

**HENDERSON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
AND THE HENDERSON COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
May 11, 2004 MEETING**

The Henderson County Planning Board and the Henderson County Comprehensive Plan (CCP) Advisory Committee met on May 11, 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, Walter Carpenter, Mike Cooper, Cindy Dabaibeh and Tommy Laughter. Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee members present were Jack Lynch, Hall Waddell, 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 and Paul Patterson were absent. Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee member Paul Prosky was absent. Also absent was Selena Coffey, Budget and Management Director.

Tedd Pearce and Jack Lynch called the meeting to order. Mr. Pearce asked for the approval of the March 9, 2004 Joint Committee Minutes. Mike Cooper made a motion to approve the minutes and Hall Waddell seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

Mr. Pearce informed the Committee that at the Comprehensive Plan Workshop with the Board of Commissioners on May 4, 2004, the Commissioners said they wanted the Committee to be briefer and wanted to see less recommendations and more specific language on the ones the Committee made in the Plan. He added that was an urge to try to get the Plan done by June 20, 2004 and therefore it will put a push on the Commissioners to speed up the public input sessions. Mr. Freeman reviewed the revised schedule for adoption of the Plan in terms of public input sessions. He said June 1<sup>st</sup> is the submission date for the Plan. He said there will be a presentation to the Board of Commissioners (Jack, Tedd, and Josh) on June 7<sup>th</sup>. On June 9<sup>th</sup> and June 10<sup>th</sup> there will be public input sessions and on June 10<sup>th</sup> there will be a meeting with the Board of Commissioners to formally discuss the Comprehensive Plan. He said finally, on June 18<sup>th</sup> the Commissioners will meet to formally adopt the Plan.

Mr. Freeman said one of the issues the Board of Commissioners brought up in the workshop was the phrasing of the document and, in particular, Commissioners Moyer and Baldwin seemed very concerned about the laid-back language in the document. Mr. Pearce noted he also felt that Commissioner Messer had the same concerns. Mr. Freeman said the Board of Commissioners felt the recommendations were too weak and wanted to see some bolder statements made. He added when Staff presented the first or second draft of the document, the recommendations were all phrased in the tone they were looking for, but at the Committee's request, we re-phrased things to be more off-handed about it. Mr. Freeman said as a group it should be decided whether you want to go with the suggestion of Commissioners Baldwin, Messer and Moyer or leave the phrasing in the tone it is at present. Mr. Pearce said he and Mr. Lynch went over the document. They cut out things they felt didn't need to be in the document. They firmed up some things that would not hurt this Committee and could get an agreement on as recommendations rather than considerations. He said the Board of Commissioners will put the document through as a recommendation and, as we go through the discussion at today's meeting, we would like to present where we think we can reach consensus as a group. Mr. Lynch added they also discussed the format of each of the issues and feels they should be more uniform so they can be more consistent. Mr. Freeman said all the suggestions that he received from Mr. Pearce and Mr. Lynch were all good and Staff is trying to incorporate the ones that seem appropriate. He said he didn't find there were any specific

changes dealing with the language or the recommendations. Mr. Pearce said they dealt only with the ones they could get consensus on. Mr. Freeman said he would like to get clear direction from this Committee as to how you want Staff to approach the phrasing on all of the recommendations, regardless whether Mr. Pearce or Mr. Lynch suggest changes or not. Mr. Pearce said they should look at it on an individual basis rather than a composite. Mr. Pearce, said as a group we could not reach consensus on specific recommendations, that we likely ought to recommend. He feels that part of it was perception as to who is doing what. From a practical standpoint, we are writing the document for the Commissioners for what they propose to be a final stage, so they are expecting it to be more specific. He feels the Commissioners would like to tone it down rather than the Committee tone it down, which he doesn't agree with it, but this is what he understands they want.

Before there was any detailed discussion about the Plan, Mr. Pearce said he feels there is too much community input illustrated in this document. He feels all public input should be prepared in some form and presented as an auxiliary document to the Board of Commissioners or made available to groups that need it and it should be available as a separate document. He added any references we make should refer people to that separate document. Mr. Pearce asked for other members' input into this and most members were in agreement. Mr. Freeman said based on last week's conversation to take almost everything in the introductory chapter regarding public input out, left a maximum one page summary. He made sure the first page of each element has a small summary of how the public input relates to the specific element. The Table of Contents would reference the document of the community meeting summary and *Designing Our Future*. Everyone else should agree with what this Committee initially wants. Mr. Pearce made a motion for the Committee to proceed in the way discussed as far as taking out the public input section. There would be a brief mention of public input and a small introductory paragraph in each section. He also moved that a separate document be prepared of all public input that was received. Vivian Armstrong and Jack Lynch seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Mr. Freeman said the way the document is drafted right now, he lays out the recommendations, and all the actions mentioned are intended to satisfy all of the recommendations. He said through the suggestion of Mr. Pearce, Mr. Lynch and Staff, they feel the Actions should be grouped with the Recommendations. He said he plans on doing this in the next draft, although there still will be some with two or three recommendations rather than just one. Mr. Pearce then started with the *Summary of all Recommendations and Actions in the CCP* as follows:

#### Economic Development Element:

After reviewing this element, the Committee felt that the E-01 Element was the most important, which reads: "Support the development of the industrial sector of the economy by implementing the recommendations of the Lockwood Greene Study." The Committee talked about changing the way the Elements and Action Steps appear in the document to better distinguish between the two. The Committee decided to take out the following Action Steps:

4. —~~"Development regional, high tech business incubator/technology training center near Asheville Regional Airport."~~

6. —~~"Develop regional workforce/entrepreneurial training consortium."~~ (This was taken out by motion from the Committee. Larry Blair made the motion and Vivian Armstrong seconded the motion.)

8. —~~"Make incentives available to non-industrial businesses, including commercial and agricultural businesses."~~

Change on Action Step 10: **Continue to** budget funds annually for economic development initiatives.

The Committee decided to change the remaining sequence of the Action Steps, making sure that Action Step #5 and #9 would be near the end of the list. Action Step #5 reading: "Identify

distressed areas of the county, and explore revitalization measures.” And Action Step # 9 reading: “Development of a Heritage Tourism Plan.” The order of the Action Steps were decided as: #1, #2, #3, #7, #9, #5, and # 10.

### Agriculture Element:

A-01 Element – Change the wording and take out “~~Provide~~ Incentives to Make Farm and Forest Enterprises More Competitive.”

A-02 Element – “Reduce Farmland Loss ~~By One Third.~~” Committee members asked to work on the rewording.

For A-03, A-04, A-05, and A-06 Elements keep, but look at the action steps.

These were the changes to the following Action Steps:

1. – “~~Ensure equal~~ **Expand** access for farm and forest enterprises assistance from economic development and tourism organizations.”

2. – Committee members felt that there should be some rewording to this action step. Mr. Carpenter said perhaps something in the terms “as good for the farmer as State law allows.”

3. – “~~Ensure~~ **Strive** for a well-prepared agricultural workforce.

5. – The Committee talked considerably about this action step which states: “Provide market counseling and marketing assistance” and felt that this action step should be consolidated with Action Step 1 and 4.

The Committee spent considerable time talking about the format of the Recommendations and the Actions section (because of the number of Action steps in the Agriculture Section) and all members agreed each Recommendation should be followed by the Action Step under it. Mr. Freeman said in Section 4 of the Plan, there will be tables of the summaries of the Recommendations and then the Action Steps following each element. This will be stated twice throughout the document.

Once, as it relates to each element, and the second time in Section 4 which summaries the table of Recommendations and Actions.

6. – 11. - Take Out.

12. – Mr. Carland said what the farmers are trying to address is the loss of so much farming. He feels anything that can be done to make the County government aware of what is taking place would be helpful. After some further discussion on this Action Step, Hall Waddell suggested the Action Step should read: “Identify ~~an agricultural proponent~~ a facilitator on County staff **or assign to Chamber of Commerce or other organizations.** After some further discussion, Ms. Cindy Dabaibeh mentioned the Joint Committee needs to be real careful about they assign to the Chamber. She doesn’t want the public to think this is something the Chamber of Commerce should be doing for us because of the small Staff the Chamber has. They would need funding for any extra work. She feels we need to be careful. Mr. Pearce said he feels the statement is safe, including the mention of the Chamber, as he feels it gives a choice.

14. – Propose a policy to protect important farmland in **publicly funded** industrial development and infrastructure decisions.

15. – ~~Modify Consider modifying~~ County and perhaps Municipal zoning and other land development codes to allow for increase in density on and off site, in exchange for permanent farmland protection.

17. – Consolidate

18. - 28 – Take Out.

Mr. Pearce said if the Committee were to prioritize them, # 12 would be the most important Action Step following Action Step # 2 and # 1.

### Natural Resources

N-01 – Although the Committee did not totally accept the fact of implementing a Flood Hazard Prevention Ordinance, they felt compelled to leave this element in but reworded to say: **Explore flood hazard mitigation measures.**

N-03 – Continue existing protection of Henderson County’s scenic vistas through better enforcement the County’s Protected Mountain Ridge Ordinance **by including it in the Land Use Ordinance. (or some other wording to that effect).**

These were the changes to the following Action Steps:

2. – 3. – Take Out.

4. – Consolidate with Action Step # 1.

11. - ~~Consider~~ **Conducting** an inventory of Historic and Culturally Significant Sites structures to ~~inform~~ **and ways to protect these sites.**

12. – Consolidate with # 11

14. – Take Out.

#### Recreation:

R-01 – Provide ~~proactive~~ cost effective recreation leadership, and meet recreation needs through 2020. The Committee felt that this should be the highest priority.

R-04 – Take out as it is initially the same as R-01.

R-05 – Consolidate with R-02 and will become an Action Step # 8.

These were the changes to the following Action Steps:

1. – The most important Action Step.

2. – Take out.

5. – After considerable discussion, rephrase.

#### Housing:

H-02 – Expand the locational options of manufactured home owners by broadening the range of zoning districts that permit manufactured homes, while at the same time, protecting adjacent property values by requiring certain aesthetics standards. – The Committee and Mr. Freeman both agreed to have this as an Action Step.

These were the changes to the following Action Steps:

1. – ~~Develop~~ **Consider** the Henderson County Strategic Affordable Housing Plan.

#### Water & Sewer:

W-02 – The County should ~~consider establishing~~ **establish** a 10-year capital improvement plan and a capital reserve fund, which is adequate to implement planned investments in water and sewer infrastructure.

These were the changes to the following Action Steps:

5. – Reword and redefine sentence: *Consider expanding the scope of the inter-local agreement to provide for the creation of a Water and Sewer Joint Management Agency (JMA).*

#### Public Schools:

After reviewing the two elements and action steps, Mr. Pearce asked, "Does the County have the ability to develop a long range school facilities master plan and establish a site selection criteria for new schools and site design criteria for all schools? Mr. Freeman said the County can do both. He added the County can require this as part of our budgeting process and as part of our Strategic Plan. After some discussion, the Committee voted to change # 1 Action Step to read: ~~Develop~~ **Require** a Long-Range School Facilities Master Plan.

Growth Management Strategy:

Mr. Freeman said some of these elements need to be changed to Action Steps.

GMS-03 – Take Out.

GMS-03 – Urban Services Area (USA) – Mr. Freeman asked the Committee whether they supported the general concept of the Urban Services Area? Mr. Pearce asked each Committee member for their thoughts on this.

Hall Waddell said he supported the concept of the Urban Services Area but not the formulas. He added he does not feel the purpose of these development areas is to limit growth, but to control where the growth should go. He said since we took out the formulas, he does not have a problem.

GMS-08, GMS-09 – Take out.

GMS-10 – Make this an Action Step.

GMS-11 – Take Out.

GMS-12 – ~~Pursue~~ **Encourage** legislation from the State, permitting Henderson County to develop a Transfer of Development Rights program. If granted, incorporate into incentives options.

GMS-13 – ~~Explore ways to limit~~ **Prohibit** the placement of additional Pre-1978 manufactured homes within the County.

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 6:30 p.m.

---

Tedd Pearce, Chairman,  
Henderson County Planning Board

---

Kathleen Scanlan, Secretary

---

Jack Lynch, Chairman  
Comprehensive Advisory Committee