

**MINUTES  
BREVARD CITY COUNCIL  
March 3, 2014 – 5:30 PM**

**Comprehensive Plan Work Session**

The Brevard City Council met on Monday, March 3, 2014, starting at 5:00 p.m. with a light dinner for the scheduled impact fees work session starting at 5:30 p.m. in City Council Chambers with Mayor Jimmy Harris presiding.

Present: Mayor Jimmy Harris, Mayor Pro Tem Mac Morrow, Council Members Charlie Landreth, Maurice Jones, Wes Dickson and Ann Hollingsworth.

Staff: City Manager Joe Moore, City Clerk Desiree Perry, Planning Director Josh Freeman and Planners Daniel Cobb and Aaron Best.

Others: Facilitator Angela Owen, TBL Leadership Partners

Press: Derek McKissock, Transylvania Times

**A. Welcome** - Mayor Harris called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. The purpose of this regular scheduled work session is for to discuss the land use section of the future Comprehensive Plan.

**B. Quorum** – City Clerk certified a quorum. All members are present.

**C. Agenda** - Mr. Landreth moved, seconded by Mr. Jones, the Agenda be approved as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

**D. Work Session Business – Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Chapter**

Mayor Harris described the Comprehensive Plan as a very important, detailed, and much thought out document that will be a valuable long-range planning and vision tool for the City.

Mr. Moore added the work on draft Comprehensive Plan will help in understanding what the City can and cannot do, and, should uncover opportunities to reach out for partnerships with perhaps the County or other organizations. Included in the materials provided is a year's worth of public comments in which one can find some central themes. Council's job is to go through to see what is and is not in the City's wheelhouse, and to then reach out for partnerships.

About two months ago Council members were provided a draft copy of the Land Use Plan Chapter in preparation for tonight's discussion. (Exhibit A) To facilitate the discussion, a large printout of the Chapter was posted along the wall for Council members

to place colored sticky-dots representing if they “disagree, have question, or agree” with the statements. Ms. Owen asked Council members to think “big picture” as throughout the work session they will review the Chapter sections (outcome, policy, actions) and asked to provide their comments, concerns or questions.

Outcome - Beginning with the drafted Chapter’s “Outcomes” (green box), Council members were asked to consider: Are these the right outcomes? Do you agree these are the desired outcomes? If you agree with them, do nothing. If you disagree, place a “red” dot indicating you disagree, and, place a “yellow” dot indicating you have a question.

Review Comments and Recommended Changes:

1. Outcome #3, Action #22 - How do we incentivize? What kind of incentives is being suggested? If City were to provide an incentive for residential, what if the unit were later changed to commercial? Do we then pull that incentive away?
2. Outcome #3, Action #26 - Is this an attainable outcome? 75% of the City’s parking is private. It is hard to commit to this without a clear (parking) plan before us.
3. Outcome #3 - Human-Scale Development”, what does that mean? Needs to either be well defined, or, find another term that communicates its meaning for the average reader.
4. Outcomes #3 and #4 - There’s a little too much overlap for them to be two distinct outcomes. Like the intent of both of them. Outcome #3 seems to be a subset of Outcome #4.
5. Outcome #4 - Label is “community aesthetics”, but the policy is to modify the UDO. Two different ideas – is the outcome a development policy or the UDO? Development must follow the UDO. It appears to be a broader view of Outcome #3. Too vague / not specific.
6. Outcome #4, Action #29 – Trying to bring about looking at a site more holistically, as a whole (front and back) and how they connect to adjacent properties. Example: Tractor Supply. A 4-lane highway with a new building that one sees the side and back of the building rather than the front of the building with its landscape.
7. Community Character – “This is what we believe about the character of Brevard.” Challenging as different areas of Brevard display different character. As an example, the ice cream shop in the Pisgah Forest area at the entrance to the Forest is in character with that area of our Community, and yet, it has a different character than downtown Brevard.
8. Are there elements of our development code that would prohibit development we’re accustomed to? Do not want to unintentionally create a situation of commercial being “all alike” or looking like every other city.
9. Recommendation: Consolidate Outcome #3 and Outcome #4
10. Outcome #5 – Development activities have tended to drive distribution and collections infrastructure placement. Gaps exist and when met could also create new development opportunities. Need a balance between development that comes to the City and thus drives where we place utilities,

- and, utilities placed to address needs that are in the community.
11. Is it a City goal to have land that is ready to roll out for development, meaning, where the infrastructure and signage is already there so that when a developer comes to look at Brevard for commercial/industrial development they can be shown some ready locations?
  12. Concern – Cannot go/grow faster than our infrastructure allows. We need to clearly articulate the City’s objectives for water treatment and wastewater treatment.
  13. Growth – High Density. Appears to be written with commercial/industrial in mind, and not high-density residential. Is that the intent? Area across from Davidson River/Pisgah Forest Elementary seems could perhaps be a prime area for high-density housing.
  14. Recommendation: Need a Chapter on Economic Development that stands on its own, with infrastructure being a major component.
  15. Recommendation: Combine Outcome #1, Policy 2 & 3 and remove the word “incentive”.

Policies & Actions – Council members were asked to consider: Are they sufficient? Will they achieve our desired outcome?

16. Outcome 1, Policy & Actions:

- a) How would we incentivize? Don’t know that we need word “incentive” written into the document. An incentive means (to most) cash on the table, get a break (tax incentives), etc. Such incentives may go away; however, we can promote, and be a resource to connect people.
- b) What if we come to an area we didn’t foresee, does the word “current” limit us? Need to maintain flexibility.
- c) Do not have a good sense of “current”. Would we not require less open space if there is a bike path running through, or a national forest really close by?
- d) Current ordinance does not give opportunity to consider location to available open-space amenities that are close by.
- e) Consider making available ability to consider nearby amenities.
- f) “Community wide stormwater” – Meaning? Brevard or Brevard and to include beyond our jurisdiction? Idea is to protect natural resources and impacts upon them. Looking towards a more “system” approach; it may not always be the best idea to require a developer to install a stormwater catch system as there may be another way to achieve good stormwater management.
- g) The word “establish” may be over-committing the City, prefer “evaluate”.
- h) “Wildlife Corridors” – Mentioned in the Outcome statement but otherwise unaddressed.

17. Outcome 2, Policy & Actions :

- a) Incentive examples. Rather than offering cash incentives, could offer increased density incentives due to steep slopes, encourage conservation easement while granting increased density, or, to allow density/increase number of stories, to name a few.
- b) Policy 7 – How?
- c) Some of the action items (LaA9-14) are meant to target built property that have some type of distress, such as, ADA issues, underlying structure issues, etc.,
- d) LaA11-14 – Questioned funding. Do not want city to get into position where we own or are having to place a lien against properties. City is not in real estate business. Liens against properties works against re-development.
- e) Throughout the City we have different capabilities for development. Using the Zaxby's Restaurant as an example, City had in place sufficient water supply for potable water for the restaurant; however, not sufficient existing at site to meet suspension requirements. Therefore, had to bore under the highway in order to achieve the required pressure. That became an "impediment" in the eyes of many for development or re-development. The former Brevard Lumber Company property may run into a similar situation.
- f) Code Enforcement – Would like to see more partnership between the Police Department and Planning Department for Code Enforcement.
- g) To what level does the city involve itself to assist an owner/developer to, for example, rehabilitate a structure? Serve as a resource to put people together, or, should the city involve themselves to the point, as an example, apply for grants/loans to hire a structural engineer to assist up to a certain point?
- h) Re-write policies. Helping property owners to address their site problems without code enforcement is a good step; however, that is not articulated in the drafted policies.

18. Outcome 3, Policy & Actions –

- a) Combine or link 3 and 4.
- b) Nothing specific in the actions that talk about walkability.
- c) Partner with entity or property owner; not city to take on the role itself.
- d) LaA21 – Redundant as it's already answered by the map.
- e) LaA25 – Trying to balance density and character at a neighborhood level; probably through a small area plan process.

19. Outcome 4, Policy & Actions –

- a) Traffic / Speed Limits – With development comes traffic, should safe neighborhood traffic concerns be covered?
- b) Three policies in one? 1. Protect character of community; 2. UDO sensitive to context, and, 3. UDO to provide flexibility.

- c) LaA27 – Can do so with new development; however, questioned ability to do so in an established neighborhood.
- d) Intent is to allow flexibility whereby a new or re-development of a neighborhood could in keeping with the established neighborhood character. To what level can this be done?
- e) UDO Chapters 5 & 12 – Generally speaking what applies on Main Street also applies on Asheville Highway & Railroad Avenue, and yet, these commercial areas are quite different in some ways as they have varied architectural styles, etc. Desire is for the regulations to recognize these differences and yet at the same time expect quality.
- f) Example: Whitmire Street. Existing neighborhood has row or mill style homes. Under present UDO Chapter 5 one could not develop or re-develop in keeping with that style. Outcome 4 desired goal is to allow one the ability to rebuild or develop new in a similar style.
- g) Desire design guidelines to allow flexibility yet at the same time not water down UDO – specifics are needed in order to insure the UDO process is fair.
- h) Recommendation – Chapter 5 of the UDO needs review.

\*\* At 8:32 PM Mr. Jones was excused from the meeting. Quorum remained.

#### 20. Outcome 5 & 6, Policy & Actions

- a) Innovation Zone (purple) – Replacement of the GI-General Industrial District. Name is intended to imply more pro-active development and target areas with investments that bring that type of development.
- b) Hard to review this without looking at the economic development component; may need to come back to revisit.
- c) Outcome #5 has zoning and infrastructure topic and one policy that addresses infrastructure. Outcome 5 & 6 bleed together; 6 is about the zoning map. Policy 11 has nothing to do with zoning and yet all of the actions have to do with zoning. Consider combining 5 and 6 and have one policy?

Land Use Map – Time did not permit detailed review of the drafted Land Use Map; will be done at a future work session.

**Work Session Feedback and Wrap-up** – Council members shared they felt the work session was productive, and offered they would like include following discussions as work continues on the Comprehensive Plan:

- Interest in seeing the differences in the 2002 and current Land Use Map; overlay of current Land Use Plan map and proposed.
- Storm Water / Utility
- Cost to developer to manage stormwater on-site?

- Implications on how the City manages stormwater and how it impacts the City's wastewater plant.
- Transportation; Infrastructure; Natural Resources

**E. Adjourn** – There being no further discussion, Ms. Hollingsworth moved, seconded by Mr. Landreth, the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Jimmy Harris  
Mayor

s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Desiree D. Perry, CMC, NCCMC  
City Clerk

Minutes Approved: April 21, 2014