

**PLANNING BOARD LDC  
SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
January 30, 2006**

The Planning Board LDC Subcommittee met on January 30, 2006 at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the Land Development Building, 101 East Allen Street, Hendersonville, NC. Members of the Subcommittee present were Mike Cooper, Renee Kumor and Tedd Pearce, Chair. Others present included Judy Francis, Planning Director; Matt Card, Planner; Anthony Prinz, Planner; Matt Cable, Planner; Autumn Radcliff, Planner; Kathleen Scanlan, Secretary; and Chuck McGrady, Commissioner and Liaison to the Planning Board. Also attending was Planning Board member Mark Williams.

Mr. Pearce called the meeting to order, stating that a meeting we had with Commissioner McGrady and Ms. Francis, resulted in forming a subcommittee to iron-out some of the issues the Planning Board had in a smaller group, forward them on to the Planning Board and have these changes forwarded to the Commissioners.

Format Issues.

Ms. Francis said one of the reoccurring comments we hear is that the Code is hard to read and understand. She stated in order to clarify some of these issues we are suggesting some changes in some of the Articles. She stated that the first Article changed would be Article IV, which is the supplemental regulations, which is a catch-all between site plan requirements, mobile home park standards, cell tower guidelines, planned development guidelines and other issues. Talking with Mr. Pearce, we felt that they need to be better organized, but by splitting all of the subjects mentioned into separate articles making it easier to navigate. Ms. Francis said that Staff is suggesting that we move the appendices out of the appendix section and into their appropriate sections in the body of the main document. Mr. Pearce said that regarding the checklists, he feels they should be left in the appendices part so that they can be easily changed to meet the Planning Department's needs. He also stated that he feels strongly that Appendix one should be in the body of the document. After further discussion, Ms. Francis said that she would talk with the County Attorney about moving the appendices of the document and discuss the pros and cons of that action.

Ms. Francis asked the Board to look over the recent density tables and how they can be displayed. She asked the members, "How do we organize the information to make it easy for people to understand what we are talking about." Mark Williams said that most people think of it in terms of how many dwellings per acre, not how many acres per dwelling and suggested perhaps using this option. Discussions were had on using fractions rather than decimals in the table. Staff stated that they would work on this and bring something back to reflect these changes at the next meeting. Mr. Cooper suggested that in Table 3.1, to not abbreviate in the section *average residential density ac/du* and rather spell it out to say "acres per dwelling unit." Also, Mr. Cooper had a question regarding the notes under the density table, note 3, which states "maximum residential density shall be applied to conservation subdivisions, planned developments and developments which include twenty-five percent of dwelling units as affordable housing." He said, "in other words you can get a bonus, is that a bonus if you put twenty-five percent as affordable housing or what was the intent of that?" Ms. Francis said that it wasn't just affordable housing; she was encouraging a density bonus if you do that. Ms. Kumor said that there are different ways to get density bonuses. Board members