

**HENDERSON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
AND THE HENDERSON COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 21, 2004 MEETING**

The Henderson County Planning Board and the Henderson County Comprehensive Plan (CCP) Advisory Committee met on April 21, 2004, for a joint meeting at 3:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room of the Land Development Building, 101 East Allen Street, Hendersonville, NC. Planning Board members present were: Tedd Pearce, Leon Allison, Vivian Armstrong, Mike Cooper, and Tommy Laughter. Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee members present were: Jack Lynch, Hall Waddell, Paul Prosky, and Wayne Carland. Others present included: Josh Freeman, Project Manager; Nippy Page, Planner; Karen Smith, Planning Director; and Kathleen Scanlan, Secretary. Planning Board members Todd Thompson, Paul Patterson, and Walter Carpenter were absent.

Tedd Pearce and Jack Lynch called the meeting to order.

Rocky Hyder gave a presentation regarding floodplain issues. Mr. Hyder said the National Flood Program was originally developed by the Federal Government because there was very little interest from the private sector in insuring the high hazard areas the federal government felt like required some type of insurance in order to make that a viable community. It was mostly in the coastal areas and North Carolina has large portions of an entire county that was located in the floodplain and therefore it was in a high hazard area. He said this County had limited opportunities to develop floodplains without some Federal intervention. He said the Federal Government designed a program that was subsidized by tax dollars with the eventual goal of being self-sufficient in order to provide flood insurance for these high hazard areas. Mr. Hyder said in 2000, there was a significant change in our state and throughout the nation. The Federal Government decided because there were a number of communities that did not participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, to tie disaster assistance funding and mitigation funding to participation in the National Flood Insurance Program. He said because in North Carolina, there were only a couple of counties statewide that did not participate in the program. North Carolina jumped right in with the revisions of the Stafford Act at the Federal level and amended General Statute 166A in North Carolina. This statute said every community in North Carolina would need to do two things; (1) develop a hazard mitigation plan and have it approved by November 2004. Because of that you needed to (2) participate in the National Flood Insurance Program in order to be eligible for disaster assistance. He stated that the way the law was written, the Staff at North Carolina Emergency Management Commission will tell you this was the "intent" of the law, but is subject to some controversy. He said the way the law was written it only applied to the flooding issues where counties that did participate in the program. He said they have asked for an Attorney General's opinion on that, but have not gotten one. Mr. Hyder said that he doesn't feel we will get an answer because there are so many issues that are very complex in nature. Mr. Hyder stated it could be very debatable whether or not the amount of disaster assistance this community has gotten in the past (and what we might be eligible in the future) would be worth in the expense of the actual program. Floodplain Management is another county program within itself and not an attachment on another department. He said the Commissioners did pass the Countywide Hazard Mitigation Plan back in the fall of 2003, and part of that plan was to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program. This was a required element and the plan would not have passed the review at the Federal and State level without that element in it. He said the real issue is the National Flood Program for us, because the County has never participated in it and it is a complex issue. He said this involves various entities of the community such as commercial, farming/agricultural community, emergency services, developers, and local government agencies. He said there are

two basic strategies that compete when you are referring to the National Flood Insurance Program. Strategy one is that we should develop a program that will somehow regulate floodplain development. Strategy two is the size of the area to be regulated. The area of Henderson County that is in the floodplain is relatively small compared to the coastal areas. Allowing development in the flood area of the County would increase impervious surfaces. When you allow development in the floodplain, what effectively is done is the area subject to flooding will be increased, (depending on how we handle the enforcement and development within that area) and the size of the floodplain could become much larger. Mr. Hyder said if Henderson County decides to participate in the program there will be some extreme pressure placed on the property within the floodplain. Once you allow people to borrow money so that they can develop that area, pressure for development will ensure in that particular area. It does a few things to the overall community. He said it will put a lot of pressure on the farmers because they will not be able to pay rent that would be equal to the profits that would be gained from the development in that area. He said there are actually two aspects to the floodplain one is the floodway, which is the riverbed itself and the other is the flood fringe, which is the 100-year floodplain. This doesn't necessarily mean the flood will only happen once every hundred years, but that there is a one percent chance the flood will happen each year. He said when it is looked at from an emergency service prospective, the more people that are in the high hazard area, the more the emergency service will need to deal with it. They will need to have the response sources necessary to deal with that situation. He said there are already many people who have filled in the floodplain, and we will need to get a handle on those people, regardless of whether we pass a strict or easy ordinance. We'll need to try to understand the effects of fill in the floodplain because that does not benefit anyone except the person who is building. He said the person across the river and the person upstream and downstream will be affected. Mr. Waddell asked, "Why do you think more people will live in the floodplain if we have the insurance?" Mr. Hyder said, "Because they can borrow money on property in the floodplain." He said, as it currently stands in North Carolina, unless you can purchase insurance, you cannot borrow money on property within the floodplain, and so you could not finance that house in the floodplain unless you can purchase insurance. Mr. Waddell said the flood elevation to build in the floodplain has to be over the 100-year flood. Mr. Hyder said if you are flooded and you are above the floodwaters, the floodwaters would still be approaching your foundation, as this cannot be stopped. Mr. Waddell asked whether he feels a property owner will intentionally build where the house will flood, just because they can borrow money to do this? Mr. Hyder said that is not what he was saying. He feels once you can borrow money on that property, the pressure for development will occur. Mr. Freeman said in Transylvania County there are many areas where the flood insurance program has enabled people to build a home in the floodplain, where it might not have happened otherwise, Mr. Freeman said over a twenty-year timeframe, regarding population pressures, as large parcels of land continue being bought up, the floodplain will become more attractive to buyers and you will need to factor these things in, as they will happen. Mr. Waddell said if you are in the FEMA program you can only fill in the floodplain under certain conditions and these conditions are very specific and very strictly regulated. Mr. Waddell said not everyone could go in and fill in the floodplain. Mr. Freeman said you are opening the opportunity to fill in the floodplain and the opportunity is being created because of the allowance of being in the program. Mr. Freeman said the point is there are facilities, properties and investments that are at more risk than ever before. Mr. Carland said in Transylvania County there are less than twenty people in the whole County that are signed to FEMA insurance. Chairman Pearce asked Mr. Hyder to brief the Committee on rules of fill in the floodplain. Mr. Hyder said the FEMA rules are generally associated with a no-rise certificate. If you fill in the flood fringe because you cannot fill in the floodway, you need a no-rise certificate and this proves that your fill would not cause a rise of water onto someone else's property. Mr. Hyder said that you prove this through hydraulic engineering studies. The basic principal behind the principle is sound, however, it doesn't actually work that way in many cases. He added what they do not account for is impervious surfaces. People will build a house up above the one hundred year flood elevation and do not count the

impervious surfaces that are associated with the floodplain. Chairman Pearce said everyone who builds anywhere including roads is adding water to a floodway and this is quite obvious. Chairman Pearce said the Committee should understand the impervious surface next to the floodway is not the only affect. Mr. Hyder said it has a more immediate affect. He said the impervious surface on a mountainside has more of an immediate affect on the actual mountainside itself in the soil and water associated with it. Chairman Pearce asked, "Under the least stringent floodplain rules that the mitigation techniques that were discussed applied?" Mr. Hyder said yes, that the most restrictive rules would prohibit development of the floodplain area, excluding agriculture because that is the type of business that you want there. Mr. Allison asked Mr. Hyder whether he would agree that there is a major difference between the mountain areas and the coastal areas regarding flood? Mr. Hyder said he would agree. Mr. Hyder said what changes the flood problems in the mountains is the flash-flooding situations. Mr. Allison suggested that in this area, he feels the streams should be cleaned up because they are polluted. Mr. Hyder agreed and said the cleaner the streams the more water they can handle. Mr. Cooper said looking at Highway 191, which runs through Mills River, he feels the road has created a dam effect in the county with the two small bridges. Mr. Hyder said it also floods in the Brookside Camp Road and the interstate area. Mr. Cooper said the County is suffering because there was bad design put into our road system in the past and with the widening of US 25 North, we will have another problem. Mr. Cooper added if the road systems were different with larger bridges and the creek, cleaned out, he feels there might not be a flood problem. Mr. Hyder said what he sees other counties doing across the State regarding the programs they are implementing, is they are trying to get where we are right now. Mr. Hyder said a mitigation buy-out plan results in buying out a property that has reoccurring flooding problems and that is what is happening in various communities, but he said he doesn't want that to happen in Henderson County. He said we should be very careful so that Henderson County does not need to develop a mitigation buy-out plan. If we put people in the wrong place that has reoccurring flooding that puts emergency responders at risk as well as the rest of the community. Mr. Waddell said the City of Hendersonville has had a flood insurance program for at least twenty years and they do not have a separate administrator for the program, so how do they administer their program? Mr. Hyder said they administer it with their zoning ordinance. Chairman Pearce said the County might think about doing it the same way. Mr. Waddell said in the twenty years the City has been in the floodplain ordinance program, there has been very little filling in the floodplain, so he doesn't feel there will be a rash of people in-filling in the floodplain. Mr. Hyder said he didn't feel he was giving that impression. Mr. Hyder said that a house can be built and the property developed without in-filling, but you would be creating another impervious surface. Ms. Smith said that the in-filling can be done at present without the insurance, which presents a problem. In closing, Mr. Hyder said that this topic is a complex issue is a long-term planning issue.

Mr. Pearce began the review of the document on page 87 with the "Agriculture" section. Mr. Freeman said this is a dual purpose chapter. He added it is not just a chapter in the Comprehensive Plan but will be a stand alone plan that will be used for a number of purposes, in particular in applying for grants for agricultural development. He said this section is to be looked at and read differently then some of the rest of the plan because it needs to function independently.

The following changes were made (**bold** indicating additions and ~~strike through~~ to delete from the document):

Page 87 -

- Provide incentives to make farming **sustainable** ~~more profitable~~
- Reduce farmland loss ~~by one-third~~

Page 88 –

The average age of Henderson County farmers is 54 compared to 55 for farmers statewide (Table A-1). **Committee wanted this language changed in particular the references to age.**

Page 91 –

Show nurseries (more up-to-date figures)

Page 98 –

Add Future Farmers of America (FFA) to list

Page 104 –

Add as policies:

1. **Review tax policy as it pertains to agriculture.**
2. **County reviews the economic development policies to consider putting agriculture on par with other industries.**

Action: Continue to support and expand a “buy-local” program for Henderson County agricultural products. **Committee wanted to add, “Encourage proactive programs especially regarding Henderson County purchases.**

Page 105 –

Policy A-02: Reduce Farmland Loss:

Action: ~~Provide~~ **Consider affordable tax and legal advice....**

Page 107 –

Action: Consider a buy-local policy for county government including a local preference policy for procurements such as food purchases by the school system. **Committee requested that this should be consolidated with the action on page 104.**

Action: **Consider** Introduceing the “paired parcels” concept to County and perhaps Municipal development codes that will allow density to be transferred from areas of important farmland to areas that are well suited to receive additional units.

After some discussion regarding paired parcels, the **Committee decided to either roll this action into the text of the previous action which states:** Action: Consider modifying County and perhaps Municipal zoning and other land development codes to allow for increases in density, on and off site, in exchange for permanent farmland protection **or reword.**

Page 114 –

Mr. Waddell said he feels the Committee needs to be aware that the map (shown on this page), which shows agricultural areas, will conflict with industrial land and said that it should be addressed. He mentioned going out Highway US 64 East, there is some feeling by some people there will be some industrial land developed which, on the map, this land is shown as agriculture. Mr. Freeman said this map does not necessarily spell out everything in the green areas will be agriculture. It only indicates these areas have large concentrations of agricultural land in existence today and as a general rule these are places that Staff needs to look at. Mr. Carland as well as Mr. Pearce were puzzled why this map is in the document. Mr. Carland said in the future if someone wants to build in the green area, (designated as agriculture) an industry there could be a large conflict. Mr. Freeman said this is just to target those areas as farmland. It does not mean to protect every parcel, but just makes sense to protect farmland that are contiguous with each other that are still actively being used as farms. **The Committee asked to reword the title of the map as well as dropping the word “critical.”**

Page 112 –

Under the action which states “Identify and pursue the most appropriate proper mechanism to provide County funding for a Henderson County Farmland Fund” it states a number of possible

tools and one of which is “mortgage tax,” **the Committee asked to delete mortgage tax from the list.**

Page 118 –

Policy N-01: Flood Hazard Mitigation. After discussion regarding this policy, Chairman Pearce said perhaps this policy could be reworded to say that, should the County choose to enact a Floodplain Ordinance, the Committee would recommend production could be afforded by limiting floodplain development by the Ordinance. Mr. Waddell felt this is what should be done because if it becomes evident the County needs to enact an Ordinance, then the Committee is recommending the FEMA standard. Ms. Smith suggested a statement saying it would include participation at a minimum level. Mr. Lynch suggested whatever this Committee proposes will only be suggestions, as the Board of Commissioners have the final say whether they agree with our comment or not, so he added that perhaps we should leave this open as it is a very difficult topic to give a solid determination on. Chairman Pearce said to go forward and reword this policy and use the suggestions of the Committee.

Page 120 –

Figure N.2 (100-year Floodplain Vulnerability by Jurisdiction. The figures for critical facilities for Henderson County as well as the municipalities should be defined. Last paragraph, first sentence, Committee added: *As of the drafting of this **County** Comprehensive Plan, ...* Josh Freeman mentioned that where it is not defined specifically, he will go back and define “county” where applicable.

Page 121 –

Mr. Waddell said that regarding the riparian area, the Henderson County *Subdivision Ordinance* addresses riparian areas and if you are in the State watershed there is a riparian area. Ms. Smith said that it is purely a setback issue in the *Subdivision Ordinance* of the County. She said the Water Supply Watershed Ordinance has a 30-foot vegetative buffer and 100-foot vegetative buffer if it is in the 10/70. Mr. Freeman said what he hopes to imply in this document is to maintain the current level of regulation. He said for properties that are subject to the *Subdivision Ordinance*, the requirements at present would remain the same and properties that were subdivided prior to the requirements, would not be subject to this when we incorporate the Comprehensive Plan into a new Zoning Ordinance rewrite. Ms. Smith said the only change Mr. Freeman is making is the way it is written in the *Subdivision Ordinance* right now, it would be very difficult to enforce at present because violations are a tracking problem. Ms. Smith said it is less of a Comprehensive Plan issue than an enforcement issue. Mr. Freeman said it is very unclear at this time but in the *Subdivision Ordinance* some areas need to be vegetative in some way. They can not be paved, but they could be graveled or have railway ties laid there. Buffers need to be something other than in a grassy state. He said that is only the substance of change. He said about 97% of the area falls under the regulation of the *Subdivision Ordinance* and most of these areas are vegetative. He said he doesn't care what type of vegetation, but just have some type of vegetation. Mr. Waddell said this issue needs some thought and the City of Hendersonville has had trouble with this issue. Ms. Smith said this can be dealt with through the enforcement system. Chairman Pearce said he feels a property that is located in the watershed should be flagged when they try to pull a building permit. This shows from a zoning standpoint what can be done there and what cannot be done there. Ms. Smith said that the best source that Staff has is the USGS maps.

Page 124 –

Define BMP, which means: best management practice.

Page 128 –

~~Strike out:~~ The county should utilize the Community Planning process to identify ways to protect the boundaries and entry corridors to such public lands.

Page 130 –

Reword the sentence: “The total number of potentially historic identified structures in Henderson County was 707.”

Page 131 –

Add the word “consider” to:

“County should **consider conducting** inventory of Historic/Culturally Significant Sites/Structure to inform above.”

“County should **consider incorporating** overlay district into existing Zoning Ordinance that prevent development from disturbing known graves,

“County should **consider exploring** economic development incentives that favor the redevelopment and reuse of historically significant commercial structures.”

Take out: ~~In order to maintain its current status as being in attainment, it is important for Henderson County to aggressively implement the specific measures envisioned in the EAC. Those measures are listed in Figure N.7 below.~~

Page 132 –

Action N-01: Adopt a Flood Hazard Prevention Ordinance – **reword**

Page 133 –

Action N-04: Encourage All Municipalities to ~~Develop~~ **Explore** Flood Hazard Prevention Ordinances. Henderson County will actively encourage all municipalities to ~~adopt an equivalent a~~ **Flood Hazard Prevention Ordinance.**

Page 134 –

Chairman Pearce felt this might be a good area regarding the floodplain, to add an Action to work aggressively in cleaning up and straightening up existing floodways. Ms. Smith said we need to explore ways because of State and Federal laws. Chairman Pearce suggested rewording to say: “**Explore aggressively maintaining the open flow of all perennial streams.**” Mr. Freeman felt another note should be added that working with the State to improve bridge designs. Chairman Pearce added **become involved with State roads and bridge designs to prevent them from adversely affecting floodways.**

~~Action N07: Consider again the development of a local Sedimentation and Erosion Control Ordinance. (all text deleted as well)~~

Page 135 –

~~Action N-10: Within the Land Development Code, modify existing zoning districts, including Open Use, to establish maximum allowable densities within areas of steep slope. (all text deleted as well)~~

~~Action N-11: Protect the Boundaries and Entry Gateways of Federal and State Lands. (all text deleted as well)~~

Page 136 –

Action N-12: **Consider Conducting** an inventory of Historic/Culturally Significant Sites/Structures to inform (**explain what**)

Action N-13: **Consider incorporating** into the Land Development Code, a historic site overlay zoning district.

Action N-14: ~~Develop~~**Consider** economic development incentives for historic redevelopment.

Page 144 –

202 Recreation Policy –

Mr. Freeman said we might not need more recreational services now but as the County population increases, he feels there will be a need to be more rigorous in planning for those things. Mr. Lynch was inquiring whether there is a current chart or information on utilization of current recreational facilities. Mr. Freeman said no. Mr. Cooper feels a better use of our tax dollars would be if we could figure out a program to utilize all the school system's facilities, because at present it is very hard to use a school facility for recreational purposes. Mr. Cooper added it might require a person to administrate a utilization program, but he feels it would be a lot cheaper than building and investing into basketball courts, etc. Mr. Freeman said it might be important to develop a policy regarding utilization of schools.

Page 151 – 157

Ms. Armstrong said regarding the level of service analysis, that in a report one of the ways to do this analysis takes into account the existing acreage, which is not mentioned in the plan, and because of this, she questions whether the County might be over-equipped with recreational facilities at present. Mr. Freeman said he is not implying in the report the County needs more infrastructure facilities, but what is intended to be said is we will need more infrastructure of certain types and the only way not to let the demand get ahead of us is to plan for future needs. Ms. Armstrong understands the level of service analysis can be done several ways. One thing to include in the calculations is the amount of existing capacity that you have. Mr. Freeman added that a sophisticated way of doing it is finding out what the analysis will tell us and the end need because this would move the planning to a more sophisticated way of doing business. It would give us outcomes we can aim for and budget for. After some brief further discussion on this issue, Mr. Waddell said t after the input data on this subject, the Committee should **recommend a Master Plan to be done to determine the list of parks and then for a comprehensive recreation utilization policy to be done to determine what the level of service is and what needs to be** and to let someone else other than this Committee decide what that is. Ms. Selena Coffey mentioned that one of the earlier discussions on greenways and recreation was to come up with a way to identify the gaps. She suggested to add the suggested plan to identify those gaps concerning greenways and facilities. Mr. Waddell said that in this master plan suggestion, we will need to incorporate the school facilities with regard to recreation. Mr. Freeman asked, "What about the general concept of regionalizing or consolidating some of the recreational management and development with the Land of Sky?" On page 155, Take out the paragraph that states: ~~The County should also explore ways to procure publicly accessible recreational sites through the development process. Examples of such measures include impact fees upon development, requiring the dedication of greenway rights-of-way or identified future park sites when such areas are located within a given project.~~ (Redundant – mentioned again on page 159).

Page 158 –

Action R-03-Develop Community Plans – **take out, redundant.**

Action R-04- Protect the Boundaries and Entry Gateways of Federal and State Lands – **take out.**

Page 159 –

Action R-05 – Revise Transportation Plans to Account for the Recreation Master Plan. **Committee felt that this should be part of the master plan section.**

Action R-06 – Increase funding for recreation and greenways development. After some discussion regarding impact fees upon developments and developers, Ms. Armstrong stated that the Committee needs to understand that when we transfer the cost to a site specific development, it is counter productive to have affordable housing. She added that we can not lay things on the developers and expect them to pass it on. Mr. Allison was in favor of taking out the "impact fee" wording out. Chairman Pearce said that there is a difference between a reasonable fee increase to cover the expense as to what we are doing as often times impact fees are used as a means to

controlling good. The Committee decided that the list of funding sources for recreation development should be incorporated in the master plan.

Page 193 – 195 - Hendersonville Area Transportation Plan Deficiency Analysis and Recommendations (Transportation) – Skipped because not all information was complete and there will be an update by the Transportation Advisory Board at the next meeting on April 22, 2004.

Page 196 – Water and Sewer Element:

Mr. Freeman said he plans on reducing the length of this section. He plans on taking out the description of existing infrastructure

Page 204 –

Water and sewer services in the Urban Services Area should be designed to accommodate a population of approximately 90,000 persons by the year 2020. **(The Committee felt that stating a specific population number is too precise and asked to reword to take out).**

Page 205 –

Mr. Freeman said regarding the Hickory Nut Gorge section, he plans on restructuring this section as well as the whole chapter but plans on keeping this in although there is much the County can do to address this particular issue the plans to back away from specific action steps.

Page 206 –

Reword: “At present, water and sewer belonging to Rutherford County service the Towns of Lake and Chimney Rock.”

Page 207 –

Take out: ~~The essential element of leadership and vision appears to be missing in water and sewer policy, planning and development.~~

Page 208 –

Water and sewer Policies and Actions

Reword: Henderson County ~~shall assume a~~ **shall become actively involved** in a leadership role in Water and Sewer Policy and Planning.

Page 209 –

Consolidate the Actions listed because as per Mr. Waddell the concept is a joint water and sewer authority or council to develop a Countywide water and sewer master plan. Mr. Waddell added the joint water and sewer council should be defined as to what the council should be and who (specifically municipalities) would be included and what their step would be to develop a county-wide water and sewer master plan.

Page 210 –

Take out: The 2020 Henderson County Water and Sewer Master Plan should set as its target, the provision of water and sewer services in the Urban Services Area sufficient to accommodate a population of approximately 90,000 persons by the year 2020.

Use: Action SW-08 as the format

Page 211 –

Action SW-10 – Use this as part of Action SW-08.

Action SW-12 - Use this as part of Action SW-08.

Action SW-13 - Use this as part of Action SW-08.

Take out: ~~The County shall make water and sewer investments, except in the case of public health cause or economic development incentives, based on the following formula~~

Page 212 –

Combine: Action SW-14 and Action Sw-15.

Move to the Land Use Chapter: “The County shall restrict most commercial and dense residential development within Henderson County’s portion of the Hickory Nut Gorge to the Bat Cave Rural Community and the Gerton Rural Community.” (Mr. Freeman said he may take this out entirely).

Move to the Growth Management Section: Sewer and Water services development should focus upon the Urban Services Area. The extension of significant sewer and water infrastructure beyond the Urban Services should be timed to evolving capacity, demand and need.”

Page 215 - Public School Facilities Element:

Mr. Freeman mentioned he would back away from any population numbers that may be in this section. He said in general he is proposing moving toward a system of a more practical school facilities improvement planning in regard to what our population projections mean in terms of school facility needs. Our capital improvement plans and capacity needs would come afterwards. He said a school master plan would basically tell us where schools should be located in the county. He said until our capacity follows with the growth in certain areas, he feels growth should be limited. He said the capacity should meet what your development is going to introduce into the school system in terms of student body population. Chairman Pearce said if you can’t pull a building permit on property that has been subdivided and is ready to be built-upon, you are talking in terms of a moratorium. Mr. Freeman said it is in the County’s and tax payer’s interest to have a handle on school facilities development and to not always be playing catch-up. He said the County needs to develop a strategic plan for the school system that identifies what twenty-year capital improvement needs will be for school facilities and build those needs into our annual capital development plan. Selena Coffey said typically the schools have been in a reactive mode. They site schools where they see there are more kids. She said she thinks you can do that. Chairman Pearce said most districts can figure out how to do that. Mr. Waddell said he feels the only point that is valid is there needs to be more cooperation between the County Schools and the School Board so they can try to get as good a handle as they can on where growth is going to be. He added the best you can do is to guess. He said for instance, if you have a large developer come in, then those things are going to happen and you need to react to them. You can not let that developer develop unless it is a sound development. Mr. Freeman said what this means is to take out any relationship between land use regulations and school facilities dealing with population. After some further discussion Mr. Freeman said he will come up with a way to control development so we are not leading ourselves constantly in the position of over-capacity in our schools. Chairman Pearce feels over-capacity is a good sign for Henderson County and feels there has never been a case where a child has gone to school and not had a place to seat. Mr. Blair feels the County shouldn’t “hold hostage” homeowners and developers to the school system. He feels we need to put the responsibility on the County Commissioners and the school board to build the schools. Chairman Pearce said the Commissioners have very limited control over what school districts do. Chairman Pearce feels there should be a big emphasis on constantly updating school facility management program. Ms. Coffey said in response to the dialogue between the County and School Board, for the last three to four years, (just after the bond referendum came up) they had very good dialogue. She said they meet quarterly with the County’s joint school facilities group and they continue improving their relationship between the Boards. Ms. Coffey said another issue regarding the bond and the reason for not funding schools is that the school board thought there was not at an appropriate level of fund balance. She said the County has really worked hard for the last six years at improving the County’s fund balance. Ms. Coffey said the Board has, for the last two years, funded the school board almost the entire amount they requested out of the capital fund and this has held taxes down.

Page 217 –

Take out: ~~Action S-02.~~

Page 218 –

Take out: ~~Action S-03.~~

Move: Action S-04 to the Land Use element.

Growth Management Strategy:

*******NOTE: TAPE WAS NOT ON, UNTIL PAGE 234 - WENT BY NIPPY'S CHANGES UNTIL THEN. *******

Mr. Freeman said anything dealing with school elements will come out of this section.

Page 224 –

Policy GMS – 02 – Intensive Growth should be concentrated in existing urbanized areas.

(Combine this policy with Policy # 1)

Page 227 –

Under “Growth Policy Summary,” the third bullet which states:

“They should aggressively pursue the regulation and segregation of incompatible land uses and maintain a minimum standard of quality for urban development. **Committee suggested to reword this sentence or take it out. They also wanted all of the text to be condensed keeping the concept but reducing the verbiage.**

Page 228 –

Bullet that states: “Privately funded sewer and water line extensions outside of the USA should be permitted. However, the County and the Sewer Service Provider (most likely City of Hendersonville) should consider requiring that such extra-USA extensions be permitted only when it is clear (**meaning excess capacity**) that existing treatment capacities to handle the new lines exist and where such extensions compromise the ability to treat within the USA, they should not be permitted.

Committee added: County should aggressively examine land use (continually/often) to make sure they are compatible with the needs of the County.

Page 229 –

Under Growth Policy Summary:

“Population densities should be generally lower than urban concentrations of population within the Urban Services Area. Residential development density in the RTA should generally range. ”

Committee members asked to take out the numbers and condense text.

Page 230 –

Privately funded sewer and water line extensions outside of the USA should be permitted. However, the County and the Sewer Service Provider (most likely the City of Hendersonville) should consider requiring that such extra-USA extensions be permitted only when it is clear that existing treatment capacities to handle the new lines exist. **Committee asked to strike this portion out:** ~~and where such extensions compromise the ability to treat within the USA, they should not be permitted.~~

Page 231 –

Under the “Growth Policy Summary” **Committee changed the number of acres:**

“Most section of the RAA is so far from sewer services as to make the extension of such largely impossible. As such, land development regulations should recognize this by disallowing densities that would require sewer services or introduce traffic capacity problems. Residential densities

should be lower than that of the USA or RTA, and should generally range from ~~5~~ **1 to 10** acres per dwelling unit....”

Page 234 –

Take out: ~~“Identify and incorporate into Henderson County’s Land Development Code measures that link current and future school facilities capacity to development permitting.”~~

Mr. Freeman reviewed Map # 25, and he compared the 1993 Land Use Map with the draft map of the present plan. He said the Committee of 100 industrial recommendations were shown in purple and they are more precise and mentioned that he will be smoothing out the boundaries because of the size. Mr. Freeman said he would reflect the US 25 North recommendations, based on the Planning Board’s guidance. He mentioned he will try to define commercial areas in the county but not try to be too precise because of the small area planning process which will be a lot more detailed. He said he concentrated on the larger items that are important now and left out the smaller area plans. He said on the map it shows the level of growth management strategies in three levels of residential density.

Adjournment. There being no further business, Mr. Pearce and Mr. Lynch made a motion to adjourn. All members were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Tedd Pearce, Chairman,
Henderson County Planning Board

Kathleen Scanlan, Secretary

Jack Lynch, Chairman
Comprehensive Advisory Committee