

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 6, 2015
1st Floor North Conference Room - City Hall

Present: Chairman Jeremy Goldstein, Kristy Carter, Jim Edmonds, Laura Berner Hudson and Karl Koon

Absent: Vice-Chair Holly P. Shriner and Joe Minicozzi

Pre-Meeting - 4:30 p.m.

The Commission discussed (1) the agenda for the May 21, 2015, mid-month meeting; (2) the agenda for the June 18 mid-month meeting; (3) possible cancellation of July 1, 2015, regular meeting; (4) possible review and comment of the Request for Proposals for the Comprehensive Plan; and (5) tax rates for vacant properties.

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 1, 2015, meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Edmonds and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.
- Ms. Carter moved to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2015, mid-month meeting. This motion was seconded by Mr. Koon and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

Agenda Items

(1) Recommendation of approval for the Historic Preservation Plan created for the Historic Resources Commission of Asheville and Buncombe County.

Historic Resources Director Stacy Merten presented the Commission with the final draft of the Historic Preservation Master Plan for Asheville and Buncombe County for their review and recommendation.

This plan represents the work of many individuals, conducted over the past 18 months with the assistance of Heritage Strategies, the planning consultants. The work of Heritage Strategies has been guided by an advisory committee chaired by Brendan Ross, the current chair of the Historic Resources Commission (HRC). The advisory committee included a diversity of interests with representation from Buncombe County, the Asheville business community, Asheville neighborhoods, the Preservation Society of Asheville and Buncombe County and the HRC. The community was further engaged through a series of public meetings, focus groups and individual interviews to gather information for input and preparation of the plan.

Although the HRC currently has a successful preservation program, which has been in place since 1979, this plan will help guide the future work of the commission and further historic preservation efforts as supported through the city's adopted comprehensive and downtown development plans, ensuring that historic preservation remains integral to quality urban design, sustainability and the strategic planning vision of Asheville and Buncombe County.

The following goals were identified early in the process and all subsequent strategies outlined in the plan are intended to facilitate these four overarching goals.

- Heighten public appreciation of Asheville and Buncombe County's heritage and historic resources.
- Ensure that public sector initiatives and actions are models for best practices in the preservation and treatment of historic resources.
- Support private initiative as a major way through which historic resources are recognized, preserved, and enhanced.
- Enlist historic preservation in the quest for great 21st century growth – make historic preservation central to Asheville and Buncombe County's understanding of the ways and means of achieving a high quality of life and economic and environmental sustainability.

The HRC recommended approval of the plan at their meeting on March 11, 2015, with the understanding that the Downtown Commission would also make a recommendation in advance of review by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the City Council Planning and Economic Development Committee (PED). She will also be presenting this Plan to the Buncombe County Board of Commissioners. The Downtown Commission moved to recommend that the plan go forward at their meeting on April 10, 2015. HRC staff has also consulted with city staff from Planning and Urban Design, and Economic and Community Development, as well as staff from the Preservation Society of Asheville and Buncombe County to gain support for the specific strategies outlined in the plan that effect those agencies.

The plan is tentatively scheduled for review by the PED on May 19, 2015, after which it will be schedule for City Council review and acceptance and then will go on to the Buncombe County Board of Commissioners.

Staff is asking that the Planning and Zoning Commission make a recommendation for the plan to move forward for review by the Planning and Economic Committee of City Council for eventual acceptance by the Asheville City Council.

In response to Ms. Carter, Ms. Merten spoke about how historic preservation overlays with future development.

When Chairman Goldstein asked for public comment, no one spoke.

Mr. Koon moved to recommend the Historic Preservation Master Plan be forwarded to the Planning & Economic Development Committee for eventual acceptance by the Asheville City Council. This motion was seconded by Ms. Carter and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

(2) Proposed amendment to the text of the City's Unified Development Ordinance for section 7-8-1 to allow replacements of telecommunication towers and support structures in all zoning districts.

Interim Planning Director Alan Glines said that this is the consideration of amending Sec. 7-8-1 Table of Permitted Uses in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to allow the replacement of existing permitted cell towers where they are located.

Currently, the definition for Section 7-2-5 of the UDO provides the following definition:

“Telecommunication tower/ support structure- Replacement tower- means a telecommunication tower intended to replace an existing approved tower where such replacement is (1) at or within 100 yards of the existing tower base, and (2) no higher than the existing tower.”

Although this definition is provided in the UDO, there is not a corresponding use provision in the Table of Permitted Uses (7-8-1(d)) showing where this replacement tower is allowed. This may have been the result of an accidental omission during a prior amendment but no conclusive documentation has been discovered. This ordinance amendment then, would specify replacement towers as a use for all districts since the specific cell towers are located where they were originally permitted.

Replacing cell towers has become more of a burden since revisions for replacing cell towers was amended in the building code. Cell towers must now comply with higher wind loads and structural standards for the tower base. This is affecting both private carriers and the City of Asheville.

Providing cell towers at a new location is generally a *conditional use permit* that has a large number of requirements that need to be met and must be approved by City Council through a quasi-judicial process. Replacing these previously approved towers should be reviewed through submittal of new building permits but need not follow the extensive public hearing process required when the original towers were permitted.

Therefore, this ordinance amendment clarifies that cell towers may be replaced where they are located provided they meet the UDO definition for replacement. The Table of Uses under '*other use types*' will be changed to reflect this.

The proposed amendment is not directly addressed in the Asheville City Development Plan 2025. But telecommunications towers may be interpreted to be a part of the basic needed infrastructure of the community that supports economic development, public safety and other basic city services and is something that everyone has come to expect.

The proposed amendment most closely complies with the City Council Strategic Operating Plan in Focus Area 1: *Economic Growth and Sustainability* - since the replacement of aging cell towers will encourage maintaining emergency communications infrastructure and reinvestment in basic community infrastructure which is stated as the second goal in the plan.

Staff recommends approval of this proposed amendment because it aligns the Table of Permitted Uses with the existing definition for replacement towers and clarifies where these are permitted.

When Ms. Carter asked what type of enforcement there will be if a tower is replaced and there happens to be higher standards at that time, Mr. Glines said that he investigate that issue prior to moving forward to Council.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 5:15 p.m. and when no one spoke, he then closed it at 5:15 p.m.

Ms. Carter moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Section 7-8-1(d) as outlined in this report and find that the request is reasonable and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, because it allows for community infrastructure to be maintained, enhances public safety and encourages economic growth and investment. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hudson and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

(3) Proposed amendment to the text of the City's Unified Development Ordinance for Section 7-11-8 (b)(4) to clarify sidewalk requirements.

Interim Planning Director Alan Glines said that this is the consideration of an amendment to Sec. 7-11-8(b)(4) to correct an earlier amendment that provides a clarification for a threshold for when sidewalks are required..

Currently, among the variety of conditions for when sidewalks are required, item (4) reads:

“All existing office, institutional, commercial, and industrial development additions or expansions to structures where the expansion results in an increase of more than 50 percent value of the structure as defined in section 7-11-1 of this chapter;”

An amendment was approved in 2009 that revised the 50 percent threshold up to 75 percent. This was done to provide some minor relief for when properties were being renovated or retrofitted for new uses to encourage reinvestment and new business uses. During a later amendment, this same threshold was changed back to 50 percent by what appears to have been a typographical error. This has resulted in some inconsistencies within in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

Therefore, this ordinance amendment seeks to correct this requirement to say that, *“All existing office, institutional, commercial, and industrial development additions or expansions to structures where the expansion results in an increase of more than 75 percent value of the structure as defined in section 7-11-1 of this chapter”*

The Comprehensive Plan speaks to the need for and support for community infrastructure such as sidewalks and seeks to balance new investment and reinvestment in new construction activities in support of community infrastructure.

The proposed amendment most closely complies with the City Council Strategic Operating Plan in Focus Area 1: *Economic Growth and Sustainability* - since the sidewalk requirement encourages investment in community infrastructure.

Staff recommends approval of this proposed amendment because it corrects an inconsistency in the ordinance and supports the construction of needed sidewalk infrastructure.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 5:17 p.m. and when no one spoke, he then closed it at 5:17 p.m.

Ms. Carter moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Section Sec. 7-11-8(b)(4) as outlined in this report and find that the request is reasonable and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, because it supports the construction of needed community infrastructure and provides a correction to the ordinance. This motion was seconded by Mr. Koon and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

(4) Proposed amendment to the text of the City’s Unified Development Ordinance amending Article 13, Chapter 7 of Code of Ordinances of the City of Asheville to expand options for real estate and construction signage.

Mr. Chris Collins, Development Services Process Manager said that this is the consideration of a wording amendment was submitted by Vannoy Construction (with support from the property owner/developer) to increase the current allowances for construction & real estate signage for development projects.

In December of 2014, City Zoning Enforcement staff served a notice of violation (NOV) to the City Centre and Hilton Garden Inn projects for construction signage in excess of that allowed by Section 7-13-2(d)(7) at 301 and 309 College Street. The NOV was generated due to the fact that the above listed construction projects are currently displaying construction signage that is in violation of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) allowance of two (2) signs with a

maximum of 32 square feet in area per sign face with a required ten (10) foot setback from the right-of-way.

In response to the serving of this NOV, the developer met with City staff and subsequently submitted a formal request for a wording amendment to Section 7-13-2(d)(7) to increase the allowed number of and size of construction signs when attached to construction fence screening materials. The request noted the following benefits of allowing further construction signage when attached to screening materials:

- Screening attached to construction fencing makes for a much better appearance to the public; and
- This type of signage assists in vendor and delivery identification for construction sites; and
- The ability to advertise on construction screening helps mitigate the cost to developers of installing the screening material itself.

In receipt of this request which is centered on an active construction site within the Central Business District (CBD) zoning district, staff prepared a report and proposed wording amendment for presentation to the City's Downtown Commission. On February 13, 2015, staff presented the option of allowing unlimited 32 square foot sign panels on construction fencing screening materials when said panels were spaced at least 50 linear feet apart and eliminated the requirement of a 10 foot setback for this type of signage within the CBD. The majority of the Downtown Commission members demonstrated support for increasing the allowance for the construction signage. Several members identified the possibility of allowing a greater size and quantity than that identified in the staff report.

On March 4 of 2015, the City's Planning & Zoning Commission unanimously adopted a motion to recommend approval of an amended and less restrictive ordinance allowing unlimited sign faces that are no more than 50 square feet in area and no closer than 20 linear feet to the next sign face.

On March 24, the request and Planning & Zoning Commission recommendation were heard by the Asheville Council. The Council stated differing positions ranging from support for the recommended ordinance change to support for exempting this type of signage from regulation. The end result was a unanimous vote for denial of the text amendment as presented and recommended. In response to this, the original applicant for this amendment has submitted a revised request to allow both freestanding construction signage and construction screening signage to exist simultaneously on the same site and exempt construction screening signage from regulations as to size and quantity.

Research by City staff has found that many other cities have a regulation in place mirror our current 32 square foot requirements. Research has also indicated that this type of construction screening materials is often not regulated nor enforced by other cities. Larger jurisdictions such as the City of Atlanta (where a prevalence of urban projects creates a high incidence of this type of screening and signage) regulate the time of placement and content of the signage rather than the area of the sign. The use of construction screening material on construction fencing is not required by City ordinance.

Currently, the text of Section 7-13-2(d) (7) reads as follows:

- 7) *Construction Signs.* Construction signs shall be allowed provided such signs do not exceed one sign per street frontage with a maximum of two signs per construction site. Such signs shall not exceed four square feet in area per display face, two faces per sign for single-family or duplex residential construction or 32 square feet in area per display face for multi-family residential or non-residential construction, and a maximum of ten feet in height. Construction signs shall not be erected prior to the issuance of a building

permit and shall be removed within seven days of the issuance of a certificate of compliance. A minimum setback of ten feet is required.

This proposed UDO text amendment adds one new definition to Section 7-2-5. These definitions are as follows:

Construction Screening- Temporary and opaque material attached to a perimeter fence or barrier surrounding an active construction site for the purpose of minimizing the visual nuisance and safety issues of the subject site.

Additionally, the proposed text amendment revising the wording of Section 7-13-2(d)(7) as follows (additions are underlined):

7) *Construction Signs*.

- a. *Freestanding Construction Signs*: Shall be allowed provided such signs do not exceed one sign per street frontage with a maximum of two signs per construction site. Such signs shall not exceed four square feet in area per display face, two faces per sign for single-family or duplex residential construction or 32 square feet in area per display face for multi-family residential or non-residential construction, and a maximum of ten feet in height. ~~Construction signs shall not be erected prior to the issuance of a building grading permit and shall be removed within seven days of the issuance of a certificate of compliance.~~ A minimum setback of ten feet is required.
- b. *Construction Signs Attached to Construction Screening*: When used in lieu of a Freestanding Construction Sign, construction signage may be attached to construction screening materials. Signs may only show the following:
 - i. Images and/or renderings of the project as it is to be constructed;
 - ii. Approved site and / or landscaping plans;
 - iii. The name and contact information of developer(s), contractors and/or financiers engaged in work on the site.
- c. Construction signs shall not be erected prior to the issuance of a building grading permit and shall be removed within seven days of the issuance of a certificate of compliance.

This wording amendment may support the City Council Strategic Operating Plan in (1) Focus Area 1 (Economic Growth & Stability) of the Strategic Plan by adding allowances for a common practice in large developments thereby promoting important projects within the community; and (2) Focus Area 2 (High Quality of Life) may be promoted through this wording amendment by the improved visual quality and pedestrian safety offered by the use of construction screening materials.

This amendment supports the following goals from the City Development Plan 2025: (1) Economic Development Goal I: Insure that Asheville's urban planning, zoning, and permitting processes, as created and administered by the City, facilitate sustained and positive development; and (2) Transportation Goal II: Making Asheville a more walkable and livable city.

Considerations:

- Provides a specific definition for *Construction Screening* within the UDO.
- Incentivizes the use of construction screening material thereby assisting with the aesthetics of active construction sites and reducing the risk of an attractive nuisance.

- Signage affixed to screening materials eliminates the more commonly used free-standing signs which may contribute to visual clutter.
- Higher allowances may improve project recognition within the community and communicate valuable information.
- Benchmarking from the standards of other jurisdictions has produced mixed results. The large majority of those surveyed enforce a similar standard to that currently found in the UDO. However, many of those surveyed noted that signage affixed to screening is not commonly regulated.

City staff recommends approval of this wording amendment.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 5:22 p.m.

Mr. Brian Walker, representing Vannoy Construction, said that they listened to the comments by City Council and revised their request. He said they want to keep a clean, presentable and safe site as much as possible during the construction process. Screening becomes expensive, so in order to help mitigate that cost, it is helpful to create opportunities for advertising and branding for the people involved with the construction process. They also want to incentivize other contractors to screen their areas.

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 5:25 p.m.

Ms. Hudson moved to approve the proposed wording amendment to Sections 7-2-5 and 7-13-2(d)(7) of the UDO of the City of Asheville, and find that this request is reasonable and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, based on information provided in the staff report and as stated in the staff recommendation. This motion was seconded by Mr. Edmonds and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

(5) Request for a property rezoning at 1 Buffalo Street PIN 9638-46-7383 from NB (Neighborhood Business District) to RM8 (Residential Multi-Family Medium Density District). The property is a 0.21 acre vacant site that is owned by SLG Properties, LLC. The project agent is Arielle Walsh.

Urban Planner Vaidila Satvika oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting a rezoning for a property located at 1 Buffalo Street from Neighborhood Business (NB) district to RM-8 Residential Multi-Family Medium Density District.

He said that the area of the subject property is approximately 0.21 acres, measuring 41 feet wide along Buffalo Street, and 244 feet long, abutting property owned by N.C. Dept. of Transportation (DOT) and I-240W. The lot is currently vacant and is a legally conforming lot based on the development standards of the Neighborhood Business (NB) zoning district. Historically, the lot most likely served as an overflow parking lot for an adjacent neighborhood grocery/convenience store to the north that was destroyed by a fire years ago. The parcel borders an unopened right-of-way (ROW) to the south that measures approximately 12 feet wide and 245 feet long; the ROW is not an essential part of the street network as it is not maintained and it dead-ends at property owned by DOT, adjacent to the I-240W corridor.

The applicant has requested a standard rezoning from Neighborhood Business (NB) district to RM-8 Residential Multi-Family Medium Density.

Due to the fact that the subject lot is nested within a residential zoning district, the request to rezone the lot to RM-8 would be consistent with the context of the neighborhood, which is primarily single-family. The zoning action, however, would create a noncompliant lot because RM-8 requires 50 feet of frontage and the subject property has only 41 feet of frontage. According to the UDO section 7-17-2, lawfully established nonconforming lots having dimensional nonconformities may be used for any permitted use allowed in the zoning district in which the lot

is located provided that any structure meets all applicable dimensional and numerical requirements (such as setbacks, for example) and all applicable procedures are followed.

The NB zoning district provides opportunities in the city to establish low-intensity businesses that are accessible to pedestrians from surrounding residential neighborhoods yet without a waiver from the Tree Commission, the landscape buffer standards would require the subject property to include a 20-foot-wide planted buffer along the southern edge of the lot, thereby reducing any structure's buildable width to 21 feet wide. In addition, a residential use is not permitted by right in the NB zoning district. Assuming that infill housing is the best use for this site, a rezoning to RM-8 is an appropriate action.

The Asheville City Development Plan 2025 encourages compatible "adaptive reuse, redevelopment and infill development" and states, "areas within the existing urban fabric that are vacant should be targeted for compatible infill development that takes advantage of existing infrastructure." Staff feels this rezoning would be compatible with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

This rezoning is consistent with the City Council's Strategic Plan, Focus Area #1: Economic Growth and Sustainability, Goal #2 to *Invest and leverage investment in community infrastructure* by promoting "strategies for infill development in coordination with the comprehensive plan."

Consideration:

- Rezoning would create a noncompliant lot within the RM-8 zoning district.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, staff finds this request to rezone 1 Buffalo Street from NB to RM-8 to be appropriate and consistent with the context of the neighborhood and broader city goals.

In response to Ms. Carter, Mr. Satvika said that he contacted the property owner of the adjoining Neighborhood Business District, but they were not interested in rezoning their property.

In response to Chairman Goldstein, Mr. Satvika said that the property could be used for any use allowed in the RM-8 District, but the vision looks to be residential.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 5:31 p.m.

In response to Mr. Dale Slusser, Mr. Glines said that the reason this lot was zoned Neighborhood Business District is that this parcel supported a neighborhood grocery/convenience store to the north that was destroyed by a fire years ago.

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 5:32 p.m.

Mr. Koon moved to recommend approval of the zoning map amendment from Neighborhood Business (NB) to Residential Multi-Family Medium Density (RM-8) District and find that the request is reasonable and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans, based on information provided in the staff report and as stated in the staff recommendation. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hudson and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

- (6) A review of a request for a major subdivision creating 8 single-family lots from 1.05 acres located on Hall Avenue and known as PINs 9638-21-3619, 9638-21-3519, 9638-21-3419, 9638-21-3303 and 9638-21-3392. The property is owned by KGTM Holdings, LLC and the project contact is Mike Anderson.**

Urban Planner Jessica Bernstein oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting review of an 8-lot major subdivision on Hall Avenue (unopened right-of-way) in West Asheville. This project is considered a Major Subdivision pursuant to Section 7-5-9 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

The project consists of six parcels with a combined area of 1.05 acres, located off Courtney Street between Fairfax Avenue and Dale Street in West Asheville. The site is zoned RM-8, as are adjacent parcels. The subject properties are currently vacant and wooded and are surrounded primarily by single-family houses or similarly vacant, wooded parcels.

The applicant is proposing to create a new street to provide access to 8 new residential lots. The lots comply with RM-8 standards as found in Section 7-8-6 of the UDO with the exception of front setback (see section on Modifications below regarding Flexible Development for setback reduction).

The new street will meet Courtney Street (a privately-maintained road) at a 90 degree angle and continue southwards. Plans indicate 20 feet of pavement within a 25 foot right-of-way. The City's standard for ROW width for this type of road is 32 feet. The applicant requested and was granted an adjustment from this requirement under the Standards and Specifications Manual.

There are no sidewalks required pursuant to Section 7-11-8 of the UDO.

Street trees are required along the new road(s) and are shown on plans.

Tree Save Area is required for this residential subdivision and is equal to thirty percent of the total area, which is 13,692 square feet (per plans). This area is shown on plans to preserve/establish natural areas. Twenty percent of the site is required to be dedicated as Open Space; more than the required amount is shown on plans and is primarily the area within the stream buffer at the rear of lots 1-7. Some areas within this designation have a grade of more than 25%.

Modifications, Alterations, Conditions:

1. Setback - A Flexible Development Application was included with this project, pursuant to Section 7-11-7 of the UDO, with the request to reduce the front setback on all lots from 15 feet to 10 feet. The reduction in front setback is to preserve and accommodate a stream buffer running along the rear of lots 1 through 7. This request has been approved by the Planning Director.
2. ROW Width - A request was included to adjust the right-of-way from 32 feet to 25 feet with a pavement width of 20 feet. This request has been approved by the Traffic Engineer according to the Standards & Specifications Manual.

This project was approved with conditions by the Technical Review Committee at their meeting on April 20, 2015. The preliminary plat must be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Comment received have surrounded environmental concerns of the stream and potential impact downstream.

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat subject to compliance with the conditions as stated in the TRC Report. Staff finds that all city standards have been or can be met with this major subdivision application.

In response to Ms. Hudson, Ms. Bernstein said that there is a possible future connection to Fairfax Avenue but that portion of the road is fairly narrow and would require additional land.

When Mr. Edmonds asked if there was any safety concerns with reducing the road from 32 feet to 25 feet, Ms. Bernstein said no concerns have been mentioned by the Transportation Department or the Fire Department regarding the turn-around.

When Ms. Hudson asked if there will be on-street parking, Ms. Bernstein said that the creation or stripping of on-street parking spaces was not discussed by the TRC; however, if a problem is encountered, residents can contact the Transportation Department to post no parking signs.

Chairman Goldstein confirmed that the modifications requested meet the technical requirements.

Mr. Mike Anderson, applicant, said that the two modification were requested in order to increase their separation from the creek to the rear of the property, which will help mitigate some of the environmental concerns. The project will require a formal erosion control plan approval prior to any construction activities. As part of the approval process, the developer will be required to hire a third-party to perform bi-weekly inspections to make sure they are in compliance with the erosion control plans. Also, City staff has the ability to perform their own inspections during the construction process.

When Ms. Hudson asked how the developer will capture runoff from the new street, Mr. Anderson said that they have been approved for a low impact development so they will not provide any curb and gutter. They will have some storm drainage pipe to move the water from ditches to the other side of the road. They are not subject to stormwater controls from a water quality standpoint for post-construction; however, they will have to control it during construction. He did not feel there would be any water runoff from the new street into the stream.

In response to Ms. Carter, Stormwater Services Manager Marcus Barksdale, said that he and his staff have reviewed the project's design plan. He then explained how they will monitor the plan during construction.

Since there will be no curb and gutters, Ms. Hudson asked if this project will generate much water runoff into the stream from the impervious street surface. Mr. Barksdale responded that all impervious surface creates additional runoff; however, the amount of impervious surface in this project is pretty limited and the net result will be a very small increase in the total runoff rate. The project does not meet the City's threshold (which he explained) for post-construction storm water quantity or quality control.

Chairman Goldstein stressed that if this project meets all the technical requirements, the Commission does not have the authority to deny the project.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 5:47 p.m.

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the project for various reasons, some being, but are not limited to: developer needs to find creative ways to integrate creative plants into the stream buffer; request to require a permanent rain garden to handle storm runoff prior to dumping into the stream; concern that the technical requirements per the survey are inaccurate such that it barely meets the City's requirements; loss of private wooded community; this project will diminish the west Asheville character; too many homes in the project; concern about buffering between sewer line and houses; concern about creek buffer; loss of wildlife; will the housing prices be; property on the other side of the new street is open for development and therefore this project is only half of the development; front yard setbacks are too small for a home; water runoff into the stream will destroy some life in the stream; question about a notation on the survey regarding a parcel overlay; will there be any environmental assessment analyses for the stream; what is the project timeline for the development; what are the hours for the noise ordinance and are there any noise abatement plans in place; are there other examples of houses built by this

developer in Asheville; concern regarding no mailing notification of project; is there adequate water pressure for these proposed homes; and concern that developer's surveyors were on private property:

Mr. Laeo McDermott, area resident
Ms. Nancy Schwarz, resident on Dale Street
Ms. Suzanne Brown, resident on Dale Street
Ms. Ashley Pearce, resident on Fairfax Avenue
Mr. Vincent Wroblewski, area resident
Ms. Ula Reeves, resident on Fairfax Avenue
Ms. Diane Brown, resident on Dale Street

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 6:02 p.m.

Ms. Bernstein responded to the questions/concerns raised by the audience regarding public notification; the TRC review by MSD representatives regarding the sewer line; buffers; size of homes; existing parcel overlap area; no City requirements for wildlife assessments; no additional environmental assessments required; plans are provided by licensed engineers and design professionals; the application is only for the lots the applicant currently owns; and noise ordinance regulations.

Mr. Anderson also responded to questions/comments raised regarding the surveyor's right to survey property on adjacent property; their commitment to protect the stream; their openness to talk to individuals regarding creative plants in the stream buffer; why the surveyors were on adjacent properties; no examples of developer's housing in Asheville; and affordable housing.

In response to Ms. Hudson regarding compatibility in the area, Ms. Bernstein said that the size of the lots mirror the same number of lots along Dale Street, and there is a similar development pattern in the neighborhood.

Chairman Goldstein acknowledged that it's always challenging to see infill properties development with open space and wildlife concerns; however, he reiterated that if the project meets the technical requirements, the Commission does not have the ability to refuse the property owner his rights to develop his property.

Ms. Hudson moved to recommend approval of the major subdivision preliminary plat for the Hall Avenue Subdivision subject to the applicable conditions in the TRC report. This motion was seconded by Chairman Goldstein and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

(7) Review of a conditional zoning request from RM16 (Residential Multi-Family High Density) to RM-16 CZ (Residential Multi-Family, High Density Conditional Zone) for the construction of 72 residential units in three buildings with associated infrastructure. The applicant is seeking approval of conditions for reduced building setbacks and parking counts and a condition to increase residential density. The subject parcel is 3.71 acres located at 29 Oak Hill Drive and known as PIN 9629-90-2093. The property is owned by Oak Hill Group, LLC and the project contact is John Kinnaird.

Interim Planning Director Alan Glines oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is seeking approval of a site plan proposing a 72 unit affordable housing development at 29 Oak Hill Drive following a conditional zoning process outlined in 7-7-8 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

The proposal is for the construction of three 3-story structures each with 24 residential units and a single large area for parking. The plan is for all of the 72 units to be affordable

meeting city standards for affordability. Open space and landscaping will also be provided on the plan. The requested density for the proposal is 19.41 units per acre. The property is zoned RM-16 Residential Multi-Family High Density District and the proposal is to rezone to RM-16/CZ Residential Multi-Family High Density District/Conditional Zoning.

The site is a 3.70 acre site located at 29 Oak Hill Drive located about 450 feet from New Leicester Highway. The site is accessed from a driveway along Oak Hill and then opens to a wider area below the level of the road. Prior to this application the site was graded to its current condition and has few existing trees except at the top of the site at the street. The railroad is adjacent to this parcel and the railroad right of way area (RR ROW) covers a significant portion of the parcel and affects placement of site improvements including buildings and plantings. The site also has a section of sewer line that crosses this property. Trees and structures are not allowed in the sewer line easement area.

Access to the property is from Oak Hill Drive. This road has several connections to local streets including New Leicester Highway to the west and Hazel Mill Road to the northeast. A new sidewalk is proposed along Oak Hill Drive along the frontage area and an internal sidewalk will provide access into the site. There are 81 parking spaces provided on the plans but a required fire truck turn-around may require the loss of several spaces. The site is within 500 feet to transit service on New Leicester Highway. The ART route W4 travels along New Leicester Highway and back to downtown Asheville.

Landscaping is required for this parcel including street trees, parking lot landscaping, building impact landscaping, dumpster screening and tree-save plantings. The proposed landscaping meets or can meet the requirements of this section.

Open space is required at the rate of 500 square feet per unit for a total of .83 acre. The site plans show sufficient area to meet this standard.

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) reviewed this application at their meeting on April 20, 2015, and approved it with conditions. All conditional zoning applications are reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Commission. City Council provides the final review of the conditional zoning proposal. If approved by Council, the proposal will return to the TRC for a final TRC review.

Conditions Modifying Development Standards: *The applicant is seeking conditions to modify some development standards pursuant to 7-7-8 of the UDO.*

- *Density-* The project is seeking approval of 19.41 units per acre. The district standard is 16 units per acre. There is a verified shortage of affordable units and the site can still meet other development standards.
- *Setbacks-* Setbacks in RM-16 are generally 40 from side and rear property lines when a single structure contains over 14 residential units. The project is seeking a setback reduction from 40 feet to 20 feet due to the location of the RR ROW which constrains the site and the locations where the buildings may be located. The RR ROW is about .4 acre and does not permit any other features in this area.
- *Parking-* The UDO provides a formula for parking based on the land use and the number of bedrooms. The UDO requires 86 spaces and the current plans show 81 spaces. Staff recommends that 10 additional bicycle parking spaces be provided to help offset the lower number of parking spaces for automobiles.

The applicant is proposing to conditionally rezone the site from RM-16 to RM-16-CZ as a way to impose conditions different from the zoning district standards as explained in the conditions section above. The proposed use will be 72 residential units. Properties to the north, west, and east are also zoned RM-16. These areas have mostly single family residential uses on them with some areas with larger vacant tracts. There is a small portion of the existing cemetery

on the east side of the tract zoned RS-2. The area to the south is zoned Highway Business (HB) which allows a wide range of commercial and residential uses. The Salvation Army operates a donation center and store there. The proposed residential use is compatible with the residential uses in the surrounding area. Higher density zoning areas are often located where community infrastructure is in place and community services such as shopping centers and employment areas are nearby. Higher density multifamily zoned areas often act as a reasonable buffer from commercial areas and other lower density residential areas.

The Comprehensive Plan supports affordable housing as a crucial community need with concerns about the lack of available units. In addition the Comprehensive Plan is supportive of infill development where the infrastructure is sufficient and community services are close by to support the use. Other council adopted plans have highlighted the continued scarcity of affordable units.

The proposal is aligned with the second focus area of the City Council Strategic Plan, *Affordability and Economic Mobility*. The plan seeks to promote affordable housing close to the CBD, jobs and transportation. The proposal with 72 affordable residential units is located with access to transit service, jobs and other community needs.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report, staff finds this request to be reasonable.

Considerations:

- The proposal includes 72 affordable residential units which are needed in the community.
- The proposal is conveniently located to transit and transportation systems.
- Shopping and employment centers are also in close proximity to the project site.
- The existing railroad right of way impacts the placement of structures and parking area on the parcel.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed Oak Hill Village conditional zoning along with the conditions requested, finding it consistent with City-adopted plans and strategic goals for the development.

Concerns raised by the public include traffic and cut-through traffic on Oak Hill Drive. City Traffic Engineer Jeff Moore, who was unable to attend this meeting, provided Mr. Glines with a note that said the scale of the development does not require a Traffic Impact Study (TIA). The afternoon peak hour would generate an additional 45 trips and in the morning peak hour the project would generate 38 trips. To trigger a TIA would be 100 trips in the peak hours.

Mr. Ward Griffin, developer, explained their request for the setback reduction is due to the high level of fill, which prohibits them from building a structure in that area. He was excited about bringing this project to the community and asked the Commission for their support of the project.

Chairman Goldstein opened the public hearing at 6:34 p.m.

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the project for various reasons, some being, but are not limited to: no mailed notification of this project; questioned how 81 parking spaces will only generate 45 trips; project does not fit into the character of the neighborhood; additional traffic on Oak Hill Drive; existing speeding on Oak Hill Drive; even though Oak Hill Drive is number 3 on the waiting list for City traffic calming, those measures should occur prior to future developments; need for sidewalk on Oak Hill Drive; need for traffic signal at intersection of Oak Hill Drive and New Leicester Highway; reduced property values; difficulty to find project information on the City's website; use of Oak Hill Drive as a cut-through; Oak Hill Drive needs to be widened; and Oak Hill Drive should be posted as no trucks:

Resident on Oak Hill Drive
Resident on Oak Hill Drive
Mr. David Butts, resident on Oak Hill Drive
Ms. Fiona McCulley, resident on Oak Hill Drive

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 6:44 p.m.

Mr. Glines responded to questions/concerns raised by the audience regarding notification and clarification of affordable housing vs. low income housing.

Chairman Goldstein understood the need to encourage affordable housing; however, questioned how we balance that need when there are existing dangerous conditions in the area.

Ms. Carter noted that the City acknowledges that there is a need for traffic calming measures on that road. She felt what will make a difference for the neighborhood is the traffic calming measures. She felt that traffic issues can be mitigated with traffic calming, but we rarely get opportunities for an affordable housing development.

Mr. Glines said that he would obtain more information from the Traffic Engineer prior to this coming before City Council for consideration.

When Ms. Hudson asked if the developer would be willing to participate in constructing a sidewalk to New Leicester Highway, Mr. Griffin said that going off-site for additional improvements is not something they are capable of doing and still keep the housing affordable.

Mr. Griffin said that the units will not look cheap and hoped that the units will be something the neighborhood likes to look at. He felt they will bring positivity to some of the declining neighborhoods.

Ms. Hudson moved to recommend approval of the conditional zoning request for Oak Hill Village on 29 Oak Hill Drive from zoning RM-16 (residential multifamily high density) to the RM-16-CZ (residential multifamily high density conditional zone) with the conditions for setbacks and parking reductions and additional density, based on the master plan 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) the proposal provides 72 affordable units which are needed in the community (2) the site is conveniently located for transit and transportation facilities, and (3) shopping and employment centers are located nearby. This motion was seconded by Ms. Carter and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

At 6:57 p.m., Chairman Goldstein announced a short recess.

- (8) Review of a conditional zoning request from RS-4 (Residential Single-Family Medium Density District) to INST- CZ (Institutional – Conditional Zone) for church renovation that will include changes to the fellowship hall to create a commercial kitchen and office space. Outside the church, work includes a new parking area, added sidewalks, and the construction of 10 student housing units with associated infrastructure. The applicant is seeking approval of conditions for reduced property line buffers for portions of the site. The subject parcel is 6.16 acres located at 311 at 315 Old Haw Creek Road and known as PIN 9659-80-1408. The property is owned by Bethesda United Methodist Church (Annual Conference) and the project contact is Sean Rice.**

Urban Planner Vaidila Satvika oriented the Commission to the site and said that the applicant is requesting review of a conditional zoning request from RS-4 Residential Single-Family Medium Density District to Institutional District/Conditional Zoning in accordance with Section 7-7-8 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), to allow for renovations to an

existing place of worship and the construction of 10 student housing units.

The project area consists of a single 6.16-acre parcel located at 311 & 315 Old Haw Creek Road with secondary frontage along Bethesda Road. The parcel is currently zoned RS-4 Residential Single-Family Medium Density District and contains a church and minister's parsonage, and a cemetery that measures nearly 69,000 square feet, occupying one quarter of the property. The site is primarily surrounded by residential uses. The site is immediately north and adjacent to Haw Creek Elementary School, a school of approximately 410 students in grades kindergarten through fifth.

The applicant is seeking to create a more flexible use of their property to be able to continue as a place of worship while also accommodating other uses. The plan is to create a multi-use property that houses students and seminarians year round as part of an educational and community service curriculum. Students would be housed in ten newly constructed small cottages measuring approximately 250 square feet each, these would be located at the southwest corner of the property and accessed through a new driveway adjacent to the church. The proposal will remodel and upgrade the church fellowship hall to include a commercial kitchen that would serve the student programs as well as the local community for local caterers or food truck operators. The fellowship hall will be partitioned to create a shared office space that will include approximately 25 work stations. Up to 20 students and 4-6 instructors will use this space. The shared office would serve approximately 50 people during the week. The sanctuary of the church will only be used as a place for worship for the various church congregations and will not have a shared use component. On the same floor as the sanctuary there are five classrooms that will be used by the same students and instructors utilizing the shared office space. The parsonage serves as a residence for clergy and lay missionaries associated with the church; it will continue to function as a residential house for the church's ministers.

Access to the property is from either Old Haw Creek Road or Bethesda Road. There will be two parking areas, one accessed from Old Haw Creek Road, the other from Bethesda Road.

Based on the mix of uses and the expected overlap, the minimum number of parking spaces required for the project is 41. The project will provide eight additional spaces to meet that requirement. Peak parking demand is summarized below:

Location & Use	Use Period	Area	Max Occupants	Parking formula	Spaces required	
Sanctuary	Workshop space	Sun	2192 SF	124	1 per 4 occ	31
Fellowship Hall	Dining space	Mon-Sat	774 SF		N.A. *	0
	Co-working office	Mon-Sat	774 SF	60	1/350 SF	2
	5 class rooms	Mon-Sat	1576 SF	25	1 per teacher	2
Kitchen	Co-working space/kitchen	Everyday	716 SF	4	1 per cook **	2
Cottages	10 small homes	Everyday	2500 SF	20	1 per unit	10
Peak Demand						41

* Not applicable because the people using these spaces are already accounted for as on-site students or church/co-working office space attendees.

** Kitchen staff/cooks on Sunday would be church attendees

Three of the spaces will be provided as accessible parking spaces. Bike parking and a loading berth will be provided.

A 20-foot-wide paved access road will extend from the new parking lot to connect the ten small cottages for access. The applicant will seek to use that access road to join the parsonage so that the parsonage's currently used gravel driveway may be removed, which would reduce the

number of entrances/exits to enhance safety and it would also allow for the planted buffer yard to be uninterrupted by the gravel road encroachment.

A new sidewalk measuring at least five feet wide is proposed along the length of the property adjacent to Old Haw Creek Road and Bethesda Road, and south, bisecting the property, along the cemetery to a 30-foot right of way, which is unpaved. The sidewalk that bisects the property will enhance the cemetery by making it easier for visitors to access and it will provide a direct connection for access to the school.

The site is along the ART bus route E2 with a bus stop across the street from the site.

Landscaping is required for this project including street trees, parking lot landscaping, street buffer, building impact landscaping, and a property line buffer. The applicant is requesting modifications to the property line buffer due to the location of the cemetery; to comply would require the relocation of more than 75 graves. The proposed alternative compliance is detailed below.

The open space requirement is 15% of the lot area. The site plan shows sufficient area to meet this standard.

Conditions modifying development standards:

1. Property line buffer – a type B (30 foot wide) property line buffer is required adjacent to RS-4 zoned properties.
 1. Along the cemetery, the property line buffer will be waived. At this southern and southeastern edge of the property along the cemetery, which measures approximately 450 feet, planting a buffer would require the relocation of more than 75 graves. *Staff is supportive of this modification due to existing site constraints and because the uses and activity along this part of the property will not change.*

This proposal was approved with conditions by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on April 20, 2015, and requires review by City Council and Final TRC prior to zoning approval.

The applicant promoted a community meeting via direct mail to 2,250 households in January 2015, which resulted in a meeting on January 25, 2015, with over 40 people in attendance. No communication has been received from the public as of the writing of this report.

The site is surrounded by other properties zoned RS-4, most of which are single-family residential. There is a pocket of RM-6 zoning to the north of the site, which is mostly used as a place of worship. By moving from RS-4 to INST zoning, the applicant seeks greater flexibility to be able to continue as a place of worship while also accommodating student housing and various classes. All of the uses proposed are identified in the UDO's impact table as "low."

The primary proposed use of the property will continue to function as a place of worship so it will appear to operate mostly as it has for many years. The property is bordered by an elementary school to the south, which as an institutional use with over 400 children served, will not likely be impacted by this project. Under the current RS-4 zoning, if the owner so chose, it would be permissible to build an additional four homes within the 60,000 square feet of the property that is currently not built upon. In comparison to what is permissible by right, 10 small cottages measuring a total of 2500 square feet, when combined, will be a low impact use far below what is developable by right under RS-4.

The proposal complies with policies adopted by the City in several ways. As stated in the *City Development Plan 2025*, reusing older buildings is "the most sustainable construction" and helps to preserve and protect neighborhood vitality and appropriately-scaled non-residential uses should be allowed in appropriate locations. This proposal aims to repurpose the site to ensure its

financial sustainability and the Plan states that the number one strategy for land use is adaptive reuse of (vacant or) underutilized structures. The addition of street trees, sidewalks and on-site bike parking as well as the location along a transit route supports bus use; the streetscape will be enhanced and automobile dependence may be minimized. A large amount of the site will remain planted and additional, native landscaping will be added to the parking areas, along the streets, and in front of buildings adding to sustainability and environmental goals.

This proposal aligns with City Council's Strategic Plan. As part of Focus Area #1: Economic Growth and Sustainability, this project will "ensure a sustainable financial future for Asheville by promoting an environment where citizens and businesses want to live, work, and invest" by reusing this site to create an eastern hub for their organization's operations. In addition, consistent with Focus Area #3: High Quality of Life, the project will enhance the quality of life for neighborhood residents by adding sidewalks that improve safety and provide more pedestrian connectivity.

Based on the above findings and the analysis provided in the report and as stated in the recommendation below, staff finds this request to be reasonable.

Considerations:

- The project proposes the reuse of an existing building and generally uses the same site layout (with improvements to access flow).
- Ten small cottages will be constructed beyond street view to accommodate students.
- Sidewalks will be provided along both Old Haw Creek Road and Bethesda Road.
- Additional landscaping will be added throughout the site to soften the streetscape and provide buffering to adjacent properties.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed conditional zoning to allow for the redevelopment of the church and fellowship hall at 315 Old Haw Creek Road, construction of ten small cottages and new parking area, and to improve the site with landscaping and sidewalks. This recommendation includes approval of the landscape modifications as detailed above.

When Ms. Hudson asked if churches and place of worship allowed in RS-4 Districts, Interim Planning Director Alan Glines said they are traditional uses in a neighborhood community and they are Uses By Right With Special Requirements. This church does pre-date those ordinances but could be met today.

Mr. John Boggs, District Superintendent for 134 churches in 9 counties, said that the Bethesda United Methodist Church is one church they have been looking at revitalizing. They developed a relationship to form a 501-c 3 non-profit in Texas who are interested in helping train young college and seminary students on a semester by semester basis. The 10 small homes would be housing for up to 20 seminary students. They have talked with Buncombe County School Superintendent Tony Baldwin about the neighborhood relationship as it will benefit by having students who can work as reading buddies and volunteers in the schools. There will be a flexibility co-working space where people who cannot afford an office can have a work space. From the street it will look like the same church and will continue to function with a Pastor appointed by the Bishop. They will be training young leadership for missional wisdom and leadership. The sanctuary will be re-shaped to function for family reunions, school functions, or other neighborhood meetings - similar to a community center.

Chairman Goldstein opened up the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the conditional zoning request, focusing mainly their opposition on the 10 small houses and the commercial kitchen: what will happen to the 10 small houses is the non-profit ceases to exist; why isn't the parsonage remodeled to accommodate the 20 seminary students; increased traffic on Old Haw Creek Road and Bethesda Road; request to keep a buffers on the west and southwest abutting properties; there will be a

transient stream of students living in the small homes with no sense of community; no notification of this project; the students should be housed in a dormitory instead of in 10 small houses; concern of whether students in the homes will be vetted; concern of noise; decrease in property values; traffic and noise from commercial kitchen; changes to Haw Creek community in a negative way; will houses have complete restroom facilities; concern the houses will have more than two students living there; will all this property be tax exempt; opposition to a commercial business in a residential area; concern of spot zoning of Institutional District in a residential neighborhood; will services continue in the sanctuary; with school traffic, emergency vehicles will be unable to reach the building; building is made out of wood and over 35 years old and does not meet fire code regulations; need to keep the history of the neighborhood intact; and looks like a satellite college campus:

Ms. Sarah Hess, resident on Old Haw Creek Road
Mr. Joe Bly, property owner on Trinity Chapel Road
Ms. April Conover, resident on Old Haw Creek Road
Resident on Willowbrook Road
Mr. Mark Hagerling, adjoining property owner
Mr. Bill Beardall, adjacent property owner
Ms. Beverly Braxton, resident on Old Haw Creek road
Ms. Ann Garrett, resident on Trinity Chapel Road
Ms. Nagle, resident in Haw Creek Valley
Ms. Barber Melton, Vice-President of Coalition of Asheville Neighborhoods
Mr. Karl Katterjohn, adjoining property owner
Ms. Virginia Pardo, resident on Leslie Lane

Chairman Goldstein closed the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

In response to Ms. Hudson, Mr. Glines said that the Institutional District allow a variety of housing types.

Mr. Shawn Rice, representing Rural Faith Development Community Development Corporation, responded to many questions/comments expressed by the audience. He said the 501-c-3 is not brand new, but they will not take on ownership of this property - the ownership will remain with Bethesda United Methodist Church's name. They propose 10 units instead of one dormitory because the idea is that these seminary students, which will go through a federal background check, will not only learn about the real community theology and building community but also learn some practical skills. Some skills include basic carpentry, canning, quilting, etc. They will also have a no alcohol policy. All ten units will have full bathrooms. Two hundred and fifty is the square footage of the footprint but the units will vary in size on that same footprint. They would learn to live in more of a monastic cell-type environment. They would have very little in terms of resources and more time for prayer, reflection and other learning. The developer will keep as many trees as possible and will only remove the trees that absolutely have to be removed around the footprint of the houses. The occupancy in the 10 houses will be limited to 2 students each. The commercial kitchen is there to be an asset to the community - not a restaurant. It will be a place where a food truck operator can do their prep work. It will be a revenue source for the Church. The co-working space will be like an internet café which will be open to the public on a sliding fee basis. He did note that the heritage of the Church is very important.

Chairman Goldstein understood that many churches need to readapt with creative uses, but wondered if this model has been represented elsewhere. Mr. Rice said that the co-working model has been replicated, but small houses around a church have not.

In response to Ms. Hudson, Mr. Rice said that they would be happy to have a condition included that the homes would be for seminary students only that have been vetted through federal background checks and they would not house at-risk youth.

Ms. Hudson questioned the sustainability of the 10 small houses. She felt there was a lot of footprint that involved separate heating and cooling systems for each. She felt a dormitory setting would be more sustainable.

Chairman Goldstein and Ms. Carter were concerned about the clearly commercial ventures of the commercial kitchen and co-working space in a residential neighborhood.

There was a short discussion on whether the applicant would like to proceed with a possible negative recommendation moving forward to City Council, or meet again with the community to discuss what options the community could support. Mr. Glines said that if the applicant chooses to continue the matter, if there are substantial changes to the site plan, the project may have to go back to the TRC. However, if there are only usage changes, it will only have to come back to the Planning & Zoning Commission for review. He did note that if the matter comes back to the Planning & Zoning Commission (since there was some question about notification) the Planning staff would re-send the public hearing notices to property owners within 200 feet of the project area.

Mr. Boggs said that there is opportunity for more dialogue with the neighborhood and requested a continuance until the Commission's July meeting. Therefore, Chairman Goldstein moved to continue this matter until the July meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Carter and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.

Other Business

Chairman Goldstein announced the next mid-month meeting on May 21, 2015, at 4 p.m. in the First Floor North Conference Room.

Adjournment

At 8:15 p.m., Ms. Carter moved to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hudson and carried unanimously on a 5-0 vote.