

**PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2019, 6:00 P.M.
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Rennie Brantz-Mayor, Loretta Clawson-Mayor Pro-Tem, Marshall Ashcraft, Sam Furguele, Connie Ulmer, and Lynne Mason

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: Elizabeth Shay-Chair, Eric Plaag-Vice Chair, Frank Venio, Chris Behrend, John Tippet and James Hedrick

PLANNING STAFF PRESENT: Jane Shook-Director of Planning and Inspections, Christy Turner-Senior Planner, and Marlene Crosby-Board Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: John Ward-Town Manager, Allison Meade-Town Attorney and Rick Miller-Director of Public Works

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Brantz called the Town Council to order at 6:00 p.m.

Chair Shay called the Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Council Member Furguele made a motion to approve the September 23, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mayor-Pro Tem Clawson.

**Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None
The motion passed.**

Planning Commission Member Venio made a motion to approve the September 23, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Commission Member Behrend.

**Vote: Aye – 4 (Behrend, Hedrick, Plaag, Venio)
Nay – None
Abstain – 2 (Tippet, Shay)
The motion passed.**

PUBLIC HEARING

CASE PL03271-110419 HACKETT PROPERTIES INC – GENERAL USE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

Ms. Christy Turner, Senior Planner presented this case as outlined in the meeting packet. She explained that the Town of Boone had initiated the zoning of a 10.813-acre portion (see Exhibit 1) for a property owned by Hackett Properties, Inc. to R1, Single Family Residential or R1-A, Single Family Residential with Accessory Apartment. Zoning is to coincide with the property owner's voluntary annexation of the property. The property is contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the Town of Boone located off Park Street and Junaluska Road. The subject annexation area is a 10.813-acre tract, and is shown in Exhibit 1 (permanently on file).

Ms. Turner referred to pages 40 and 41 of the meeting packet that showed a map and survey of the said property. Ms. Turner opened the floor for questions. Council Member Furguele asked if the property was annexed would there be two separate parcels. Ms. Turner said the applicant has submitted an application to recombine the two parcels. Ms. Turner said the applicant was waiting to review said application to see how the parcels would be zoned, when it was annexed. Council Member Furguele

asked if this would create a split-zone property. Council Member Furgiuele confirmed that the lower part of the property currently in Town limits is currently zoned R4 with portions zoned R1 and R1A.

Member Furgiuele asked if the parcels were annexed and if the upper portion of the property was zoned R1 and R1A would it allow an increase in density in the lower portion of the development which is zoned R4. He asked would this in any way prevent them from meeting intensity rules. Ms. Turner said the land use intensities have to belong to the appropriate zoning districts. Member Furgiuele confirmed that the R1 property would have to be developed with R1 densities and the lower property would be unaffected and whatever can be done now could still be done but not more. Ms. Turner agreed.

Member Furgiuele asked Ms. Turner if Park Street is adequate for the low-density residential development that is proposed for the upper property. Ms. Turner said that in the past the Fire Department has noted some concerns about the grade of Park Street. Member Furgiuele referred to a letter written to the Town Council dated December 17, 2019 from Mr. Lloyd Scott and Mrs. Cheryl Scott (permanently on file). Council Member Furgiuele noted that in the letter Mr. Scott said that his moving truck was physically unable to negotiate the road up to his house. Ms. Turner said the width of the road was not a concern mentioned by the Fire Department.

Member Furgiuele asked Ms. Turner about the removing of trees that had been mentioned in the letter from the Scott's. Ms. Turner said they were allowed to cut some brush and some small saplings for access into the property. She also noted that there was a permit issued for the demolition of the house located on the property.

Member Furgiuele asked if there were other ways to access the area to be annexed. Ms. Turner said there is a small access off of Junaluska Road but it is not adequate for road access at this time. Council Member Furgiuele asked how is the road not adequate for road access. He said that previously it was said that the area was being used for utilities. Ms. Turner said the applicant had indicated this information. Council Member Furgiuele asked the dimensions of the access road.

Council Member Furgiuele asked how is the parcel characterized in the Growth Strategy Map. Ms. Turner said it was on the edge of the Rural Growth Area. Council Member Furgiuele asked when the Growth Strategy Map was adopted. Ms. Turner said in 2006.

Council Member Mason confirmed that the parcel connected to Junaluska Road is already in the Town Limits. Ms. Turner agreed.

Ms. Meade asked Ms. Turner to clarify that in the case the applicant is asking for voluntary annexation even though the Town has initiated the request for a zoning change. Ms. Turner agreed.

Ms. Meade asked Ms. Turner to explain why the applicant is asking for voluntary annexation. Ms. Turner said for purposes of water and sewer.

Council Member Furgiuele asked if the said parcel is in the secondary pressure zone. Ms. Turner said parts of the parcel are in the secondary pressure zone.

Ms. Meade asked about the intensity of development of the R4 versus the R1, she said would the R4 be reviewed for intensity separately even if the two parcels were combined. Ms. Jane Shook, Director of Planning and Inspections said the two districts would be looked at separately if combined except for Viewshed which would apply to the property as a whole. Ms. Turner pointed out the Viewshed on the map on page 24 of the packet and noted that this is a presumed Viewshed because the Staff has not looked at it on site.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Ms. Turner if the applicant could use the proposed R1 annexation area once the existing R4 area is annexed to calculate that percentage of permitted land disturbance within the Viewshed. Ms. Turner said this is correct.

Council Member Furguele asked what the limitations on land disturbance in the Viewshed are. Ms. Shook explained that the rules are three-quarters of an acre for the first two acres and an additional 30 percent of the remaining acreage.

Ms. Shook said a site-specific development plan would be needed to determine whether a development was within the Viewshed.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked about the map on page 40 of the meeting packet. He asked Ms. Turner if the information in the top-right corner of the map was accurate. Ms. Turner noted that this map was submitted by the applicant. He further noted that from this map, it looks like a sizeable amount of land potentially coming into the Town Limits and a relatively small portion of the lower parcel remaining in the County. Ms. Turner agreed. He asked if the Staff had received any community input from the residents of Junaluska Road in regards to this proposed change. Ms. Turner said that she has heard from several residents about this proposal. He asked Ms. Turner to summarize the information that she had received from the Junaluska residents. Ms. Turner said that she had received one phone call from a person from the community and she said they were not very concerned about the proposed development. Ms. Turner said that she had heard from a lot of residents from the Park Street area.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked if the street would reach out to Junaluska Road would the width of this street be sufficient to serve the R4 area. Ms. Turner said the road would have to be at least 18 feet with curb and gutter.

Council Member Ashcraft asked if the Fire Department took into account the zoning of the R1 and R1A. Ms. Turner said the review of the Fire Department is on the annexation and not the rezoning. Ms. Shook pointed out that the Director of Public Works is present at the meeting to answer any questions.

Member Furguele asked if there have been reports of accidents on streets in the Town that are similar in grade to Park Street and Junaluska Street. Ms. Shook said there has not been any accidents that have been reported to the Planning and Inspections Department.

Mayor Pro-Tem Clawson asked about the drainage issues on the proposed parcels. Ms. Turner explained that for single-family areas, rain barrels, rain gardens or swales could be used for the drainage issues.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked in regards to the existing R4 parcel, what is the water and sewer allocation to this parcel and will it serve the maximum density that could be developed on that existing parcel. Mr. Rick Miller, Director of Public Works said the water would have to come from the secondary pressure zone. He said the water line on Park Street is six inches and the sewer lines are six to eight inches. Mr. Miller confirmed that the R1 parcel would also be in the secondary pressure zone area. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked how would a developer obtain water within the secondary pressure zone. Mr. Miller said the water could be obtained from the Junaluska Road tank or the Charles & Gladys Street tank. Mr. Miller also noted that an extension for water is necessary for the parcel already in the Town limits and it comes from the secondary pressure zone. Mr. Miller further explained that some of the requirements would not have to be met because the tanks and pump stations are already in place.

Mr. John Ward, Town Manager said the connection from Junaluska Road is approximately 30 feet in width. Council Member Furguele asked if the 30 feet would serve a major subdivision. Ms. Shook said the minimum private street requires a 30 feet right of way. She explained that there are no limitations on what a private street can serve.

Council Member Furguele asked if there are any other potential ways to access Park Street without easements. Mr. Miller said there could be an access point from the private road to the water tank but the Town would have to grant an easement. Mr. Miller said it is just a gravel path about 10 to 12 feet wide.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked if sidewalks could be installed from Junaluska Road to the proposed development. Ms. Turner said yes.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked about the implications of the land disturbance of running lines and road over or along the ridgeline. Ms. Turner said the red on the map indicates greater than 50 percent slope which would go over the 10 percent that is allowed. Mr. Miller noted that once a site-specific development plan was submitted, the burden would fall on the developer to demonstrate how they would run the lines and road along or over the ridgeline.

Planning Commission Member Veno asked if the reason that the developer wants to annex the property is for development. Ms. Turner said that a development plan has not been submitted yet. Ms. Turner said the zoning is being discussed as a result of the annexation application that has been submitted for this case. He asked about the concern of Mr. Lloyd and Cheryl Scott regarding the development. Ms. Turner said she has spoken to them and explained the development possibilities for this zoning district and their concern was for the R4 zoning. She further explained that some of the uses have transitional zones involved that would need further board approval, if triggered.

Council Member Furguele asked if the parcel that is in the County remains in the County what could occur on the property. Ms. Turner said the County would review it for well and septic requirements. She said there is no zoning in the County other than lot size. Ms. Shook said the County has other requirements but was not sure as to what they were.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag explained that in this hearing the zoning is being discussed. He asked at what future meeting the annexation would be considered. Ms. Turner said, if the zoning is approved, the annexation would be the next thing discussed in the process at the December Council meeting. Ms. Meade explained that the Council has proceeded to consider both the zoning and the annexation review simultaneously.

Planning Commission Chair Shay confirmed that actually building on the parcels is not being considered in this hearing. Ms. Turner said this hearing is only considering the zoning of the property.

Council Member Mason asked about the slope of the property. Ms. Shook noted that the Town has mapped steep slopes which are slopes between 30-50% and very steep slopes which are slopes greater than 50%. Discussion ensued as to the requirements for geologists and geotechnical engineers when there was disturbance of a steep or very steep slope.

The applicant, Mr. Dino Hackett of Hackett Properties, Inc. came to the podium. He said he wanted to address the questions that he has heard at this hearing and from the October 17, 2019 Town Council meeting.

Mr. Hackett said that he purchased the Junaluska Road property exclusively to be able to make the water connection. He said that he does not have plans to put a road in and will not put a road in as long as he owns the property.

Mr. Hackett said the small trees were removed as a result of a demolition permit that he applied for to take down an old house because he had received numerous complaints regarding vandalism and squatters being there. He said he was not able to get heavy equipment to remove the house without removing some of the small trees.

Mr. Hackett said that in all of his conversations with the Fire Department, he was never told that Park Street was a problem for the Fire Department to get to his property. He said he was told that the 10 percent is the maximum grade and he would need approval for over 10 percent.

Mr. Hackett gave a brief history of his properties. He said in 2010 he purchased 20 plus or minus acres at 232 Park Street which was zoned for 50 units for town homes. He said that 10 plus or minus acres was

inside the Town limits, he said the other 10 plus or minus acres which is shown on the map with the unusual border was outside the Town limits and dedicated green space for the town homes. He said the green space is located in the previous Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ). He said in 2012, he purchased an additional 44 acres that goes up to almost where the fire tower used to be. He explained that around 2017 the ETJ was discontinued but he was not told about this change to his property. In 2018, he revisited the possible development of the property. He said that he assumed that the green space gave him the density that he needed for the 10 acres and below. Mr. Hackett said he could get utilities because his property touches the tank on Queen Street. He said he hired a civil engineer to create a map and a description of approximately ten acres to be annexed into the Town limits. He said he made the change on the map to make a more square-like boundary. He said this is the reason he is at this hearing is to bring his parcels into a continuous 20-acre tract of land. He said he wanted to know why the green space on his property was impacted by the ETJ law change for purposes of development. Mr. Hackett said he has made three sets of civil drawings, two sets of architectural drawings, two traffic studies, two noise studies, two light intrusions studies, and he has paid for water allocation and attorney fees on top of his initial investment for the property.

Mr. Hackett said that on July 27, 2011 he met with the neighbors on Park Street and there was no opposition of what he was proposing to do on his property with the zoning designations listed. He said he feels confident that he can develop a successful residential neighborhood that will help satisfy the need for affordable and quality housing.

Mr. Hackett said he did not want to see his property reduced zoned to R1 and he is not interested in the annexation part being zoned R1. He said the annexation was meant to encompass the extra land that is above his property and he would be willing for the annexation to encompass a smaller area. He referred to the ridgeline map and stated that he has no intentions of building outside of the current field as shown on the map.

Council Member Furguele confirmed with Mr. Hackett that he has new architectural plans. Mr. Hackett said he does have a preliminary site plan. Council Member Furguele asked Mr. Hackett if he had considered conditional district zoning. Mr. Hackett said yes this is the process that he is trying to do. Council Member Furguele explained that the case before them is for general use zoning.

Mr. Hackett explained that he is confused and believes that he has been misinformed regarding the use of his R4 parcel. Mr. Hackett noted that his previous Special Use Permit approval had expired. Ms. Meade explained that Mr. Hackett is now having to start from the beginning. She further explained that the case being reviewed at this time is for the ten-acre parcel to be considered as R1 zoning for single-family development only. Council Member Furguele explained that a site development plan would be needed in order for more answers to be given to Mr. Hackett on his properties.

Discussion ensued on the amount of property owned by Mr. Hackett that is in the Town Limits.

Council Member Mason asked Ms. Shook what uses were allowed in the R1, R1A and R4. Ms. Shook noted that the tables prepared for the report went over the R1 and R1A and not the R4 but that the uses in the in the UDO would need to be reviewed.

Council Member Mason asked about the occupancy requirements in the R1 and R4. Ms. Turner noted both were no more than two unrelated.

Mr. Hackett explained that after hearing all of the comments from this hearing, he wants to withdraw his request for a zoning change and put together a site plan for luxury town homes and show the neighbors what he is planning to do. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Mr. Hackett about what he had said earlier about building affordable homes. Mr. Hackett said that in his opinion selling the town homes at \$250,000 to \$325,000 is affordable to what you can buy in the Town of Boone. Mr. Hackett noted that

he does not have anything to compare his costs to since there has not been much development in Boone for town homes in the last ten years.

Council Member Furguele talked about a discussion that occurred at the September 2019 Council meeting regarding annexation and conditional district zoning as the initial zoning. He asked if there was a resolution to this type of situation. Ms. Meade and Ms. Shook indicated that it had been discussed and agreed it could be done.

Ms. Shook explained that she and Ms. Turner had met with Mr. Hackett and they had explained to him the different zoning options for his property. Ms. Shook said that Mr. Hackett wanted to move forward with an application for general use and wanted to do a by-right development that did not need additional board approvals.

Planning Commission Member Behrend explained to Mr. Hackett that affordable housing is important to the people who work in Boone.

Mr. Hackett said he hopes to show the Town how he plans on bringing in the water to the property and showing the neighbors what he is planning to do it.

Council Member Mason informed Mr. Hackett about the proposed creation of the R1S Small Home Residential District which is a zoning district that is on this public hearing agenda. She said this proposed zoning district would allow R1 zoning with lower density and he may be interested in reviewing this zoning district for his proposed development.

Ms. Meade also reminded Mr. Hackett to keep in mind how much property he is bringing into the Town through annexation and possibly bringing some of the green space into the Town so it can be part of the project.

Council Member Furguele talked about the two primary concerns from his point of view which are the impact on the existing neighborhood and the old infrastructure of Park Street. He further talked about the right of ways that may need to be worked out for the proposed projects.

Ms. Meade confirmed that Mr. Hackett is withdrawing his zoning and annexation request outlined in this case.

Mayor Brantz opened the floor for public comments. Ms. Meade asked the Council if public comment should occur since Mr. Hackett has withdrawn his application. It was the consensus of the Council to hear the comments on this case.

The first speakers were Mr. Paul Zimmerman and Mrs. Marjon Zimmerman who live at 366 Park Street. Mrs. Zimmerman handed out a booklet that contained information on their thoughts of what responsible development in their neighborhood should be (permanently on file). She said that the Town does not need more student housing, and hopes that there will not be a mixed-use development in their neighborhood and noted the need for affordable housing for families in the area. Mr. Hackett was given a copy of the booklet.

The second speaker was Mr. Wilt Boone who lives at 346 Park Street. He explained that his concerns are with water running down the edge of the R4 lot between his property and the Zimmerman's property. He talked about the loss of tree canopy during developments and feels this should be discussed. He talked about the potential for landslides on the property.

The third speaker was Mr. Michael Curcio who lives at 267 Park Street and he also owns property at 158 Dotson Drive. He said he thought the R4 parcel was six acres but it is ten acres. He supports the development of the R4 property exactly how he bought it. He said he is against the area being annexed

into the Town limits unless it is zoned R1 or R1A. He is concerned with the water run-off and the narrow width of the road.

Council Member Furguele asked the Planning Staff if there were types of development that could have been done by right. Ms. Shook said yes.

Council Member Furguele said that he appreciates that Mr. Hackett is willing to come back to the Town with a site-specific development plan. He talked about the impact issues that the Town reviews and the development issues that have to be addressed by the applicant.

With no further questions or public comment, Mayor Brantz closed the public hearing for this case at 7:33 p.m.

CASE PL03227-101819 T-13 TEMPORARY USE 9.01 PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES in B1 – GENERAL USE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

In October 2019, Town Council requested that draft text be prepared for the November Public Hearing which would modify the Town of Boone Unified Development Ordinance to allow Use T-13: Temporary Use 9.01 Public Colleges and University Leased Swing Space in the B1 Central Business District as an accessory use for Use 12.03 Indoor Theater subject to limitations.

This request was initiated when Council was approached by Appalachian State University who wished to use the recently opened Appalachian Theatre as classroom space. Please see Exhibit 1: ASU's presentation to Council on October 17, 2019 (permanently on file).

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag said in the interest of full disclosure, he wished to note that he serves as a trustee on the Board of Trustees of the Appalachian Theatre of the High Country. He said that he has reviewed the conflict of interest and based upon his review of the Board's policies, that he does not have a conflict of interest in this case as defined by the theater. He said that he has also reviewed the Town of Boone Municipal Code Section 30.52 regarding the Town's Code of Ethics, and because this case does not involve his own "direct or indirect financial interests or official conduct" that it appears he is not under any obligation to legally or ethically recuse himself from this case. He said it is his understanding that the Planning Administrator and the Town Attorney concur with his interpretation. In addition, he said that he wishes to emphasize that he believes he can be objective to all parties in the hearing of this case. He said that he fully recognizes that his obligation in this matter is to represent the best interests of the Town of Boone and its residents above any other associations.

Council Member Mason acknowledged that she has served in an Ex-Officio position on the Board of Trustees for the Theatre. She is not a voting member and has attended periodic meetings. She said that she does not feel that she has any reason to recuse herself from the hearing of this case.

Council Member Ashcraft noted that his wife is on the faculty at ASU and he does not feel like he has a conflict or reason to recuse himself from the hearing of this case.

Ms. Meade talked about the conflict of interest under State law and she did not feel that there was a conflict of interest with the members present at this hearing.

Ms. Shook presented this case as outlined in the meeting packet. Ms. Shook read the proposed changes to Section 15.69.14 for T-13 Temporary Use which will require a zoning permit. She said the proposed text was based on the parameters that the Council had discussed previously. Council Member Furguele said he thought that Council Member Ulmer had suggested a two years' sunset period and a review after two years with a determination whether it would continue. Ms. Meade said there was clear direction that the temporary use itself should terminate automatically after the ten years. She said the question was how would the Town police parking and traffic on an ongoing basis. Council Member Furguele asked what are the standards that the administrator would apply to see if the applicant has not met the required

demonstration of efficient parking. Ms. Shook said as discussed at the Council meeting there is not a good answer for this question.

Mr. Ward noted that the Town does have concerns for parking and they are not sure right now they would be able to keep a check on the parking.

Ms. Shook noted that the presentation that the University presented at the Council meeting is in the Board book. She said the University discussed the parking changes that they had made. Ms. Shook said the University noted that there would be problems with them not allowing students to park in the Downtown area. Council Member Furguele noted that the University can check on parking but they choose not to or does not seem willing to.

Council Member Furguele asked Mr. Ward what has been the experience with the parking lot at the Greenway Trail as it has been used by students attending the Levine Hall. Mr. Ward said that he has dedicated additional resources to parking enforcement on the specific Deerfield Road lot and the Clawson-Burnley parking lot due to use by students. Mr. Ward said that additional signage has been put up and the Police and Public Works Departments, as well as parking enforcement employees have patrolled these areas. Council Member Furguele asked if this helped the parking issue. Mr. Ward said it changes depending on rainy or cold weather and he noted that it may be a larger issue.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Mr. Ward if there is a mechanism for subsequent parking tickets after the first ticket has been issued. Mr. Ward said if a vehicle remains in violation, there could be additional charges.

Council Member Mason asked Mr. Ward about the base line data on the metered parking spaces in the Downtown area for the time period of between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. Mr. Ward responded by saying that in the general area from approximately the College of Education down to Grand Boulevard, the Town is seeing the majority of the spaces being filled by 9 a.m. and it seems to continue on down King Street. He said the Town lot spaces can be prepaid up to eight hours and is the first one to fill up. He also pointed out that there is not a requirement who can utilize the public parking spaces as long as the fees are being paid.

Ms. Meade talked about the research she had done. She said American University, located in a residential area of Washington, DC, has a campus wide zoning permit that says that students cannot park in the residential neighborhoods and has some enforcement mechanisms. She said this parking information is noted on the University website. She explained that the other city that she looked at has parking districts that are actually marked "no University student parking". She also talked about having for example an Excel spreadsheet listing of the student's license plate numbers. She said she believes that there is a means and a law to address University students from parking in the Downtown area. Mr. Ward said in other cities where there is university, residential or commercial interactions where it comes to parking, he has seen parking decals issued and placed on vehicles and if a vehicle did not have a decal, it could not park in that area. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag said he is familiar with this type program at Georgetown University.

Ms. Shook noted when ASU applies for their permit, they have to demonstrate parking requirements. She noted it will be difficult to know who is parking Downtown without some type of mechanism to track it. She said the tracking of parking is beyond the scope of what the Planning Staff usually handles. Mr. Ward said this would be the same situation that is occurring on the parking enforcement on Linney Street.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag voiced one solution would be the University dedicating a portion of the Peacock lot between the hours of 8 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. reserved specifically for students enrolled in classes that are being held at the theatre. Mr. Ward said this could be a potential solution to the parking

issue because Mr. Paul Forte, ASU Vice Chancellor had previously noted available parking spaces on campus.

Council Member Mason noted her concerns about the students not being able to afford parking passes. Planning Commission Vice-Chairperson Plaag said that this request that the University is making is extraordinary which requires extraordinary action on behalf of the applicant. He said it seems to him that the University dedicating some of their resources to facilitate this request such as not charging the students to park in the upper part of the Peacock parking lot until 12:30 p.m. seemed reasonable. He suggested that this would be proposed as a free parking pass to incentivize students to park away from the Downtown area.

Discussion ensued as to the locations of the metered parking downtown.

Discussion ensued as to the possibility of changing the timing on the meter so as to limit the likelihood a student would use the metered parking. Council Member Furgiuele suggested limiting the parking on King Street from 8:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. and to only allowing parking for 30 minutes at a time and patrol and ticket the spaces and switch the meters back to multiple hours for the rest of the day after 11:30. Mr. Ward indicated that the smart meters could do what is being suggested. Mr. Ward noted that part of the Town's goal with the smart meters was to cut down on signage and program the information into the meter. Mr. Ward talked about the complaints about the one-hour parking and then the meters were changed to two hours and it cut down on the parking time complaints. Mr. Ward said the only concern he has is the possible deterring of the lunch people for parking that starts around 11:30 a.m. He said he could start a test phase on the parking meters for the times of between 8:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. and allow longer parking periods from 11:00 a.m. on.

Council Member Ulmer suggested contacting ASU and ask them to track the parking of their students.

Council Member Mason said we might need to factor in that between the timeframe of 8:00 a.m. to 11:15 a.m., there could be multiple classes held in the theatre. She said there could be overlap and competition for the parking spaces.

Council Member Furgiuele asked a question regarding a possible modification to Section 15.69.14(B)(3)(b) by adding "in every two years thereafter for the duration of the permit there", and in Section 15.69.14(C) change "to allow the Town Council to suspend and revoke the permit".

Council Member Ashcraft said that he does not see a limit in the ordinance for the number of class room attendees. He suggested monitoring the number of students. Council Member Furgiuele suggested instead of limiting the ordinance, could we make the failure to keep the commitment made in the materials from the University now the basis to revoke their permit like for example a conditional district process is handled. Ms. Meade pointed out that this is not a special use permit or site specific type permit.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag said that he listened to Mr. Paul Forte's presentation from the October 2019 Council meeting. He said that Mr. Forte did say that he anticipated 150 students at the beginning but Mr. Forte also felt that later on they could fill the theatre with students. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag noted that he is concerned that there is the possibility that there will be more than 150 students up to approximately 640 students coming to the theater for classes with some portion of them looking for parking in Downtown Boone.

Ms. Meade suggested some re-structuring of the proposed text in Section 15.69.14(B)(3)(a). She suggesting keeping the first sentence and removing the text from the rest of this section. She also suggested moving the text from c. into the b. section and moving the text from b. into the c. section. The Council members agreed with this proposed change.

Planning Commission Member Veno voiced his concern for parking in the Downtown area and he said there is no way that the Downtown area can accommodate the need for the amount of parking being proposed in this case.

Planning Commission Chair Shay pointed out that at the University it is rare to have over 200 or 250 students attending a lecture.

Mr. Ward said he has seen when the students are running late for class or work and in extremely bad weather parking in the Downtown and risking getting a ticket under these types of circumstances. He also explained that the current requirement is to get a permit to park on campus anywhere other than the hourly lots and this type of parking requires prepayment. He said there are also students that may not be able to afford to prepay for parking and they may be the ones paying the parking meters in the Downtown area.

Planning Commission Chair Shay pointed out that the University has some parking options that they have not yet considered. She suggested that the University let the students purchase parking by the day or a portion of a day. Council Member Mason noted that at Virginia Tech they provide a certain number of free parking passes for designated lots. She said this encouraged the students to walk or bike to class.

Mr. Nick Katers, Associate Vice-Chancellor for Facilities Management from Appalachian State University came to the podium. He explained that the University continues to add parking every year. He said the University added 652 parking spaces in 2019 and they will add 585 parking spaces in 2020. He said they encourage the students to ride the Appalcart and will help Appalcart purchase electric buses. He noted that the University is working with the Town to provide ride-share bicycles. He said the University classes to be held in the theater are capped at 150. He noted that the students attending classes at the theatre are freshmen and sophomores and they are not allowed to have vehicles on campus, they have to use the satellite parking lots and find other means of transportation to campus. He said that the University does not collect license plate information from the freshmen and sophomore students because they are not eligible to purchase parking passes. Council Member Furguele asked Mr. Katers how the University knows if the students are parking in the correct places. Mr. Katers said the students that purchase parking passes provide their license plate information otherwise this information is not required. He said the University instructors would put in the freshmen and sophomore's student syllabus that the students are not to park on King Street or on campus.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Mr. Katers what the University's mechanism is to enforce parking. Mr. Mark Ginn, Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education said that the students can be emailed as well as the information being put into the student syllabus about not parking in the Downtown area.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag noted the University had two facilities on campus that are not being used for theatrical type classes and noted that these facilities sit vacant most of the time. He asked Mr. Ginn if the University is not going to use the large auditorium spaces on their campus for classes why should the Town endorse use for these types of classes in the B1. Mr. Ginn said he said the facility spaces do not have good projection equipment or atmosphere for certain types of classes. He noted one of the facilities housed the University's organ and the students have to schedule the time they want to use the space.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag referred to comments made by Mr. Forte at the October 2019 Council meeting stating "the University is in support of this change to the UDO". Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag said to his knowledge neither the ATHC board or its executive committee have endorsed this proposed zoning change. He also pointed out that there are no other people present at this hearing from the Appalachian Theatre of the High Country other than himself. He also pointed out that there were no people present at the October 2019 Council meeting, when Mr. Forte gave his presentation. He

asked what is the basis for Mr. Forte saying, the theatre board supports the proposed zoning change. Mr. Ginn said the Theatre wants the patronage they have offered up in exchange for the facility use agreement (permanently on file). Mr. Ginn said that the Appalachian Theatre administrator, Laura Kratt made the pitch for the proposed zoning change and he had talked to other board members that were in support of this proposed zoning change. He said that Ms. Kratt knew that a zoning change would be needed to allow for the facility use agreement to take effect. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag said that is not accurate because the first time this topic became an issue was at a Planning Commission meeting, with respect to the HOW Space and the transitional zones that were being discussed at that time. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag noted that at that time no one knew there was an issue with respect to zoning. He said that he recalled specifically three members of Council did not know about classes in the theater. Mr. Ginn said that the University was approached and asked if they would like to use the theatre for classes.

Ms. Meade said that she and Ms. Shook knew that this was an issue going back approximately one year plus.

Council Member Mason asked about possible damage to the theater and who will be responsible for possible damages to it and she said it was not clear who would be responsible. She added that the community has worked for years on fundraising for the theatre and they are very proud of it. Mr. Ginn said that he is not sure of the provisions in the agreements but the University would take care of possible damages at the theatre.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Mr. Ginn if he was familiar with the approval of the HOW Space and the UDO process. Ms. Michele Novacek from Appalachian State University Facilities Operations Department, came to the podium and she noted that she was aware of the HOW Space approval process. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Ms. Novacek, if she knew that the University had been using the building for University uses for one year and one half until it came to the attention of the Council in 2018. He said a use exception was created retroactively to bring the University into compliance with the UDO. She said she was aware of these actions. He asked Ms. Novacek if she was aware of UDO Section 15.70 says "that the activities involved in the use must be the same as activities of uses allowed as of right in the zoning district". Ms. Novacek said yes. He asked if the University was teaching an activity of use that is permitted in the B1 zoning district presently. Ms. Novacek said no.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag handed out a three-page excerpt from, "The Appalachian" containing an article on the Walker College of Business dated October 6, 2019, as well as a screen shot of a page from the Walker WORKspace website (permanently on file). He said the article is about the Walker WORKspace which is at the HOW Space location. He explained that after the approval was given by Council the HOW Space closed in the fall of 2019, then, Walker College of Business launched the "Walker WORKspace". He read the description of the WORKspace found on page three of the handout. He asked Ms. Novacek if she was familiar with an article dated October 6, 2019 written by Hayley Canal of "The Appalachian". Ms. Novacek said no. He said included in this article is information from Mr. Bob Stec a management lecturer and experiential learning faculty fellow for the college and Ms. Jacqueline Tilton, an assistant management professor who teaches business ethics. He read parts of this article. He continued to say that there is a long history of the University promising one thing and doing something else. He asked Ms. Novacek how is the Town to trust the University now with this special consideration of the proposed zoning change.

She asked Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag when he found this article. He told her it had been scrubbed from their website and he found it from the use of the Way Back Machine at archive.org. She said if the University is ever in violation, they want to correct it. She further said that the purpose of the said HOWspace is so the students can practice what they learn in the classroom with the intention for the

students to help local businesses with things such as marketing and IT solutions. She said the University language needs to be changed so that groups that are available to the entire community are allowed. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Ms. Novacek who sets the location for classes for the University, she said it is the office of academic affairs. She noted that no classes are scheduled in the space.

Council Member Furgiuele agreed that representations have been made by the University that have not been kept.

Mayor Brantz called for a ten-minute break at 8:42 p.m.

Mayor Brantz reconvened the hearing at 8:55 p.m.

Ms. Meade asked Ms. Shook to talk about her communications on the HOW Space. Ms. Shook was in the Downtown area one night and she noticed some activity at the HOW space. She contacted Ms. Novacek to ask what was going on there. Ms. Novacek let Ms. Shook know that the way the semester works that they were too late to use the event this semester so they were using it for some events related to the Walker School of Business. Ms. Shook said there was one event that did not meet the criteria. Ms. Shook said she let Ms. Novacek know what uses were allowed in the space.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Ms. Shook when her last conversation was with Ms. Novacek regarding this topic. Ms. Shook said maybe one month or less. He further asked Ms. Shook if she had been told that classes had been held there. Ms. Shook said no.

Council Member Furgiuele asked Ms. Shook if the University recognizes what the zoning requirements were for the HOW Space. Ms. Shook yes at the time the application was submitted, they have stated the standard and how they are meeting the standard. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked, when the application was submitted. Ms. Shook said she does not have that information with her at this meeting. She confirmed that it was submitted in 2019. Ms. Novacek said that the application was submitted after August of 2019 because the lease was signed for the space around August 15, 2019.

Council Member Furgiuele talked about his concern that the University may not be paying attention to the zoning ordinance after their University approvals. Ms. Novacek said that her job position was recently created to police the properties that are leased by the University. Council Member Furgiuele noted that he is wondering if the Town should do an inventory of the Council approved University uses in the B1 to make sure the uses are being used correctly. He noted two changes that Council had approved in the last year. Ms. Novacek said the University has changed their forms to include how the leased space will be used to benefit the community.

Council Member Mason voiced her concern on how the theatre will be shared knowing the success of the theatre is based on having a schedule of active performances. She asked how will the space be compatible, if it takes several days to set an event up. Ms. Novacek stated that the University is not having classes on Fridays so the theatre can prepare for their weekend events and the University students would be out of the theatre on Thursday afternoons.

Planning Commission Member Veno noted that the largest issue in regards to the proposed zoning change is parking. Mr. Ginn said that the University does not see parking being an issue for the Downtown as it relates to this case. He said the University would love to have more parking decks available during the day for their students and more parking is in the making at the University that would be available for the Town during the afternoons and evening as well.

Ms. Meade asked if freshmen students are required to live on-campus and what are the parking rules with respect to the ASU sophomore students. Mr. Katers said that freshmen are required to live on campus

but sophomores are not though they can purchase a parking pass for limited on-campus parking but for the most part they park at the satellite parking lots.

Ms. Meade asked Mr. Katers what is to prevent the sophomore students who live off campus from parking on King Street. He said it is inconvenience because there are only 200 parking spaces on King Street. He said the University is in the process of upgrading their parking areas and adding gates to the lots. Ms. Novacek said that there is hourly parking for students in the Rivers Street deck.

Mayor Brantz opened the floor for public comment.

The first speaker was Mr. Michael Curcio who said he is a coach at Appalachian State University. He talked about his difficulties of finding a parking space at the University. He said that Mr. Forte noted in his presentation to Council that the University is encouraging biking and public transportation to the students. He said he does not bike to the University campus anymore because it is too dangerous for him to do so. He said a parking permit at the University has increased to \$260.00 per year. He talked about trucks unloading on campus in the early mornings and blocking the sidewalks. He said that he wants the theatre to be successful but has concerns about the parking.

The second speaker was Ms. Libby Hendley who lives at 236 Harrison Lane and she owns a Downtown Business at 549 W. King Street which is two doors from the Appalachian Theatre. She expressed concerns regarding parking. She noted there is already a parking issue with the students in the Downtown area. She felt like if we allow the proposed zoning request, there will be more of a parking issue than we have currently.

Mr. Ward handed out information about the parking in the Municipal Service District (permanently on file). Mr. Ward explained that all of the parking is in the Municipal Service District because of its expansion. Ms. Lane Moody noted that the numbers that Mr. Ward is talking about have not been updated since the lot was opened at Town Hall. He reviewed the information on the handout as presented.

Mayor-ProTem Clawson said she noticed that the Horn in the West parking lot does not have that many vehicles in it. Mr. Ward said he would have to double check the parking spaces at this lot.

Mr. Ward said the University is doing a parking study analysis. He said that the elevated Queen Street parking lot is permit based parking that supports the Downtown businesses and their employees. He also talked about the revenues from this lot and the availability in it. He said he can show where the parking spaces are located.

Mr. Ward said over time the Town has expanded the Depot Street lot and the parking lot next to Town Hall are the only two long-term parking options in Downtown Boone. He explained the change to the parking meters on Queen Street to expand the time allowed in the parking spaces.

Mr. Ward said there were more complaints with one-hour parking but the complaints lessened with the change to two-hour parking and he talked about other changes. He said that more adjustments will be made as needed.

Ms. Meade asked Mr. Kater if one reason the University has the facilities agreement is because they want to give funding to the theater and it needs to get something in exchange. Mr. Kater said yes. She noted that the University cannot just give the theatre a donation. Mr. Kater said that is correct. She asked if classes from 8 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. work for the University. He said that he would have to ask the Administration but probably would not work for the University. Mr. Ginn said that 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. might be a more reasonable timeframe. Mr. Ginn explained that if they could have 8:00 a.m. to 12:15 a.m., it gives them three blocks of time which is what they are requesting. He further explained that 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. gives them only two blocks of time.

Ms. Meade asked Mr. Kater asked if the University has discussed with the theatre any other way to justify its annual contribution other than the use of classroom space. Mr. Kater said there have been previous discussions on other forms of contribution, and he said that he has been told that the classes have to be included in the deal from the Administration's perspective. Council Member Mason asked if the other provisions in the agreement for other use is contingent on the classroom use as well and cannot be a partial agreement. Mr. Kater said no.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked if it is true that the theatre has suggested to the University performative uses such as for example having film screenings for the film classes that were open to the public and to the students to attend for free. He asked if uses like this example were proposed. Mr. Kater said yes but they were rejected.

Ms. Shook noted the time at 9:36 p.m. and she asked the Council if they still want the Planning Commission to consider this case or do they feel it needs more discussion. Mr. Ward pointed out the logistics of the review process, if this case moves forward or not. He said that a recommendation is needed if this case is to be considered at the December 16, 2019 Special Council meeting. He noted that the new Council members would be hearing this case after said date. Ms. Meade said in that case, it would be proper for the new Council members to watch the video of this hearing. Council Member Furguele said he is interested in the recommendations of the Planning Commission. The consensus of the Council Members is to proceed with this case prior to December 16, 2019.

With no further questions or public comment, Mayor Brantz closed the public hearing for this case at 9:38 p.m.

CASE PL03178-100319 MAXIMUM HEIGHT IN B3 – UDO Text Amendment

In August 2019, Town Council requested that the Town of Boone Unified Development Ordinance be modified to reduce the maximum building height in the B3 Zoning District to 4 stories.

Ms. Shook presented this case as outlined in the meeting packet. Ms. Shook noted a correction in Section 16.08.02 to the B2 which is three stories at 40 feet.

Council Member Furguele confirmed the maximum setbacks in Section 16.08.03. Ms. Shook confirmed that all setbacks increase by 11 feet for the fourth story.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked Ms. Shook to explain why Council proposed this change. Ms. Shook explained that there is an overall concern for the height in the B3 zoning district especially in the secondary height being too tall for the corridors. She said this is the intermediary step to make this correction. Council Member Mason said in order to address community character issues, she said it can be part of a plan but it also has to be done by the UDO.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked about the need for developer to apply for variances to be reviewed by the Board of Adjustment. Ms. Meade said a variance has to be site specific. She pointed out that this topic has already been before the Board of Adjustment once and it was rejected. She further pointed out that it is hard to imagine that height poses a hardship.

There was no public comment on this case, Mayor Brantz closed the public hearing for this case at 9:45 p.m.

Case PL03173-100319 MINIMUM LOT SIZE IN R3 – UDO TEXT AMENDMENT

In August 2019, Town Council requested that the Town of Boone Unified Development Ordinance be modified to increase the minimum lot size of the R3 Multiple Family Zoning District to 20, 000 square feet.

Ms. Shook presented this case as outlined in the meeting packet. She noted that the proposed change is recommending that any new lot in the R3 has to meet the minimum of 20,000 square feet.

Council Member Mason asked Ms. Shook what will happen to the parcels that the Council reviewed for possible rezoning that are currently in the R3 zoning district and are less than this size. Ms. Shook said they would be considered legal nonconformities or grandfathered and could be developed if they don't meet the standards though new lots cannot be subdivided into smaller than 20,000 square feet. Ms. Shook explained the uses for this zoning district.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag recommended against stackable units.

Ms. Meade asked are there simple apartment complexes in the R3 that are on lots 10,000 or 15,000 square feet. Ms. Shook said there are triplexes that are on lots of this size. Ms. Meade asked Ms. Shook if there will be issues, if extensive upgrades are proposed for these types of lots because of expanding a non-conforming with the tiered system. Ms. Shook explained the tiered system 1, 2 and 3.

Council Member Ashcraft noted that that the danger is infill development.

There was no public comment on this case, Mayor Brantz closed the public hearing for this case at 9:54 p.m.

CASE PL03171-100319 CREATION OF R1S SMALL HOME RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT – UDO TEXT AMENDMENT

In January 2018, Town council requested Staff research the possibilities regarding higher density for single-family dwellings due to the desirability of creating acceptable transitions between higher density and lower density uses and due to the concern over the lack of affordable housing in the Town of Boone.

The following November, Staff presented a preliminary report on cottage housing which outlined two different concepts. The first concept was a new zoning district which would allow smaller single-family homes to be built on lots smaller than currently allowed in the UDO. The second concept was for a cottage housing type of principal use, which in concept, would be allowed to be constructed in existing residential zoning district subject to limitations. After discussion, Council authorized Staff to proceed with a new zoning district, "R1S" and outlined parameters for the new district, including implementation process, application process, density, building height, setbacks, uses, and parking.

Subsequent to this direction, Staff drafted text based upon the requested parameters and brought draft text back to Council in August 2019 for review. At that time, with some modification, Council authorized the text to be sent to public hearing.

Ms. Shook presented this case as outlined in the meeting packet. Ms. Shook explained that previously the Council asked the Planning Staff to research the possibilities regarding higher density for single-family dwellings. She said the options the Planning Staff found were to either create a new zoning district or new uses for existing zoning districts.

Ms. Shook referred to page 80 of the meeting packet and pointed out the proposed changes that the Planning Staff has made. She pointed out that in Article 14 the numbering of the sections will be different as proposed changes are made. She further pointed out that R5 is not in this article because it was not adopted at the time the proposed changes were being made by the Planning Staff. She referred to page 83 of the meeting packet and pointed out that the R1S has been added to the Table of Principal Uses.

Discussion ensued as to why vehicular gates were allowed. Ms. Shook noted that vehicular gates were regulated so that the Fire Department could ensure certain standards were met.

Council Member Mason asked about garages and carports being excluded from the maximum footprint. Ms. Shook said she doesn't remember that being part of the exclusions discussed. Council Member Furguele said he thought that an apartment over a garage should be part of the calculation. Ms. Shook said she thought it would be difficult to do this calculation. Mr. Ward said he has seen in some communities a beach style construction that has the parking underneath the living unit.

Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag asked about basement spaces. He referred to a home that was built due to the terrain with the main living space being in the basement with the bedrooms on the top floor. Ms. Shook suggested that this type of change needs to be discussed and modified to be included if desired.

Discussion ensued as to the setbacks. Mr. Ward noted that the Fire Department or the Building Inspectors may need to be consulted.

Discussion ensued as to possible changes on how height should be calculated and how the text could be revised to allow a basement due to topography. Council Member Mason suggested having some options for structures being built on a slope. And she said it is a smaller footprint and lot. Ms. Shook noted a one and one-half story house allows more light into a home than two-story homes built close together. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag said one way around this is to go back to the garage idea. He said by allowing the one and one-half story from a flat grade or permit half of the basement as finished space and the other half could serve as a garage non finished space. Ms. Shook said it sounds great but it will depend on where the slope is located on the property and whether you can get a driveway to the basement portion of the building. Ms. Shook noted that some thought needs to be given to the lots that have significant topography. Council Member Furgiuele said if we exclude garages and redefine stories in Section 16.08.01B and we would have the option of one and one-half story above or below the grade or have one story with finished basement height. Ms. Shook said the solution would be to begin with the modification of Section 16.08.01(A) and (B) with the maximum building footprint and the upper story. Planning Commission Chair Shay said we want neighborhoods that look modest and cohesive and that fit together well. She was in agreement with what Council Member Furgiuele said regarding this proposed text change. Council Member Furgiuele noted that he felt that as proposals come in some of the text may need to be revisited. Ms. Meade talked about the different types of grades for example the primary street grade. She said one way to approach the text change is to give maximum square feet, then deal with the scale issue to measure it. Planning Commission Vice-Chair Plaag suggested that by limiting the amount of heated square footage, someone could potentially take advantage of the zoning and create something different than you are intending and keeps you in the neighborhood of what you are trying to accomplish with the new zoning classification. Ms. Meade noted that the Planning Staff may have enforcement issues regarding the limiting of the square footage. She said if someone builds an unfinished basement what is there to prevent it from being finished in the future and it will require enforcement on the front end and on the back end. Council Member Mason said the basement almost becomes a plus for a parcel of land that it fits. Ms. Meade said a description will need to be added on where to measure the one and one-half stories. Council Member Furgiuele pointed out that the garage should be excluded as part of the footprint because if you put in a garage you will have a larger lot. Council Member Mason said that a garage could be possible with a creative developer. Ms. Meade confirmed to keep in the language the maximum building footprint. Ms. Shook recapped the proposed changes from this discussion, she said modifications need to be made from where the height is measured and staying with the one and one-half story, and a below grade basement is allowed if possible.

Ms. Shook noted that the rest of the proposed changes in the staff report are fitted into the new zoning district where the current R1 is located.

Council Member Furgiuele confirmed that the development of small houses will be on separate parcels and Ms. Shook said the permitted use is a single-family home on a single lot.

There was no public comment on this case, Mayor Brantz closed the public hearing for this case at 10:36 p.m.

Discussion ensued on continuing the Planning Commission tonight and if so which cases do they want to consider or if they want to defer the considering of these cases to another meeting that quorum can be

obtained. Ms. Shook asked the Council to direct the Planning Commission on the cases that they would like for the Planning Commission to make decisions on agenda items one through four.

Discussion ensued on the most important cases to be considered first. Council Member Mason said the cases for the Town are more important and the Appalachian State University case could wait another month. Ms. Meade noted that ASU wanted to know about their approval because of getting the information into their fall catalog for classes and locked in by January 2020.

Planning Commission Chair Shay suggested continuing the Planning Commission to another date and time to discuss and make decisions on the active cases. It was noted that Case PL03271-110419 Hackett Properties, Inc. – General Use Zoning Map Amendment was withdrawn with no further consideration needed.

OTHER MATTERS

There were no other matters discussed at this hearing.

ADJOURNMENT OF TOWN COUNCIL

Mayor Brantz made a motion, seconded by Council Member Ulmer for the Town Council to adjourn at 8:45 p.m.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None
The motion passed.

Rennie Brantz, Mayor

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary

Elizabeth Shay, Planning Commission Chair

CONTINUATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Chair Shay opened the Planning Commission meeting at 10:42 p.m.

Discussion ensued on choosing another meeting date to continue the Planning Commission meeting on the four active cases. It was the consensus of the Commission members to schedule a Planning Commission meeting on Monday, December 9, 2019 at 6 p.m. in the Council Chambers located at 1500 Blowing Rock Rd.

Chair Shay introduced the new Planning Commission Member John Tippet to the Commission, she asked each Commission member to introduce themselves to Commission Member Tippet.

ADJOURNMENT OF PLANNING COMMISSION

With no other matters to discuss at this meeting, Commission Vice-Chair Eric Plaag made a motion, seconded by Commission Member Tippet, to adjourn the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

Vote: Aye – All
Nay – None
The motion passed.

Elizabeth Shay, Planning Commission Chair

Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary