

## Let's not overlook energy issues in the 2045 Comprehensive Plan

Dear Commissioners,

I am delighted to see an update to our overall County Plan. I believe it points at appropriate goals.

Today I ask your attention to a utility issue very likely to engage our public discussions in the next twenty-odd years. We are looking at significant changes to the way County citizens and residents are apt to use energy.

In the past three days there has been press coverage of three energy concerns that may rise to the level of influence on land use, that may bear on the Comprehensive Plan:

- On Saturday the Times-News had a lead article “e-bikes could impact North Carolina”. It is limited in the types of vehicles it considers. I would also look at <https://restofworld.org/2022/scooters-and-3-wheelers-are-really-whats-driving-an-ev-revolution/> and <https://www.protocol.com/manuals/future-of-mobility/>
- The Winston-Salem Journal said yesterday that Wal-Mart is joining the large tech firms Apple, Meta and Google in objecting to Duke Energy’s carbon plan required by State law (HB 951, 2021): <https://journalnow.com/news/local/such-a-paradox-walmart-as-a-customer-says-dukes-carbon-plan-falls-short/>
- WSOC-TV Channel 9 and others reported Moore County substations have been damaged by sabotage.

My own sense is that the first story, about transportation directly, is the most apt to influence our land use and utility discussions in the twenty-year planning period. There is also a not insignificant chance that energy storage facilities, likely under the auspice of utility companies, may become a productive part of our local grid system, adding to its resilience, but also demanding our attention as a new feature of our land use.

The demands of changes in energy on our public bodies’ attention are likely to be important during the coming twenty-odd year planning period.

I join with a call that the proposed plan offered to this hearing be further seasoned prior to its adoption.

## Let's not overlook energy issues in the 2045 Comprehensive Plan

Christopher Berg  
6 Rosemary Trail  
Flat Rock, NC 28731

Dear Commissioners,

I am delighted to see an update to our overall County Plan. I believe it points at appropriate goals.

Today I ask your attention to a utility issue very likely to engage our public discussions in the next twenty-odd years. We are looking at significant changes to the way County citizens and residents are apt to use energy.

In the past three days there has been press coverage of three energy concerns that may rise to the level of influence on land use, that may bear on the Comprehensive Plan:

- On Saturday the Times-News had a lead article “e-bikes could impact North Carolina”. It is limited in the types of vehicles it considers. I would also look at <https://restofworld.org/2022/scooters-and-3-wheelers-are-really-whats-driving-an-ev-revolution/> and <https://www.protocol.com/manuals/future-of-mobility/>
- The Winston-Salem Journal said yesterday that Wal-Mart is joining the large tech firms Apple, Meta and Google in objecting to Duke Energy's carbon plan required by State law (HB 951, 2021): <https://journalnow.com/news/local/such-a-paradox-walmart-as-a-customer-says-dukes-carbon-plan-falls-short/>
- WSOC-TV Channel 9 and others reported Moore County substations have been damaged by sabotage.

My own sense is that the first story, about transportation directly, is the most apt to influence our land use and utility discussions in the twenty-year planning period. There is also a not insignificant chance that energy storage facilities, likely under the auspice of utility companies, may become a productive part of our local grid system, adding to its resilience, but also demanding our attention as a new feature of our land use.

The demands of changes in energy on our public bodies' attention are likely to be important during the coming twenty-odd year planning period.

I join with a call that the proposed plan offered to this hearing be further seasoned prior to its adoption.

## Comments to the Henderson County Commissioners Board on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022

The new draft of the CP that you have now, after the extensive revisions made by the Planning Board on Thursday, raises many questions and contradictions with the established goals of the CP that had been made public before.

Let's start with questions about the maps in the Appendix, which **contradict** the **very-well** established goals in support of environmental and farmland protection. I invite you to look at the page in front of you as I ask these questions. Why do these maps (in the Appendix) suggest that a significant swath of the Pisgah National Forest is suitable for commercial development? (p.108)

Why does it say some of our floodplains are highly suitable for commercial development?

Why do they indicate that areas of prime farmland are highly suitable for industrial development?  
(p.109)

It seems contradictory to Goal #2, in Outcome #1, namely: "Protect and conserve [the] rural character and agriculture."

All of these maps in the Appendix (commercial, industrial and even residential suitability) **must** be over-ridden by the “Conservation Target Areas” shown on the map on page 62. Leaving “any ambiguity” in the CP will be an open door for developers to present proposals, and might even lead to suits to use those lands for that purpose.

**Most importantly** why don't the maps reflect **county residents desire to preserve and protect** the county's greenspace and farmland? Which, by the way, are the pivotal assets that the county has.

The answer to these questions is on page 106 of the Plan, where the inputs used to make these maps are explained. **These inputs ignored** the results of the surveys showing the residents' desire to protect greenspace and farmland.

Fixing the inputs (criteria) used to prepare these maps in the Appendix would go a long way in making the Plan much more consistent with what the residents want to see over the next 20 years and support the well-established goals in the Plan.

**In addition**, last Thursday's revisions, further undermine the goals established goal. The new draft that you have in your hands has **dozens** of deletions and **significant** softening in language that seriously **undermine** Goal #3 in Outcome #1, name-

ly: “Improving the resilience of the natural and built environment.”

**More seriously**, at Thursday’s meeting , it was announced that the full list of the 100+ last minute changes would be posted separately on the website for the public to react. **They were not**, but rather --only the “**final**” draft of the Plan was posted. **You** will not be able to notice the many changes made on Thursday.

So, for these two reasons, improving the maps and giving appropriate time to the public to respond to the last-minute changes, I respectfully request the extension of the public hearing time for this Plan.

After the extensive participation and feedback given since last September, our residents deserve adequate time to absorb these changes and respond. And you too, Commissioners, deserve adequate time to review these changes before making the enormous commitment to approve this far-reaching plan.

Thank you for your time.

I’d like to leave a copy of these comments for the public record, to go together with the maps distributed.

Enrique Sanchez  
December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022