

WORKSHOP AND REGULAR MEETING  
TOWN OF WAYNESVILLE  
PLANNING BOARD  
MAY 21, 2007  
MONDAY - 5:00 P.M.  
TOWN HALL

The Planning Board held a regular meeting on Monday, May 21, 2007. Members present were Don Stephenson, Dan Wright, Gary Sorrells, Lee Bouknight, Brooks Hale and Marty Prevost. Also present were Planning Director Paul Benson and Deputy Town Clerk Freida Rhinehart. Acting Chairman Gary Sorrells called the workshop meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. with the regular meeting following at 5:30 p.m.

Workshop Session - Old Business - Hillside Ordinance Amendment

Staff Report:

Background:

At the request of the Planning Board, staff has reviewed steep slope ordinances for surrounding areas including: Asheville, Boone, Buncombe County, Haywood County and Jackson County.

Overview:

Each of these ordinances was unique, and they ranged from simple grading ordinances in Haywood County to complex sets of regulations based on protecting viewsheds and geological hazard areas in Boone. Most ordinances operated like Waynesville's by limiting density and disturbed area based on slope in an identified protected area. Buncombe County's ordinance is part of its subdivision regulations so it only applies when land is being subdivided.

Specific Regulations:

Protected Area:

Waynesville – above 2900 (about 200' above valley floors)

Asheville – above 2220 (about 100' above valley floors) with 15% or greater slope, or in any residential zone with slopes over 25%

Boone – 100' above valley floor, or hazard areas on Geologic Hazard Map

Buncombe – any tract with average slope greater than 15%

Haywood – all property

Jackson – ridgetops and all property with slopes greater than 30%

Density Limitations: most ordinances limit the minimum lot size, number of residential units per acre, and the percentage of the site that can be disturbed:

Waynesville – ranges from no additional density limitation at 15% to 1 unit per 10 acres at 50% or greater

Asheville – varies by density of underlying zoning district and ranges from 7.2 units per acre in high density districts at 15% to 0.1 unit per acre in low density districts at 40% or greater slope.

Boone – regulates development with intensity standards including floor area ratio; high hazard areas are subject to a 90% reduction in intensity standards (floor area ratio, etc.)

Buncombe – ranges from .8 acre at 25% to 10 acres at 65%

Haywood – none

Jackson – ranges from 2 acres at 30% to 10 acres at 45% or greater

Grading limitations:

All jurisdictions (except Haywood) had significant limitations on the amount of the site in protected areas that could be graded based on the degree of natural slope. All jurisdictions (including Haywood) have standards on the maximum slope of cut and fill slopes. In Waynesville these standards are in the grading ordinance and apply to all areas not just to hillsides.

Other standards:

1. Asheville requires public water and sewer in protected areas. It does not allow vegetation removal except in approved grading areas. Asheville also is considering a retaining wall ordinance to require attractive retaining walls. Asheville limits the disturbed corridor width for new roads.
2. Boone has two sets of regulations based (1) on a viewshed map, and (2) on a Geological Hazard Map. The viewshed regulations are more aesthetic, while the Hazard Map regulations are more safety based. Boone's is the most complex ordinance with floor area ratios, open space ratios and other intensity limitations.
3. Buncombe's ordinance applies to land subdivision only.
4. Haywood's ordinance is essentially a grading ordinance – it applies to all land in the county and primarily establishes maximum cut and fill slopes and contains retaining wall standards. It does not control density, building height, percent disturbed or percent impervious surface. It contains no landscape or building design standards.
5. Jackson County's ordinance addresses grading restrictions such as maximum slope of cut and fill slopes, and retaining wall design. It also limits density, disturbed area and impervious surface based on slope. It requires various reports including: soils, geotechnical analysis, tree survey/reforestation and hydrology. This ordinance is similar to Waynesville's recent hillside conservation conditional use amendment.

Effect on small subdivisions with existing infrastructure:

1. Waynesville – no exception
2. Asheville – no exception
3. Boone - no exception
4. Buncombe – does not apply to exempt subdivisions (divisions of tracts of land of 2 acres or less into not more than 3 lots where no new road is required)
5. Haywood – does not address lot size or density
6. Jackson – no exception

Summary:

There are many approaches to slope regulation from basic to very complex. Waynesville's basic slope ordinance is very simple, with density and grading restrictions that are in line with those of other jurisdictions surveyed. The town's new hillside conservation conditional use amendment is very much in line with the newer ordinances that require slope maps, geotechnical assessments, limit road construction and address building design.

In response to the Planning Board's consideration of a request to amend the ordinance to relax the hillside protection standards for small steep lots well above the 2900' protected elevation with existing infrastructure the staff offers the following comments:

The primary purposes of the hillside protection standards are to protect steep hillsides from development that lead to safety, environmental, aesthetic and economic problems. Recognizing that road and utility construction would not be required certainly helps with these problems, but grading for the building, driveways and parking areas are still cause for concern. In addition, clearing existing vegetation for construction and views from the site can also cause aesthetic and environmental problems.

While aesthetics are always challenged as a basis for regulation, the fact is that clear authority exists in North Carolina for regulations based on aesthetic issues. In reality, mountain scenery is the basis of Waynesville's economy. It could therefore be argued that protection of aesthetics is of greater importance to the public welfare than the environmental and safety issues associated with steep slope development.

Given these considerations the staff recommends that this discussion could lead to some improvements in the Town's hillside protection standards:

1. Add the hillside conservation conditional use to all districts with elevations above 2900. There is no reason to limit this alternative to the Hall Top district.
2. Remove the standard that the minimum lot size must be 3 acres in the hillside conservation conditional use, so that smaller properties may take advantage of it. Change the minimum lot size to that in the underlying zoning district.
3. Provide a density bonus of 50% to developments requiring no offsite road or driveway construction, and utilizing public or private water and sewer lines with no off-site extensions required. This provision makes allowance for the lower impact of development that already has infrastructure in place.
4. Add a requirement that all new lots have a buildable area (building envelope) sufficient for the proposed use or building at a natural ground slope of 30% or less. This insures that lots have a suitable building site, and puts development on the more level portions of the site.

Mr. Benson pointed out that Waynesville is in the same situation as many other communities in our area. Waynesville has one ordinance designed to address the following areas:

1. Appearance
2. Safety
3. Environmental issues

He then referred to the staff recommendations listed above. Item #2 would allow for smaller lot size and encourage building on more level spots. #3 would allow a 50% density bonus in exchange for a reduction in land disturbing activity. About half the disturbance impact comes from utilities and roads. Item #4 would make the ordinance tighter by requiring building pads with less extreme slopes.

Dan Wright pointed out that pedestal homes can be built with very little impact. Mr. Benson said that Item #4 might offer more incentive to build such structures because the building envelope could be much smaller.

Gary Sorrells asked about the 50% density bonus in Item #3. Mr. Benson responded that if water, sewer, and roadways were already in place, the requirements for the minimum lot size could be cut in half.

Dan Wright expressed his appreciation to Mr. Benson for compiling all the necessary information to develop an ordinance amendment. He is very much in favor of Items #1-3 and feels that the state will develop

requirements regarding Item #4. Mr. Wright stated this is what he had in mind when this issue was first proposed. Don Stephenson agreed.

Lee Bouknight asked if the Jackson County ordinance applied to the entire county. Mr. Benson responded that their ordinance is only proposed at this time, but when a final ordinance is adopted, it will apply to all of Jackson County.

Brooks Hale stated that sewer and septic systems become a problem if the slope is greater than 30%.

Marty Prevost asked if existing lots would be grandfathered. Mr. Benson replied that in most cases they would be. He did continue that in some cases a developer, for example, might own 10 previously platted lots which had not been sold. Possibly, if there was not a buildable area, the lots might have to be recombined to meet the minimum lot size before they could be sold.

At 5:30p.m. the regular Planning Board meeting began.

Jack Kersten asked about private water systems listed Item #3 of the staff recommendations for the proposed changes to the hillside protection standards. Mr. Benson responded that some subdivisions have a community water system which serves several residents.

Dan Wright moved, seconded by Brooks Hale, that the Planning Board recommend the adoption of an amendment to the Hillside Protection Ordinance to the Board of Aldermen including Items #1-3 except for previously platted lots. The motion carried unanimously.

#### Approval of Minutes of April 16, 2007

Dan Wright moved, seconded by Brooks Hale to approve the minutes of the April 16, 2007 meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

#### Conditional Use Permit Application - David Damereau - Glen Meadows - 116 Thomas Park - Pigeon Street Neighborhood District (PS-ND)

##### Staff Report:

Proposed project: 55 attached single family units in 15 buildings and 1 multifamily building with 20 units.  
Location: 10 acre vacant property at corner of Pigeon Street and Thomas Park  
Zoning: Pigeon Street Neighborhood District (PS-ND)

##### Staff comments:

1. Overall project density is ok at 7.5 units per acre, up to 10 units per acre are permitted in the PS-ND
2. The Community Appearance Commission has recommended approval of this development on the condition that the following issues are corrected.

Conditions on approval:

1. The parcel identification number references for the subject property are incorrect. Buildings need to be numbered for reference on the site plan.
2. Parking space counts need to be provided for multi-family building and clearly indicated on the site plan, as per 154.306(B).
3. Street style entrances to the multi-family building's underground parking are not permitted – redesign to driveway style entrances, as per 154.302(C)(3).
4. Grade level entrances to multi-family buildings require sidewalks with front door connections to each unit. Entryways must be elevated at least 18" above sidewalks, as per 154.122(B)(8)(a).
5. A sidewalk must be provided along Thomas Park Drive from Pigeon Street to Community Housing Corporation property line as per 154.122(B)(6)(a).
6. Streets need to be named and indicated as public or private 154.309(2).
7. Driveway separations between 18 units (4-5, 8-9, 14-15, 18-19, 20-21, 22-23, 25-26, 27-28, 32-33, 34-35, 36-37, 39-40, 42-43, 45-46, 49-50, 51-52, 54-55 and 55-56) do not meet the minimum separation of 25' as per 154.122(B)(6)(c)(2).
8. The driveways for units 1, 40 and 42 do not meet the minimum separation of 70' from street intersections as per 154.122(B)(6)(c).
9. The front of building 47 is within the 20' setback from the internal lane. 154.122(B)(3).
10. Common open spaces need to be clearly labeled as such on the site plan, 154.219(C).
11. Open space covenants must be recorded providing for reservation and maintenance of open space, 154. 219(C).
12. Buildings must have a minimum of 20' separation as per 154.227(C),this is not met in 5 places: between buildings with unit numbers: (1) 30-40and 34-37, (2) 42 - 44 and 45-47, (3) 22-24 and 25-28 , (4) 48-52 and 53-56, (5)6-9 and 10-13.
13. Sidewalks along Pigeon Street must be a minimum of 8' wide, 154.307(B)(2). The street tree planting strip along Pigeon Street must be a minimum of 11' wide. The street tree planting strip along Thomas Park Drive must be a minimum of 8' wide as per 154.309(D),Table VII-3.
14. The townhouse unit elevations need complete material information, only the roofing is specified. Vinyl or metal siding is discouraged on facades facing public streets, 154.122(B)(8)(c)7.
15. The multi-family building elevations need to specify facade materials and color, there is no information on either.
16. A scale plan with the locations of lighting fixtures and a point-by-point footcandle array is required. Detailed information on lighting fixtures is also required.

Recommendation:

One difference in the recommendation of the Community Appearance Commission and Town Staff should be addressed specifically by the Planning Board: the staff recommends that a sidewalk be constructed along the length of Pigeon Street within the right-of-way of Pigeon Street toward the bottom of the bank along Pigeon Street, so that a future pedestrian link along Pigeon Street will be possible. However, the Community Appearance Commission has endorsed the sidewalk plan as submitted by the applicant which shows pedestrian traffic from Pigeon Street being routed into the development along the sidewalk along the internal lane with access to Pigeon Street on a pedestrian connection toward the south end of the project between units 13 and 14. The Planning Board should address this issue with a specific recommendation.

Staff recommends approval for this project on the condition that the above 16 items are addressed by the applicant prior to issuance of a Land Development Permit.

Paul Benson stated that this same project was reviewed in 2003 and 2004 by town boards. There are 55 townhouse units and a 20 unit condominium building. The development meets current density standards. Community Appearance recommended approval on the condition the technical issues identified by staff are corrected. The concept is good but the 16 items listed above should be corrected on the final plan.

Marty Prevost asked why the project had been delayed so long. Mr. Benson responded this is a question for the developer. The conditional use permit expires after 6 months if a building permit is not issued. Staff granted a single six-month extension but the project went well over a year without starting construction. This is a new process now even though evidence to the contrary may be presented. The project is being evaluated under the current ordinance and the 16 items listed must come into compliance.

Gary Sorrells asked about the wetlands area on the property. Mr. Benson replied that there is a Corps of Engineers protected wetlands area designated on the site. They are showing that as being reserved and there is a Corps of Engineers permit. A grading permit has been obtained from the state. Any permits they have obtained that do not have deadlines are still in force. Basically what is being considered here is the site plan and the landscape plan that are subject to our land development standards. Issues include building separations, driveway separations, items that need to be added to the plans, and sidewalk issues.

One issue has been the sidewalk. Public Works Director Fred Baker would prefer to have the sidewalk along Pigeon Street. Since the site is in a low area below the street level, it would be difficult to put a sidewalk along the street. The developers instead would like to run a sidewalk from Pigeon Street up to the entrance to the development and use the internal sidewalk for connectivity back to Pigeon Road. Community Appearance Commission did make this recommendation. Also, trees would be required along the sidewalk which would be difficult. Board of Adjustment will make the final decision on this matter, but it is up to the Planning Board to recommend such changes. There will also be a sidewalk running from Thomas Park to the new entrance. Some members of the Planning Board felt it would be better for pedestrians to walk in front of homes on a sidewalk rather than behind the homes.

Mr. Benson announced the Town has received a DOT grant for a pedestrian comprehensive plan for Waynesville. The Planning Board will be involved with this. Highway 276 (Pigeon Road) is the main north-south link through town. Mr. Benson said we will definitely need a pedestrian link along this road.

Jack Kersten said that the plans before the Planning Board took over 18 months to develop. Now his client is having to start all over. Mr. Kersten said Mr. Damereau previously had all his permits, the trees have been purchased and are sitting in nurseries, an erosion control plan has been pulled, and a stormwater management control plan was developed and all permits were issued. Now, Mr. Kersten continued, the plan must be considered as if it were brand new. Mr. Kersten disagreed in particular with Items # 7, 8, 9 and 12.

Mr. Kersten inquired about Item #4. Patrick Bradshaw, engineer, responded that this refers to the condominium unit on site. The entryways must be elevated 18"

David Damereau responded as well and pointed out drawings showing the elevations of the unit. There is an underground parking area with three pedestrian style elevators since the building will be most likely house older people. There is also access from the units to the sidewalks for walkability to trails, paths and

the public park which the developer has donated to the community. There is also access to the property next door.

Mr. Damereau addressed the issue of sidewalks and said that he would prefer that to promote connectivity and safety of the pedestrians by allowing sidewalks to go through the development rather than behind the homes next to the bank along Pigeon Street. Street trees are being stored in a nursery for planting as soon as the development is to that point and sidewalks are in place.

Mr. Sorrells asked Mr. Damereau about plans for the wetlands area. Mr. Damereau said he has a permit from the Corps of Engineers for development of that area with wildflowers, wetland plants and elevated walkways that accesses a pier so you can walk across the wetlands area and possibly even a barbeque area to be used by the residents and community as well.

Mr. Kersten also expressed concerns about the sidewalk running along Pigeon Street. Mr. Damereau agrees and added that he would like for the residents to be allowed more privacy behind their homes. Also, Mr. Damereau would like to landscape the bank behind the homes with wildflowers.

Mr. Sorrells asked Mr. Damereau if there were any items on the punch list that he could not meet. Mr. Kersten said Items 1-6, 10, 11 can be met. Items 7, 8, 9 and 12—he needs to come back to.

Regarding Item #13, Mr. Damereau said the Public Works Director told him that he would only need to allow 5 ft. for a sidewalk and 5 ft. for a planting strip along Thomas Park Drive. On Pigeon Street, Mr. Damereau would like for the sidewalk to run through the subdivision and would only have to be 5 ft. wide.

Mr. Damereau said the information has been provided for Item #14. Mr. Benson said it has not. Mr. Damereau said that Hardi-board siding will be used on the townhouses, dimensional shingle roofs will be used on all buildings, stone and rough-sawn timber frame look on the condominium, with a shake siding finish. Mr. Benson told him that it just needed to be indicated on the plan.

Mr. Kersten said that if building separations are met, driveway separations cannot be met. Mr. Benson responded that driveways could be shared. Mr. Kersten indicated that most people do not like to share driveways. Mr. Kersten referred to the amendment to Section 154.122(B)(6)(c)(2) which gives the Public Works Director and Planning Department the authority to reduce driveway separations from 50' minimum to 25' minimum. Mr. Benson said he is aware of the ordinance but the minimum separation must be 25 feet. Mr. Damereau is requesting a separation of only 18 ft. Mr. Sorrells pointed out that Town Staff only has the ability to reduce the separations to a minimum distance of at least 25 ft.

Mr. Kersten then referred to the minutes of the Board of Adjustment dated July 6, 2004 in which a Conditional Use Permit was granted to Mr. Damereau subject to a list of conditions. Mr. Kersten argued that Town Staff had the authority to vary the 25 ft. minimum.

Mr. Damereau said the units could all be combined, but the development is much more appealing and livable with the units separated. The traveled way within the development is a lane.

Marty Prevost asked why Mr. Damereau did not proceed with the development in 2004. Mr. Damereau replied it was due to economic conditions. He chose to wait until the market was better and he could make a more substantial return on his investment.

Patrick Bradshaw said that perhaps consideration was given to measuring from center line of driveways rather than from the edge of driveways to determine the 25 ft. separation. Mr. Damereau agreed.

Paul Benson explained that he was not part of the approval process, but his comments are based on ordinances and amendments as they are written. There may have been negotiated agreements, but if there were, Mr. Benson does not feel they are legal. If it is not in the printed ordinance, it is not legal. In the ordinance, it states that driveway separations are measured from the inside edge to the inside edge. Any agreements are not valid at this point.

Mr. Damereau insisted that changes have been negotiated so that the plan will work and sell.

Mr. Benson said it appears that mistakes were made by Town Staff in the issuance of the Conditional Use Permit the first time.

Mr. Kersten asked if the site plan was reviewed by the Planning Board, the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Benson informed him that the Board of Aldermen did not review or approve any plans. The considered only two specific amendments. Staff did not make detailed presentation of plans to the Board of Aldermen.

Marty Prevost asked about the use of a single driveway at the street and then splitting off to each unit. Mr. Damereau explained this would result in a great deal more impervious surface.

Gary Sorrells asked if minutes could be obtained from the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment. Mr. Sorrells suggested the item be continued until the next meeting to give applicants opportunity to meet with Mr. Benson and Mr. Baker and anyone else who needs to be involved in working out some of these issues. The Planning Board cannot approve a plan in violation of the ordinance.

Mr. Damereau said that he is just hoping for some flexibility in approval of the plan based on topography. He feels that with addition of the public park, concessions could be made by the Town.

Dan Wright pointed out the Wal-Mart and Home Depot development required a great deal of flexibility on the part of the Town to approve plans. Mr. Wright feels that this is a similar situation.

Mr. Sorrells explained that when the Planning Board votes to recommend approval on a plan that has conditions, they vote that all the conditions must be met before the plan is approved.

Don Stephenson said he feels the Town needs this kind of development and thinks it would be good for Waynesville to have these units in that area.

Marty Prevost moved, seconded by Dan Wright, to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit for Glen Meadows residential development to the Board of Adjustment on condition that the issues identified in the staff report are resolved by the developer, with the exceptions of the minimum driveway separation issue, (#7 on the staff report), which should be measured from centerline rather than the closest edges, the minimum driveway to intersection separation issue (#8) on the staff report, and the minimum building separation issue, (#12 on the staff report), which should be reduced to 10' rather than 20'. The motion carried unanimously.



Marty Prevost moved, seconded by Lee Bouknight, to recommend to the Board of Aldermen that the following amendments be considered in cluster developments:

1. Driveway separations of 25 feet minimum to be measured center line to center line.
2. Separation of buildings in cluster developments be reduced to 10 feet if all other conditions are met.

The motion carried unanimously.

ETJ Exclusion - Inglewood Court - Country Place Subdivision - Mauney Cove - Halltop Rural District - (HT-RD)

Staff Report:

Background: When the Waynesville ETJ map was prepared a point-to-point boundary description was used in places resulting in many split properties. The subject property is an example of one such property. Approximately 3 acres of the 39 acre tract are within Waynesville's ETJ while the majority of the property is not.

The applicant, Ralph J. McClendon, has requested that this section of his property be excluded from Waynesville's ETJ so that it may be developed in the same manner as the majority of the property – as a low density single-family residential subdivision.

Recommendation: This area is included in Waynesville's long range land development plan. It is indicated as a future land use as "rural" and is shown outside of the town's urban services area.

The staff has presented a map to the Town Board of Aldermen showing a proposed expansion of the town's ETJ that would use property lines, streets and other features as boundaries. The proposed expansion would include all of Mauney Cove, but no action has been taken.

Until the time when the Town Board wishes to undertake a more comprehensive expansion of the ETJ into Mauney Cove with more clearly defined boundaries, the staff sees no reason to retain this relatively small portion of land that splits the applicant's property and therefore recommends that this request be approved.

Mr. Benson said that the ETJ is just catching a small percentage of this entire tract. There are some other properties that have been split. The Town would not accomplish anything by trying to regulate such a small piece of property. A new ETJ map has been submitted to the Board of Aldermen for consideration which follows property lines. They have not taken action on that at this time.

Marty Prevost moved, seconded by Dan Wright, to recommend approval of the exclusion from the ETJ. The motion carried unanimously.

Text Amendment Application - Harold McClure - 17365 Great Smoky Mountain Expressway - South Waynesville Neighborhood District - (SW-ND)

Staff Report:

The applicant owns property within the South Waynesville Neighborhood District (SW-ND) that adjoins and is accessed from the Smoky Mountain Expressway.

A limited range of office and institutional uses are currently permitted within the SW-ND only on properties that abut Old Balsam Road. The applicant is requesting that this provision be expanded to include properties that abut and have direct access to the Smoky Mountain Expressway.

It appears that only about 3 or 4 other relatively small properties have a similar situation in the SW-ND abutting the Expressway with direct access.

Staff Recommendation:

Given that the requested amendment would have little impact on the development pattern in the SW-ND, that NCDOT would be unlikely to approve any new driveway connections to the expressway and that property in this situation would not be highly desirable for residential use the staff recommends that this amendment be approved.

Lee Bounknight moved, seconded by Brooks Hale, to recommend approval of the Text Amendment to the Board of Aldermen. The motion carried unanimously.

Rezoning Request - Sylva Church of Christ - from Raccoon Creek Neighborhood District to Raccoon Creek Neighborhood Center

Staff Report:

Vision/Goals: The Raccoon Creek Neighborhood District is planned to be a residential gateway into town with a range of residential densities. The Raccoon Creek Neighborhood Center is planned to be a gathering place for east Waynesville neighborhoods and to develop with a small scale mixed use pedestrian friendly pattern.

2020 Land Development Plan: indicates that this property is within a medium to high density residential development area.

Utility service: water and sewer service is available to this property.

Street access: Asheville Road/US Highway 23 Business

Zoning pattern: This property is within and bordered by the Raccoon Creek Neighborhood District to the west side of Asheville Road. Directly across Asheville Road is the Raccoon Creek Neighborhood Center District.

Surrounding development: This property borders a grandfathered commercial use to the south, residential is to the west and north and commercial uses to the south across Asheville Road.

Recommendation: This property is directly on a major thoroughfare with mixed use commercial zoning directly across the thoroughfare. Just to the north of this property a land use pattern was established by a recent text amendment that opened the block of property within the district fronting Asheville Road from Zemery Lane to Hillside Terrace to a limited range of business, professional and personal services.

A rezoning of this property to the Raccoon Creek Neighborhood Center District would create an arbitrary zone boundary and would potentially expose the residential development on the west side of Asheville Road to a range of intensive commercial uses permitted within that district. Instead, the staff recommends that the location standard for business, professional and personal services be amended to extend from Zemery Lane to Piccadilly Drive. This would permit some lower intensity non residential uses, and would be consistent with the amendment made for property to the north side of Zemery Lane.

Paul Benson said this structure is located near the roundabout. It is an institutional building where the church met. Next door is a commercial building. It is in a high traffic area. Rather than rezoning, Mr. Benson is suggesting extending the location standard for business, professional and personal services from Zemery Lane to Piccadilly Drive. This would only involve a few properties.

Wallace Bembry and Max Holland were present from Sylva Church of Christ. They had no objection to Mr. Benson's proposal. They just want to sell the building and feel that it would be best marketed as a commercial property.

Lee Bouknight moved, seconded by Don Stephenson, that the location standard for business, professional and personal services be amended to extend from Zemery Lane to Piccadilly Drive. The motion carried unanimously.

#### Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned by consensus at 7:25 p.m.

---

Gary Sorrells  
Acting Chairman

---

Freida F. Rhinehart  
Secretary