that they have been working with Pisgah Legal Services for a needs based assessment on each home. The whole purpose with coming up with this fund was, without knowing a specified value, to help those that will be displaced. Ten to 12 people have already found places and 4-5 have already moved out. A blanket approach is not appropriate. When the mobile home park residents were given notice in January that they had until August 1 to vacate, the developer started contacting Mountain Housing Opportunities, Asheville Housing Authority, Henderson County Housing Authority, etc. to look for resources. They have found out that most of those organizations aren't necessary uniquely qualified to help the people they are trying to help. The developer has now recognized that he needed to step up and help with funds to the displaced people.

Ms. Heather Dillashaw, the City's Community Development Manager, said that Community Development staff has been engaged in conversation with Miami Circle residents, initially through the Buncombe County Schools' Homeless/At-Risk Liaison for families. That liaison has a relationship with Ms. Christiana Tugman through the Homeless Initiative Advisory Committee. Ms. Tugman, an attorney from Pisgah Legal Services, staff from the Asheville Housing Authority and other housing and service providers have gone to monthly meetings in south Asheville organized by community advocates there. Community Development staff will continue to provide resources as best as they can.

In response to Ms. Hudson, Ms. Dillashaw said that relocation can happen at anytime. In fact, some have already relocated. When funds become available they can start immediately trying to relocate people. We don't want everyone to hit the market at the same time because we don't have the units to house all the people all at once.

In response to City Attorney Currin, Ms. Dillashaw recommended the \$250,000 be placed into the Homeless Initiative General Fund line item for relocation expenses. Whatever is not used would be placed in the Housing Trust Fund, as we do with other donations. The benefit of the money coming to the City is that they can control the process with our community partners who do this work. Another option would be for Pisgah Legal Services to be a sub-recipient and we do have that process in place. There is a high level of accountability.

In response to Mr. Edmonds, Ms. Dillashaw said that the needs assessment that Pisgah Legal Services is starting to perform is very important because the needs of the households in the park vary widely. What we don't want to see is everyone getting \$5,000 because \$5,000 might not help one family at all. Some people will get more money than others based on their needs. The needs assessment is important when the pot of money is not endless.

Mr. Nick Hathaway, representing the developer, said that \$250,000 will be in place with the closing, which will be approximately 60-90 days after Council approval, which Council will consider on June 14.

Ms. Hudson explained that the Commission wants to make sure that the residents would not have to vacate (perhaps 60 days) until after the relocation assistance money is available. Mr. Hathaway said that they would be willing to coordinate the timing to accomplish this. Mr. Bisette said that his client would be willing to include this as a condition to the ordinance.

Vice-Chair Carter suggested the condition read that \$250,000 of relocation assistance will be available to the residents of the mobile home community and that eviction proceedings not begin until funds are available to the families. City Attorney Currin said that the condition can be ironed out prior to the project being considered by City Council. She wanted to make sure the condition contains language about where the \$250,000 will go and when the funds will be paid.

Mr. Edmonds suggested the condition read that the developer is required to pay \$250,000 and that the details be worked out by the developer, the City, the mobile home residents, and Pisgah Legal Services.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

The following individuals spoke mainly regarding the displacement of residents/pets and relocation assistance money of the mobile home residents:

Deacon Rudy Triana, St. Barnabas Catholic Church
Susan Chitwood, Social Justice Chairperson for St. Barnabas Catholic Church
Sheryl Peyton, Director of Religious Education for St. Barnabas Catholic Church
Resident on Miami Circle adjacent to the Mobile Home Park

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 8:17 p.m.

Mr. Edmonds felt that there is no right that someone can live in a mobile home park forever. North Carolina law states that you can give evict someone living in a mobile home park in 60 days for no reason at all. He felt the best thing the Commission can do to help protect the residents is approve that the money be paid to the people who are being displaced. People have the right to do what they want with their property but if we can provide some benefit to the residents, then we've done the best we can do. He felt the \$250,000 relocation assistance offer is reasonable and suggested the details be worked out prior to City Council consideration on June 14.

Chairman Goldstein agreed with Mr. Edmonds, noting that the developer can evict the mobile home residents and still develop their property under the current zoning.

Mr. Hauser asked if there were other developments along Miami Circle that would result in sidewalks. Ms. Bernstein responded that there is another project scheduled to be constructed, but they can't link their sidewalk to Long Shoals Road because there is a piece of property between them and Long Shoals Road owned by Duke Energy. Mr. Hauser felt that this is an issue that still needs to be addressed, but appreciated the developer's commitments to the project.

In response to Vice-Chair Carter, Mr. Day explained the route of the vehicular traffic going into TC Roberson, noting that the Buncombe County Schools said the safest place for a new sidewalk would be along Miami Circle to link the project site with the Buncombe County School property's driveway into the TC Roberson High School campus.

Regarding staff's request that the applicant extend the sidewalk along Miami Circle southwards to connect down to Long Shoals Road, Mr. Day explained that the right-of-way is limited and the cost is approximately \$100/linear foot based on the topography for the approximately 600 feet length of sidewalk requested.

Mr. Hauser suggested the condition read that the developer will contribute \$250,000 into a fund with oversight by the City for use in relocating current residents of the property contingent upon eviction notices being made consistent with the availability of the relocation funding; and furthermore funds not used for relocation will be given to the City's Housing Trust Fund to be used for affordable housing development.

Assistant City Attorney Jannice Ashley noted that the condition regarding the commitment that the project shall contain at least 10% affordable units at rent standards not to exceed 80% Area Median Income will stand for a period of not less than 15 years, will require the applicant to execute an affordable housing deed restriction. Mr. Bissette agreed to this condition, but asked for a copy of the deed restriction which will be required to be signed.

Mr. Hauser moved to recommend approval of the the conditional zoning request from Residential Multi-Family High Density District (RM-16) and Institutional (INST) to Institutional Conditional Zone (INST-CZ) with the requested conditions for the development of a multi-family residential project and find that the request is reasonable, is in the public interest, and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, subject to the draft Exhibit B.1 Conditions (with the deletion of staff suggested conditions) in that: (1) The proposal places higher density residential development in an area proximate and walkable to transit, commercial, educational and recreational uses; (2) The project includes pedestrian connections to community uses and transit; (3) The project includes dedicated affordable housing unit (a minimum of 10% of the units at 80% Area Median Income for a minimum of 15 years); and (4) the developer will contribute \$250,000 into a fund managed by the City and its partners for use in relocating current residents of the property contingent upon eviction notices being made consistent with the availability of the relocation funding; and furthermore funds not used for

relocation of those residents will be given to the City's Housing Trust Fund to be used for affordable housing development. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hudson and carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

Other Business

Chairman Goldstein announced the next meeting on June 1, 2016, at 5:00 p.m. in the First Floor Conference Room in the City Hall Building.

Adjournment

At 8:46 p.m., Ms. Hudson moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Edmonds and carried unanimously on a 7-0 vote.