

**TOWN COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2024, 6:00 PM
1500 BLOWING ROCK ROAD AND VIA WEBEX SOFTWARE**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Tim Futrelle, Todd Carter (via WebEx), Eric Plaag, Virginia Roseman (via WebEx), and Edie Tugman

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Frank Veno-Vice-Chair, Chris Behrend, Garrett Kight, and Anne Pruitt

PLANNING STAFF PRESENT: Jane Shook-Director of Planning and Inspections, Mike James-Commercial Zoning Administrator, Brandon Wise-Deputy Director, and Brenda Henson-Board Clerk

OTHER TOWN STAFF/REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Allison Meade-Town Attorney

Call to Order

Mayor Futrelle called the Town Council to order at 6:00 p.m. Vice-Chair Veno called the Planning Commission to order at 6:01 p.m. The meeting was held in the Town Council Chambers at 1500 Blowing Rock Road and via WebEx.

Moment of Silence

A moment of silence was observed.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Council Member Plaag asked that the following corrections be made in the last paragraph on page two of the May 29, 2024, Public Hearing minutes:

- Wording in the first sentence should change from *general integrity of design, citing workmanship of materials* to *general integrity of design, workmanship, and materials*
- The word *historic* should be removed from the last sentence

Council Member Tugman moved to approve the May 29, 2024, Public Hearing minutes as amended. Council Member Roseman seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – None
Absent – 1 (George)

The motion passed.

Commission Member Behrend moved to approve the May 29, 2024, Public Hearing minutes as amended. Commission Member Kight seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – None
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Jane Shook, Director of Planning & Inspections, welcomed new Planning Commission member Anne Pruitt.

PUBLIC HEARING

Case A24-0595 174 S Depot St – Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment

Thaler Irrevocable Trust – Esther and Michael Thaler submitted a Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment application to rezone 174 S Depot Street from B1DC Downtown Core to Conditional District B1DC Downtown Core with a site-specific plan for: Use 1.14 Multi-Family Dwelling In Mixed Use (up to 30 Bedrooms), 3.06 Vacation Rental, 11.06 Restaurants ≤ 3,500 ft², 11.11 Retail Store up to 5,000 ft², and 11.14 Business or Professional Office.

Mike James, Commercial Zoning Administrator, presented the request as outlined in the meeting packet. He noted that the applicant had obtained a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission to demolish the existing structure and construct a new structure. The Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment was necessary for the applicant to build a two-story building in the historic district.

Bill Dixon, with Appalachian Architecture, stated that his clients, Michael and Esther Thaler, purchased the property about two and a half years ago and had worked with adjoining neighbors to get utility easements in place. Mr. Dixon expressed his appreciation to Town Council for allowing the pre-application workshops with the Historic Preservation Commission. He stated that it helped architects get design feedback before the COA meeting.

Mr. Dixon explained that the new two-story building would be commercial on the ground floor with four apartments above. The apartments would be for long-term and short-term rent, as indicated in the staff report. He stated that the project was complicated because, though it was small, they shared property lines with two neighbors, and the property was partially in the floodplain and would require flood protection.

Council Member Tugman referred to the creek in that area and asked if the building encroached into the stream. Mr. Dixon replied that the hash marks showing the floodway were off on the site plan. He noted that according to flood studies, the floodwaters went to the opposite side of the creek toward the ASU music building until it was funneled by the acupuncture building.

Council Member Plaag noted that the HPC minutes reflected Mr. Dixon's statement that the existing building was a CH classification, which meant it contributed to the character of the district based on its historical significance related to events or individuals associated with the property. Mr. Dixon also stated that the building was not a CA classification and was not of architectural significance, so it should be allowed to be torn down. Council Member Plaag stated that Mr. Dixon was not the only one who misunderstood those classifications. He explained that either classification meant that they were contributing resources, so their demolition was, in essence, destructive to the character of the district regardless of whether it was significant for their architecture or the historical element. Council Member Plaag stated that this was something that the Town, the HPC, and Planning needed to consult with the town attorney to clarify so that confusion did not exist for other people.

Council Member Plaag noted that part of the existing building was located in the 100-year floodway. He asked if there was a requirement to elevate the building when building in the floodway. Mr. Dixon replied that the new building would not have to be elevated. However, they would be required to floodproof the building up to two feet above the base flood elevation, meaning all the back doors, openings, and utilities on the ground floor would have to be floodproofed.

Council Member Plaag asked for the height of the existing building compared to the 33-foot height of the proposed structure. Mr. Dixon referred to page 20 of the meeting packet that listed the current building height at 20 feet on the primary façade. He stated that the proposed building would be 33 feet to the gable on the primary façade and approximately 25 feet on the back of the building.

Council Member Plaag asked about the two parking spaces behind the building that were mentioned in the HPC meeting minutes. He noted that one of them was a handicapped-accessible space. Council Member Plaag asked if the spaces would be accessed via Ice House Alley. Mr. Dixon replied that was correct. Council Member Plaag stated that the alley was being used as a parking lot by someone, which raised the question of enforcement by the Town to keep people from parking in the alley due to fire safety and access. He also thought there was a rough transition from the pavement off of Howard Street to the gravel in that area and a drop greater than 15 %. Council Member Plaag asked what would be required to bring the alley up to an appropriate access point to get to the back of that building and who would pay for that.

Allison Meade, Town Attorney, stated that she did not think the Town had a legal responsibility to upgrade the access for the sake of a private owner to use the alley. She felt the responsibility would fall on the Thalers to provide necessary upgrades unless the Town wanted to do something beyond what they were legally required to do. Mr. Dixon stated that he had met on-site with the engineer, Justin Stines, and Brandon Wise, and the staff agreed that, based on the Town Council's approval, they could use the alley to access the parking spaces. Mr. Dixon said they planned on having two parking spaces, which had been reduced to only one handicap-accessible parking space because of the cost of removing an electrical pole in the alley and installing underground utilities.

Council Member Plaag asked about the location of the required parking spaces. He expressed concern that there was a hole in the UDO requirements when it came to vacation rentals, noting that the UDO required vacation rentals to have one parking spot per bedroom. However, vacation rentals as a use were not required to have a parking spot in the B1. Council Member Plaag felt this needed to be looked at further. Ms. Shook stated that the way she would interpret this was that a vacation rental was a dwelling unit, and dwelling units required parking spaces. Council Member Plaag noted that the table had no entry for vacation rentals for parking, so there was a discrepancy between the text and the table.

Council Member Plaag stated there were six bedrooms, and the ratio required for residential use in the downtown core was .7, which came to 4.2 parking spaces. He asked if that would be rounded down to four or up to five. Mr. James replied that the staff had traditionally rounded down.

Council Member Tugman disapproved of using any residential unit as a short-term rental.

Commission Member Kight asked if it was correct that any construction in the floodway required a no-rise certificate. Brandon Wise, Deputy Director of Planning & Inspections, replied that a no-rise would be required. He stated that replacing an existing structure with a structure in the same footprint would be a little bit simpler, but it still had to be certified by an engineer that there would be no changes in the floodplain caused by the development.

Commission Member Kight stated that the site plan indicated the bottom floor would be flood-proofed. However, a side note on the right-hand side of the page said that the wall would be substantially permeable to water infiltration. Mr. Dixon replied that the word permeable should be impermeable.

Vice-Chair Veno asked if parking spaces would be allocated for this building in the parking lot across the street. Michael Thaler, property owner, replied that when he purchased the property, there was an unwritten understanding that he would have the opportunity to use 40 % of that lot, which was the equivalent of 6 ½ spaces. However, that did not work out. Mr. Thaler stated he spoke to the person who owned the lot right next door, and he gave him a fair rate for leasing either four or six spaces.

Council Member Plaag asked what would happen if the parking lot was sold or if the owner did not want to lease the spaces anymore. Ms. Meade replied that the property owner would have to procure parking

to meet the specific standards in the UDO, or it would be a violation and a potential revocation of their CO.

Council Member Roseman stated she thought the alley was a right-of-way street that belonged to the building beside it on Howard Street. Mr. Wise replied that Public Works maintained the alley; it belonged to the Town and was supposed to stay clear. However, Public Works was okay with the applicant upgrading the alley. Ms. Shook added that the Town had received a request to close that alley, but that request was declined.

Vice-Chair Veno noted that only two people attended the neighborhood meeting, and both voiced concerns. Mr. Dixon explained that Mr. Heath owned apartments adjacent to the subject property and was concerned with any safety impacts on his building. The other concern was from Mr. Morton, owner of the building on the corner of Depot and Howard Streets. Mr. Dixon stated that the sewer line exited Mr. Morton's building, ran through the Greenhouse building, and back down towards the creek. He noted that easements were in place to guarantee the perpetual right to use the area for the underground utilities.

Vice-Chair Veno referred to the staff report on packet page 40, which indicated that the fire department had a few issues that needed to be addressed, and asked what those issues were. Mr. James replied that the fire department's concerns were with the placement of building numbers and fire protection equipment. He added that those items would be addressed during the zoning permit process.

There was no public comment on this case.

With nothing further, Mayor Futrelle closed the public hearing for this case at 6:42 p.m.

Case A24-0640 Occupancy & Other Residential Clarifications/Modifications – UDO Text Amendment

A UDO text amendment to revise the residential occupancy requirements in the WD Wellness and E2 Educational zoning districts; remove occupancy limitations listed in UDO Subsection 15.03.05(D); clarify terms related to residential uses and residential occupancy limitations; and to revise the standards for vacation rentals in multi-family developments.

Jane Shook, Director of Planning & Inspections, presented the request as outlined in the meeting packet. She noted that the word *boarders* would be stricken from Subsection 14.04.02. A new Subsection, 14.04-05, was added to clarify that the occupancy limitations in 14.04 did not apply to group living and transient residential uses. Ms. Meade suggested adding language to 14.04.05 that *there may be other occupancy limitations relating to these uses in other provisions of the UDO*.

Ms. Shook noted that the words *per dwelling unit* would be added to each occupancy section in Article 14. Council Member Tugman asked if a one-bedroom accessory dwelling unit would allow four people. Ms. Shook replied that the regulations for accessory dwelling units were separate.

Ms. Shook noted that occupancy limits were included in the Wellness District and the E2 Education District. She also pointed out that Subsection 15.03.05(D) *Occupancy of each unit shall be limited to (2) two unrelated persons* was stricken.

Ms. Shook stated that recent discussions regarding vacation and homestay rentals created concern on the Council's part about the number of dwelling units going from long-term to short-term rentals. She referred to Article 15, which showed three language options for the Council and Planning Commission to consider.

Council Member Plaag stated that if they were to keep the allowance of no more than 5% of dwelling units being vacation rentals, he would prefer Option 2 over Option 1 because it was more to the spirit of

what was intended. However, given the current housing crisis, he would prefer not to see vacation rentals anywhere. Council Member Plaag felt that one of the types of housing that Boone was missing the most was one and two-family dwellings because they were now being used as vacation rentals.

Ms. Meade stated it was better to allow short-term rentals in some areas of town versus banning them altogether.

Ms. Shook stated that she failed to include the permit language in Option 2, which was located in Option 1, so that would need to be included.

Due to potential enforcement issues, Ms. Meade suggested not allowing short-term rentals in developments with 29 or fewer dwelling units. Ms. Sook replied that short-term rentals were currently monitored for compliance and did not feel there were enforcement issues.

Ms. Shook stated there was concern that the 5% allowance was per building instead of per development, which could increase the number of vacation rentals allowed in a development.

Council Member Carter stated that 36% of Watauga County's housing stock was owner-unoccupied. He added that the Town needed to do whatever it could to promote neighborhoods and housing for people who worked and lived within its 6.3 square mile radius.

Ms. Shook stated she would like to give credit where credit was due. She noted that Mike James, the Commercial Zoning Administrator, was the one who brought this issue to her attention because he did not think the outcome was what the Council had intended.

Council Member Plaag supported implementing Option 2 as soon as possible and then looking at further limitations in the near future.

Council Member Roseman stated she was for short-term rentals in the business district because this was a business. However, they should not have an absurd percentage of rental units being used as short-term rentals. Council Member Roseman noted that she encouraged tourists because that was money in our community. If short-term rentals could help make it more affordable for someone else to live in town, she did not want to nix that option altogether.

Commission Member Pruitt researched and found that Asheville had a short-term rental text amendment from January 2024 that talked about the state laws regarding short-term rentals that she would share with the staff to send to Council and Planning Commission members.

There was no public comment on this case.

With nothing further, Mayor Futrelle closed the public hearing for this case at 7:25 p.m.

Case A24-0642 Appearance Standards Modification – UDO Text Amendment

A UDO text amendment to revise Article 25 Community Appearance Standards to modify administration of the article and required building design elements.

Ms. Shook presented the request as outlined in the meeting packet. She stated that this proposal was a stop-gap measure until a full review of the Community Appearance Standards could occur. Ms. Shook referred to Subsection 1.28 Building Design Elements and stated that there were certain things that the Town could not regulate from an appearance standpoint based upon general statutes.

Ms. Shook noted that *Site Walls* had been changed to *Retaining Walls* and *Pedestrian Orientation* had been replaced with *Building Orientation*. She stated that townhouse uses could be regulated for building orientation.

Ms. Shook pointed out that *trellises* had been removed as a building feature in 25.09.02. She reminded Council and Commission members that a complete rewrite of the Community Appearance Standards was recommended.

Ms. Shook referred to Subsection 25.09.04 Exterior Materials and noted that the language had been cleaned up, reordered, and reworded. She noted the wording *high-quality* materials in 25.09.04(A) has been added though it had not been defined. Ms. Shook referred to 25.09.07(B)(7), noting that it presented an option for the language regarding the allowance of synthetic or composite materials. Ms. Shook stated that new products were coming out daily for exterior facades.

Council Member Plaag stated that when he was on the HPC, he was vehemently opposed to the use of the concrete panel wall system at the County's parking deck, and, in his view, his fears had been realized. Council Member Plaag added that he was hesitant to allow anything that duplicated any item listed in the list.

Ms. Shook stated that these standards would not apply to commercial development in the B1 Downtown Core and the B1 Downtown Interface because they had different architectural standards.

Council Member Roseman left the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

Council Member Carter stated he had heard 20 years ago that if you were doing things the way you did them five years ago, you were probably doing them wrong. He added that he was for preserving the character and feel of Boone while providing the flexibility to allow for new technologies. He also felt there needed to be a definition of high quality.

Council Member Plaag stated that the tried and true materials were still tried and true. Ms. Shook noted that some technological changes dealt with energy efficiency and other items beyond appearance.

Ms. Shook expressed concern that staff's decisions could be questioned without proper guidance from the Council and Planning Commission regarding the regulation of synthetic or composite materials. She explained that if the staff decided to allow a material that they felt would not be visually distinguished, then when it was applied, it was distinguishable, there would be fallout. Ms. Meade agreed that this scenario would make the staff feel like they had not correctly done their job. She added that having vague language could empower the staff to insist on high-quality materials.

Council Member Plaag suggested referring to the National Parks Service because they had a list of acceptable, modern substitute materials. He further indicated that the staff could maintain a list of acceptable synthetic or composite materials outside of the UDO so that it could be more easily adapted.

Ms. Shook referred to Subsection 25.09.05 Colors, noting that the language had been rearranged and reworded. She stated that roof color was added to regulate the brighter colors for publicly visible roofs. Ms. Shook asked the Council and Planning Commission to consider whether or not they wanted to continue not allowing black as a field color and consider lowering the allowed light reflection value from 60 to 50.

Ms. Meade asked if this change would prohibit light-colored roofs, noting that lighter-colored roofs were more solar reflective and energy efficient. Ms. Shook replied that roofs could still be a lighter color. Black as a field color was discussed. Clear direction regarding LRV and field color was not given.

There was no public comment on this case.

With nothing further, Mayor Futrelle closed the public hearing for this case at 8:14 p.m.

Adjournment of Town Council

Council Member Tugman motioned to adjourn the Town Council at 8:15 p.m. Council Member Plaag seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 3
Nay – None
Absent – 2 (George, Roseman)

The motion passed.

Tim Futrelle, Mayor

Brenda Henson, Board Clerk

Frank Veno, Planning Commission Vice-Chair

PLANNING COMMISSION

Vice-Chair Veno called a break in the Planning Commission meeting from 8:15 p.m. until 8:21 p.m.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Commission Member Behrend moved to approve the June 5, 2024, Planning Commission meeting minutes. Commission Member Kight seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – None
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Case A24-0595 174 S Depot St – Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment

Thaler Irrevocable Trust – Esther and Michael Thaler, submitted a Conditional District Zoning Map Amendment application to rezone 174 S Depot Street from B1DC Downtown Core to Conditional District B1DC Downtown Core with a site-specific plan for: Use 1.14 Multi-Family Dwelling In Mixed Use (up to 30 Bedrooms), 3.06 Vacation Rental, 11.06 Restaurants ≤ 3,500 ft², 11.11 Retail Store up to 5,000 ft², and 11.14 Business or Professional Office.

Commission Member Behrend stated she was initially concerned about the waterway, but was satisfied after the public hearing and noted that existing UDO provisions should cover the parking.

Commission Member Pruitt asked if the building would be inspected for flood compliance. Mr. Wise replied that an elevation certificate to show that everything would be elevated two feet above the base flood elevation would be submitted with the zoning permit application. During demolition and construction, inspections would be made monthly to ensure that there were protections around the streambank and that everything was constructed per the plan.

Vice-Chair Veno expressed concern about the sewer line underneath the existing building. Mr. Wise stated that the sewer line was privately owned.

A brief discussion ensued as to the preservation of the building materials. Mr. Dixon noted that the property owners had looked into it, but there did not seem to be anything worth salvaging upon review.

First Motion and Vote: Commission Member Behrend made a motion that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning map is consistent with the Town's comprehensive plan and any other adopted plans of the Town that are applicable because the amendment is consistent with:

Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.1.5 Downtown

C. A variety of mutually compatible and supportive mixed uses shall be encouraged in the downtown area.

Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.3.2 Community Character

A.1 Conduct on-going assessments of critical locations in community deserving special attention by the zoning ordinance, in light of their high visibility, traffic impact, strategic location, or other unique features. Continue to encourage significant new public buildings and outdoor spaces to locate in these and other positions of visibility and strategic prominence. Encourage the private sector to do likewise.

A.2 Seek out locations of historical merit in the community, and prepare an action plan for their enhancement, rehabilitation, or relocation as may be necessary.

E. New development, redevelopment and rehabilitation of structures and sites shall occur in a manner which is consistent with the neighborhood and architectural context of the immediate area, and supportive, whenever possible, of Boone's original community character as a High Country small town.

The motion was seconded by Commission Member Kight.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – 0
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Second Motion and Vote: Vice-Chair Veno made a motion that the Planning Commission recommends approval of Ordinance A24-0595 within Exhibit A and believes approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the new development would revitalize a very important part of the area, the proposal is architecturally compatible and would contribute to the economic vitality of downtown. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Behrend.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – 0
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Case A24-0640 Occupancy & Other Residential Clarifications/Modifications – UDO Text Amendment

A UDO text amendment to revise the residential occupancy requirements in the WD Wellness and E2 Educational zoning districts; remove occupancy limitations listed in UDO Subsection 15.03.05(D); clarify terms related to residential uses and residential occupancy limitations; and to revise the standards for vacation rentals in multi-family developments.

Ms. Shook noted that during the public hearing, it was suggested that language be added to 14.04.05 referencing other provisions related to occupancy for transitional and group living uses. Recommendations on vacation rental options were also needed. Ms. Shook stated that the Town Council seemed to favor option two more, but they wanted to have more discussion which could lead to

something like option three in the future. She added that the Town Council had never anticipated nor intended that this vacation rental text could allow up to 50% of a development to become vacation rentals. Ms. Shook noted that the proposed text would only impact vacation rentals in the B1, B2, or B3.

Vice-Chair Veno stated he would like to ban vacation rentals; however, that could lead to unintended consequences, so he would support option two.

Commission Member Pruitt stated she would also support option two.

First Motion and Vote: Commission Member Behrend made a motion that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning ordinance, with Vacation Rental Option 2, is consistent with the Town's comprehensive plan and any other adopted plans of the Town that are applicable because the amendment is consistent with:

Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.1.5 Downtown

A. A compatible design character for the downtown area, drawing upon the locality's original High Country small town features, shall be identified, reinforced and supported to put forth a quality image and sense of place.

C. A variety of mutually compatible and supportive mixed uses shall be encouraged in the downtown area.

Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.3.3 Housing and Neighborhoods

A. The protection and rehabilitation of viable neighborhoods shall be encouraged to ensure their continued existence as a major housing source and as a reflection of the area's image as an attractive, highly livable community.

F. The affordable housing needs of area residents, particularly elderly and low to moderate income residents, shall be recognized in Town policies and actions regarding residential development.

G. Compact, full service neighborhoods, offering opportunities for living, working, shopping, and gathering places, shall be encouraged in newly planned developments, as well as for redeveloping areas.

The motion was seconded by Commission Member Pruitt.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – 0
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Second Motion and Vote: Commission Member Behrend made a motion that the Planning Commission recommends approval of Ordinance A24-0640 within Exhibit A and believes approval is reasonable and in the public interest because this is a way to have further discussion and planning for Airbnbs and other rentals in the area, while keeping the neighborhoods safe. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Pruitt.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – 0
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Case A24-0642 Appearance Standards Modification – UDO Text Amendment

A UDO text amendment to revise Article 25 Community Appearance Standards to modify administration of the article and required building design elements.

Commission Member Kight stated that Rhodes Motel's covered parking area was a mixture of wood and steel and was not necessarily part of the building envelope. However, it was visible from the exterior. He noted that the carwash across the street had metal on the top of their stepped building that did not necessarily form the building envelope but was attached to the building envelope. Commission Member Kight stated he did not see a steel element on the materials list. Ms. Shook replied that this could be an oversight in the language or it could fall under Section F, "All other materials not listed."

There was a discussion regarding wording for synthetic or composite materials. Commission Member Pruitt suggested a combination of the two language options in 25.09.04(B)(7) to read *Synthetic or composite material that duplicates and cannot be visually distinguished from any item listed in 1, 3, 4, or 5 above*. Commission Members agreed with this wording change.

Commission members agreed that they had no issues with the suggested changes regarding color.

First Motion and Vote: Vice-Chair Veno made a motion that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning ordinance, with the revision of language in 25.09.04(B)(7) to read *Synthetic or composite material that duplicates and cannot be visually distinguished from any item listed in 1, 3, 4, or 5 above*, is consistent with the Town's comprehensive plan and any other adopted plans of the Town that are applicable because the amendment is consistent with:

Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.1.1 Economic Development

A. The Town shall protect and enhance a high quality of life, image, cultural amenities, and natural beauty as the most effective, long term component of an economic development strategy.

A.1 Continue to evaluate and amend development regulations to help ensure aesthetic quality in the area and preserve the natural beauty of the area.

Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.3.1 Community Appearance

C. The significance of major roadway entrances into Boone as measures of community image and quality shall be recognized through building placement, landscape, signage and other visual improvements. The Town, along with private property owners and developers, shall work to jointly improve the appearance and design of major street corridors.

Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.3.2 Community Character

E. New development, redevelopment and rehabilitation of structures and sites shall occur in a manner which is consistent with the neighborhood and architectural context of the immediate area, and supportive, whenever possible, of Boone's original community character as a High Country small town.

The motion was seconded by Commission Member Behrend.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – 0
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Second Motion and Vote: Vice-Chair Veno made a motion that the Planning Commission recommends approval of Ordinance A24-0642 within Exhibit A and believes approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the language sets standards for community appearance and gives the Town Council

guidance for further discussion to implement more articulate standards. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Pruitt.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – 0
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Other Matters

Ms. Shook stated that Boone Next, the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, was close to beginning finalization. Once the drafts were proofread, the consultant would present the draft at an open house with the Town Council, Planning Commission, and the public. She noted that the open house could tentatively be scheduled for Wednesday, November 19, 2024, but that date was still uncertain.

Ms. Shook informed the Commission that the Town Council approved a stipend for board members that would be paid quarterly. She reminded everyone to submit their completed tax and deposit paperwork in order to receive the stipend.

Adjournment of Planning Commission

Vice-Chair Veno made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 p.m. Commission Member Behrend seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 4
Nay – 0
Absent – 2 (Tait, Warren)

The motion passed.

Frank Veno, Planning Commission Vice-Chair

Brenda Henson, Board Clerk