

Present: Vice-Mayor R. Carl Mumpower, Presiding; Councilwoman Terry M. Bellamy (excused from meeting at 5:50 p.m.); Councilman Jan B. Davis; Councilwoman Diana Hollis Jones; Councilman Brownie W. Newman; City Manager James L. Westbrook Jr.; City Attorney Robert W. Oast Jr.; and City Clerk Magdalen Burleson

Absent: Mayor Charles R. Worley and Councilman Joseph C. Dunn

CONSENT AGENDA:

Grant Applications for Montford Complex and Aston Park

Summary: The consideration of two resolutions authorizing the Mayor to apply for a grant and enter into an agreement with the N.C. Dept. of Environment and Natural Resources to assist with the renovations of the Montford Complex and Aston Park.

Funds are available through the N.C. Dept. of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Parks and Recreation in the North Carolina Parks and Recreation Trust Fund (PARTF) to assist with the development of parks and greenways.

The renovation of Aston Park has been identified as a priority by the community at large and by the tennis community. For many years, the Dick Covington Foundation raised money to help build a new tennis center at the park. The City of Asheville now holds \$260,000 from the Covington Foundation to help build the tennis center. In anticipation of the park transfer as part of the Water Agreement, Parks and Recreation wishes to pursue grant funds to renovate the park including construction of a new the tennis center, and renovation of the playground, trails and basketball court.

The Montford Complex is in the heart of the Montford neighborhood and the most heavily used park featuring the Montford Center and the surrounding park. The center and features in the park are in need of renovation and in some cases complete replacement in order to meet safety and handicap accessibility requirements. The Parks and Recreation Department wishes to pursue grant funds to renovate the park including improvements to the center, new amphitheater, playground, ball field lights, ropes course and basketball courts.

The Parks and Recreation Department is requesting \$260,000 in grant funds for renovation of Aston Park, and \$150,000 for renovation for the Montford Complex from the N.C. Parks and Recreation Trust Fund. Each grant application requires a dollar for dollar cash match. The cash match for renovation of Aston Park is available in the Parks and Recreation Department's existing Capital Improvement Project budget via the Dick Covington Foundation. The cash match for the Montford Complex renovation is in the proposed Parks and Recreation Department's Fiscal Year 2005-06 Capital Improvement Project budget.

The Reid Center renovation, a top Capital Improvement Project priority, is not being considered for the 2005 PARTF funding cycle, but will be a PARTF application in January 2006. The PARTF awards up to \$500,000 requiring a dollar for dollar cash match. The Reid Center fundraising team wishes to apply for the full amount but at this time the cash match is not available. By 2006, the first year of fundraising will be complete and matching funds will be in place to apply for the full amount.

This action complies with City of Asheville Strategic Operating Plan, Council Focus Area: Natural and Built Environment, Goal 2: Increased greenway benefits equitably throughout

-2-

Asheville – Continue to implement and develop greenways that enhance quality of life for Asheville.

Pros:

- The trail in the Aston Park renovation will link densely populated neighborhoods near downtown Asheville to the Clingman Forest Greenway Corridor, which will connect to the French Broad River Greenway Corridor.
- Continue to make progress on the Parks and Recreation Department's strategic plan to renovate and improve Montford Complex.
- Respond to public demand to improve Aston Park.
- Be ready to manage Aston Park upon transfer from Buncombe County.
- Raise outside funds to support facility renovations and reduce reliability on City funds to support Capital Improvement Project cost.

Cons: None noted

- The Parks and Recreation Department recommends the City of Asheville apply for and enter into an agreement for grant funds through the North Carolina Parks and Recreation Trust Fund for \$260,000 for renovation of Aston Park, and for \$150,000 for renovation of the Montford Complex.

Parks & Recreation Director Irby Brinson responded to several questions/comments from Councilwoman Bellamy, some being, but are not limited to: how did we chose which centers would be renovated with this grant; when is the Reid Center scheduled for renovation; how is the staff structuring in the Reid Center progressing; and what is the update with the church property.

Exchange of Property at Beaverdam Reservoir

Summary: The consideration of a resolution authorizing the City Clerk to publish a notice regarding the exchange of an easement on real property located on Black Oak Drive for an easement on real property located on Pinecroft Road.

- The City and Mr. & Mrs. Fulton H. Beville have negotiated an exchange of a driveway easement over the Beaverdam Reservoir property (PIN No. 9751.17-10-7654) on Black Oak Drive for a slope/fill easement across real property located on Pinecroft Road (PIN No. 9751.17-10-9594).

At the time that the Beaverdam Reservoir was built a substantial amount of fill was placed on the Beville's property thereby allowing a cost savings to the City and providing lateral support to the reservoir site maximizing the use of the property. The Beville's were not compensated for the use of their property, but instead understood that the use of the reservoir access road would be available to them to access a portion of their property not easily accessible from Pinecroft Road because of topography.

A formal arrangement has not been in place heretofore, but it is advisable to formalize the arrangement through an exchange of easements which will satisfy the City's need to keep the fill in place as well as the Beville's need to access their property.

The driveway easement would be 12' wide and about 350' long comprising an area of 4,200 square feet. Based on the tax value of the land per square foot (.92), at a 50% easement value, the driveway easement would have a value of \$1,932. Water Resources staff estimates that the benefit to the City of having the fill in place would equal or exceed the value of the driveway easement.

-3-

The use of the driveway by the Bevilles will not impair the function nor security of the reservoir, but could improve security to the extent that the Bevilles would be able to observe the reservoir site.

The positive aspects of the transaction are:

- The exchange will be a fair exchange of value for value.
- It will establish record title in the City of the right to have the fill area remain on the Beville's property.
- It will establish a clear description of the size and location of the driveway easement.
- It will formalize the arrangement thereby reducing the likelihood of future misunderstandings.

The negative aspects are:

- The driveway easement will limit the use of the reservoir property within the easement area.

Approval of the resolution will initiate the exchange of the properties through the process provided in N. C. G. S. 160A-271.

- Planning & Development staff and Water Resources staff recommend adoption of the resolution authorizing the City Clerk to publish a notice regarding the exchange of an easement on real property located on Black Oak Drive for an easement on real property located on Pinecroft Road.

New Street Name of "Owen Bells Lane"

Summary: The consideration of a resolution accepting the new proposed street name "Owens Bell Lane."

Mountain Housing Opportunities, Inc., owner of lots on Owens Bell Lane off of Clingman Avenue has petitioned the City of Asheville to accept the street name "Owens Bell Lane." The new street will begin at Clingman Avenue and end at Rector Street.

City staff recommends adoption of the resolution accepting the new street name of "Owens Bell Lane."

Governor's Crime Commission Grant for 800 MHz Radios

Summary: The consideration of a resolution to apply for and enter into an agreement with the North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety for funds through the Governor's Crime Commission to assist with the purchase of 800 MHz VIPER-compliant radios for Asheville Fire Rescue and Asheville Police Departments.

Public safety agencies in WNC experienced a serious need for interoperability in their communications systems when mutual aid services were provided during the historic flooding of 2004. In response to this need, several public safety agencies from Asheville and Buncombe County are collaborating to establish an interoperable communication system, which will ensure a better communication link among all agencies. In addition to promoting efficient disaster response, an interoperable system will be an important component of terrorism prevention.

To support this system, Asheville Fire Rescue and Asheville Police Departments are partnering with other agencies (Buncombe County Rescue, Buncombe County Sheriff, Buncombe

-4-

County Emergency Services, Enka Fire, Haw Creek Fire, Reynolds Fire, Riceville Fire, Skyland Fire, Swannanoa Fire, and West Buncombe Fire) to apply for a \$492,800 grant from the Governor's Crime Commission to purchase a total of 127 radios to be distributed among the participants. Asheville will assume lead responsibility in applying for the grant and purchasing all radios, including radios for our partner agencies. The grant requires a 25% match of the total cost (\$492,800), or \$123,200. The cost of the match will be shared by all participating agencies based on the number of radios each receives. The City's net cost is expected to be \$61,300; it will come from the City's fund balance.

This action coincides with the City of Asheville's Strategic Operating Plan under the focus area of Partnerships To Improve Critical Services & Infrastructure, goal #3: Explore ways for the City and County to work together to share in regional infrastructure investment needs.

Pros

- This project will help develop in WNC the statewide voice interoperable network including 800 MHz radios, in collaboration with the Voice Interoperability Plan for Emergency Responders (VIPER) that has been established by the state of NC.
- The public safety agencies listed are committed to interoperability and have agreed to participate in the project and to match 25% of the cost of the radios.
- The project will improve public safety in Asheville and Buncombe County by enabling WNC emergency responders to communicate with each other and with others across the state.

Cons

- The cost of the match.

The Fire Rescue and Police Departments recommends the City of Asheville apply for and enter into an agreement for grant funds to assist with the purchase of the radios.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower asked that the record show that City Council received this information and instructed the City Manager to place these items on the next formal City Council agenda.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE'S RECOMMENDATION

Vice-Mayor Mumpower said that Councilman Dunn has requested that this item be postponed until the February 15, 2005, worksession in his absence.

Upon inquiry of Councilwoman Bellamy, Mr. Summey said that the blue items are recommendations that will require additional input and decisions by City Council. Those recommendations will also require additional citizen and industry input to finalize any changes to the ordinances or the processes. The items in green and white are items that City staff has already implemented.

Councilman Newman felt that the recommendations, in particular the ones regarding land use policies in the community, need to have a broader public input prior to City Council input and recommendation.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower felt it would be useful to have a representative from the Task Force at the worksession for a resource.

Building Safety Director Terry Summey thought it was appropriate to review the recommendations with City Council first for guidance in case City Council is not interested in pursuing a recommendation or may wish to change a recommendation. He said that the recommendations requiring Council consideration will include other public input sessions, e.g., (1)

-5-

any Unified Development Ordinance amendments will require a public hearing before the Planning & Zoning Commission and a public hearing before City Council; and (2) any amendment to the Standard Specifications and Details Manual is reviewed by a citizens group, prior to it being considered by City Council.

Discussion then followed on the process to be followed either prior to the worksession or after the worksession regarding public comment.

Council expressed their concern that they are reaching into areas that they didn't originally intend for the Task Force to reach into (land use planning vs. operational issues) and it has created complications on how to proceed. Therefore, it was the consensus of City Council to (1) instruct City staff to hold a public input session on the entire recommendations prior to the worksession; (2) invite members of the Task Force to the worksession as a resource; and (3) instruct the City Manager to report back to Council, after meeting with Mayor Worley, about how to proceed.

Councilwoman Bellamy moved to continue this item to the February 15, 2005, worksession. This motion was seconded by Councilwoman Jones and carried unanimously.

STAFF PRESENTATION ON UPDATE OF CAMPUS CREST

City Attorney Oast said that there has been a lot of observations about what is going on the Campus Crest site. The purpose of Planning & Development Director Scott Shuford's report is to assimilate those comments and respond to those in a structured fashion to Council. He pointed out that vested rights, under this conditional use permit have attached, and any action that Council takes that could lead to a reduction, modification or revocation of them could only occur following notice and opportunity to be heard by the developer. Depending on the nature of the action, it might require a quasi-judicial hearing.

Mr. Shuford said that this is a report to City Council addressing the buffer issue along Montford Avenue regarding the Campus Crest development.

After approval of the conditional use permit for the Campus Crest development in the Montford neighborhood, construction of the project began under a grading permit. As part of this construction, grading occurred near the Montford Avenue frontage of the project.

This area of the site was specifically covered under a condition of the conditional use permit that reads: *A landscape buffer containing the equivalent landscape material as a Type-A buffer should be provided along the Montford Avenue frontage; in addition, on-site tree retention shall be in accordance with the master plan provided by the developer.*

Concern has been expressed that the grading is inconsistent with either (or both) the permit condition or the statement made by the developer early in the conditional use permit hearing that indicated that an 80-foot strip of undisturbed vegetation would be retained.

Staff relies on the wording of the conditional use permit to ascertain compliance with the permit, not statements made in public hearings. The developer has disseminated the attached press release that describes site conditions that warranted tree removal in excess of his comments at the Council meeting. How Council might choose to address this is a separate issue.

Much of the discussion to date centers on whether the "buffer" requirement has been met. A Type A buffer is 15 feet in width and, along a frontage the length of the subject property, would contain 34 evergreen trees, 12 large-maturing deciduous trees, 12 small-maturing deciduous trees and 46 shrubs (75% which must be evergreen species). Staff will require the

installation of these plants prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any building on the site. These plantings are in addition to the 27 evergreen trees that have already been planted at developer initiative based on Tree Commission comments from the Technical Review Committee meeting that followed Council action.

The site plan in City Council's packet at time of conditional use permit consideration illustrates that existing vegetation would be retained in an area comprising roughly one-half of the property's Montford Avenue frontage. This vegetation is not specifically dimensioned but is shown as varying in depth, becoming much deeper near the Klondyke Homes side of the property as it transitions into the setback area on that side of the site. Current site conditions are similar to this plan from the Klondyke Homes side to roughly halfway to the end of the vegetation; from that point, the vegetation becomes more narrow but has been supplemented by the additional tree plantings. Retaining walls have been removed from the plan, allowing building roof heights to be lower than originally proposed from Montford Avenue, lessening the potential for visual impact from that viewing angle. Staff feels that if the intent of the condition was to ensure a thorough screening of the site from this area of Montford Avenue, once the buffer plants are installed and mature, the condition will be satisfied.

Councilman Newman said that after reviewing the Council meeting tape where the conditional use permit was issued, the developer seemed to be so explicit in terms of his discussion of the buffer that would be on Montford Avenue. Mr. Harnett, who was representing the developers, said that "I'm not sure you will ever get a true site line on the property from Montford because we are going to be keeping the existing 80-foot tree buffer along Montford." When Mr. Sneed, attorney representing the developers, asked Mr. Harnett "from the houses across the street on Montford will you be able to see this property at all?" Mr. Harnett showed a photograph of a view from the westernmost home across the street from the property line. When Mr. Sneed asked "Does your plan envision cutting any of those trees?" Mr. Harnett replied "no sir." Mr. Harnett showed other photographs and repeated that their plan did not envision cutting any of the 80-foot existing forest buffer. There were also other illustrations at the Council meeting that appeared to represent a pretty large buffer all along Montford Avenue.

Mr. Shuford agreed that the statements made by the developer was confusing. He said City staff can only follow what the conditional use permit states in trying to enforce the requirements.

Councilman Newman said that the conditional use permit states "A ... Type-A buffer ... along Montford Avenue frontage; in addition, on-site retention shall be in accordance with the master plan provided by the developer." In reviewing the tape of the Council meeting, one of the exhibits submitted showed an extensive buffer all along Montford Avenue. That, in conjunction with the developer's statement very clearly that their plan calls for an 80-foot existing forest buffer, creates the strong impression that the site plan included the 80-foot buffer.

Councilman Newman suggested City Council give direction to City staff to talk to the developers and ask them if they would be willing to sit down with people in the neighborhood and talk about what might be a reasonable way to move forward. Obviously we won't be able to fully replace the mature forest buffer that was clear-cut or the aesthetic values, economic values or environmental values of that mature forest buffer, but there might be some ways to mitigate some of the other impacts of the project. He felt that it would make sense for the neighborhood to designate a couple of representatives to represent their concerns to the developer.

Mr. Shuford felt that the developer would be receptive to a voluntary meeting with the neighborhood and his development team to talk about possible mitigating actions that can be taken. We certainly would want to schedule that to occur fairly quickly to preserve other options for City Council.

Councilwoman Jones wanted to feel more confident that our conditions are enforceable and that the people that are given the trust of this Council to do something are not making too much of a subjective call. Mr. Shuford said that staff will be bringing some code amendments to Council to streamline enforcement and make it more effective.

There was discussion, initiated by Councilman Davis, about the site adjacent to the property being used for fill dirt. Mr. Shuford said that there is a provision in our Code that requires developments that are within a certain distance of each other, that are basically done by the same people, that occur within a 3-year timeframe have to be treated as a simultaneous development. If we had a building that was going onto that site, then we would have grounds to pursue that as a violation. Unfortunately it was just a fill site and had we known about it ahead of time, we would have asked that it be part of the application, but we didn't find out about it until after the work had started.

Upon inquiry of Councilwoman Bellamy, Mr. Shuford said that we can (1) toughen up our section that deals with the consecutive development of property in close proximity; and (2) look at landscape standards and see that in the cases where we do have this type of mature vegetation, that we can look at the possibility of requiring some retention of a wider area.

Regarding the conditional use permit condition regarding landscaping, Mr. Shuford said that the 4-5 hour public hearing mostly surrounded traffic, parking and site access. As a result of all that, and in part of the developer's earlier discussion about existing vegetation, he didn't think he did as good a job as he could have in making sure that everyone understood what was likely to happen in that area. That is an area he will improve on and do a better job of that in the future. In addition, we have some computer imaging capabilities which we will, over time, be able to superimpose a building on a site. If an area is sensitive, we may also request the developer to provide that information to Council in order to give as accurate picture as possible.

City Attorney Oast said that there is a difference between expectations and requirements. What Council is struggling with is that the conditional use permit requirements are somewhat less than what Council was led to expect would occur in the development of this project. He said there has been no determinable violation but we are going to look into the issue of the expectations that Council had to see if there is anything that can be done to address what has occurred. One of the things that could be clarified in the discussion between the staff, the neighborhood and developer is not so much what is there now, but what will be there when the project is finished.

Mr. Shuford suggested that his next step be to immediately discuss with the developer the possibility of holding a neighborhood meeting to see if they can find some way to mitigate the issue to match the expectations with what is actually happening. He will get with Councilman Newman to help him get people from the neighborhood who would want to attend, unless Council thinks it should be anyone who wants to attend. He personally thinks it may be more effective to limit it to a smaller number. Then, after the meeting he will report back to Council with the results. Then Council can decide whether they are satisfied with that or if they want to pursue other options – but some of those are time limited and we would want to hold this meeting as quickly as possible so as to not preclude Council being able to be flexible in taking whatever action Council wants to take.

Upon inquiry of Councilwoman Bellamy, City Attorney Oast said that we can only enforce the conditional use permit, not what was said at the public hearing.

Councilman Newman felt there is a good case to be made that the developer is in violation right now of the conditional use permit based on the evidence they submitted to City Council under oath at the quasi-judicial meeting.

-8-

City Attorney Oast said that our staff has investigated the complaints received by them to date and determined there has been no violation. City Council can appeal that determination to the Board of Adjustment. If Council is going to do that, that is a decision that needs to be made by Council acting as a body and should probably be done with the opportunity for the developer to be heard. Mr. Shuford noted that the appeal to the Board of Adjustment is one of the options that has a time limitation on it. Basically, 30 days from today (when Council has been formally notified that staff doesn't think there is a violation) is Council's window to take that action, which is why we think it would be appropriate to very quickly get the developer in and have that neighborhood meeting.

It was the consensus of City Council to have staff immediately talk to the developers and ask them if they would be willing to sit down with representatives from the neighborhood and talk about what might be a reasonable restitution for this project to move forward. After said meeting, Mr. Shuford will report back to Council.

It was Councilman Newman's hope that the developer and neighborhood can reach a reasonable compromise. If not, he did want this to come back to Council and will welcome the opportunity for the developers to talk to us about what happened here and for them to explain themselves. Then Council can consider appealing this decision to the Board of Adjustment or taking other courses of action that may be available to them.

UDO AMENDMENT REVIEWS

City Attorney Oast said that these Unified Development Ordinance amendments are being brought before City Council in order that staff may respond to questions Council may have prior to the public hearings, which have been scheduled on January

25, 2005. He advised Council that it would be inappropriate for Council to receive comments from the public at this worksession.

Notice of Violation Procedures

Urban Planner Julia Cogburn said that this is the consideration of an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of changing the notice of violation procedures to allow notification and citation of property owners for tenant noncompliance.

Article XVIII of the City of Asheville's UDO sets forth procedures for enforcing the provisions set forth in the ordinance. The section (Sec. 7-18-3) dealing with procedures for notice of violation and the issuance of citations currently provides that notifications go to the person in violation and only if that person cannot be ascertained shall the notification be sent to the owner of the property on which the violation is occurring. The ordinance makes no provision for notifying and holding a property owner responsible when their tenant is non-compliant with the city's ordinances. In practice, there have been a number of instances where a tenant has failed to comply and notification of the property owner has brought quick results. The City Attorney's office, in working with the enforcement staff of the Planning and Development Department, has suggested that a provision be added to the ordinance that clearly allows for this additional measure to gain ordinance compliance.

The amendment has been routed to CAN, CREIA, and CIBO for review and comment.

Pros-

- The amendment provides a mechanism for improving the effectiveness of gaining compliance with the ordinance.

-9-

Cons-

- The amendment may create conflicts between property owners and tenants.

The Asheville Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of this code amendment on January 5, 2005, by a unanimous vote of 7-0. Staff recommends approval as well.

Ms. Cogburn responded to questions from Councilwoman Bellamy about whether the property owner or tenant would be liable for fines.

Proposed Group Home Changes

Mr. Joe Heard, Director of Development Services with the Planning & Development Department said that this is the consideration of an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of correcting and clarifying zoning districts that allow group homes as a use of right, subject to special requirements.

This proposed ordinance amendment is intended to correct an error made in the UDO that lists "Group homes" as uses by right, subject to special requirements in the RM-6 and RM-8 districts. Presently, the standards for these two districts lists "Group homes" as both uses by right, subject to special requirements and conditional uses. As presented and discussed during a UDO amendment adopted by City Council in August, 2003, the intent was for group homes to be conditional uses in the RM-6 and RM-8 districts. The proposed amendment would eliminate the words "Group homes" from the listing under uses by right, subject to special requirements.

This proposed amendment has been forwarded to CAN, CIBO, and CREIA.

Pros –

- This amendment would correct the UDO to comply with City Council's intentions when adopting UDO requirements for group homes in August, 2003.
- This amendment would clarify the UDO for anyone seeking to know where group homes are allowed.

Cons –

- None

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of these code amendments on December 1, 2004, by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the UDO for the purpose of correcting and clarifying zoning districts that allow group homes as a use of right, subject to special requirements.

Development Projects Scheduling Changes

Mr. Joe Heard, Director of Development Services with the Planning & Development Department said that this is the consideration of an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance to expedite the development approval process by allowing development projects to be scheduled for review by the Planning & Zoning Commission prior to consideration by the Technical Review Committee (TRC).

This proposed ordinance amendment is intended to expedite the development approval process by allowing projects to be scheduled for review by the Planning & Zoning Commission prior to consideration by the TRC. Presently, this section states that a project cannot be scheduled for a Planning & Zoning Commission meeting until after review and approval by the

-10-

TRC, which can place unnecessary restraints on time-sensitive projects. To help expedite the development review process in certain circumstances, staff is requesting this amendment to allow greater flexibility in scheduling applications for Planning & Zoning Commission review.

This amendment does not propose to change the number of required meetings, nor does it propose to change the order of the process. So, it does not limit opportunities for public review or comment in any way.

This proposed amendment has been forwarded to CAN, CIBO, and CREIA.

This amendment would be one step toward meeting the goal of improving the plan review process outlined in City Council's adopted Strategic Operating Plan.

Pros –

- This amendment would help to expedite the review of development projects in certain situations.
- This amendment is consistent with the City Council's adopted Strategic Operating Plan.

Con –

- This amendment may be viewed by certain people as an attempt to "fast track" projects and limit public review.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of these code amendments on December 1, 2004, by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the UDO to expedite the development approval process by allowing development projects to be scheduled for review by the Planning & Zoning Commission prior to consideration by the Technical Review Committee.

Reducing Window Sizes and Buffer Changes in the Neighborhood Corridor District

Mr. Joe Heard, Director of Development Services with the Planning & Development Department said that this is the consideration of an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of reducing the amount of windows required on the front and side facades of buildings in the Neighborhood Corridor District and to allow alternative forms of landscape buffering to better accommodate development in the Neighborhood Corridor District.

The Neighborhood Corridor District (NCD) was adopted by City Council in November of 2002 for the purpose of accommodating medium-density, mixed-use development in appropriate areas throughout the City of Asheville. Since this District was created, staff has been looking for opportunities to evaluate if the design and development standards are effective and reasonable. Evaluation of several recently proposed projects leads staff to believe that the current standards for landscaped buffers, building setbacks for taller buildings, and the amount of windows (60%) required on first floor facades are overly restrictive.

After reviewing these requirements, staff is recommending that a landscaped buffer ten feet (10') wide with the provision of a fence eight feet (8') in height be allowed as an alternative to landscaped buffer requirements in the NCD. Alternative landscaping solutions could also be approved by the Planning Director to provide appropriate buffers in unusual situations. In addition, staff is recommending the elimination of a forty-foot (40') setback requirement for buildings of four stories. The intent of these proposed amendments are to allow greater flexibility during site development.

-11-

Staff is also proposing new standards of 45% window coverage for front facades and 40% windows for side street facades. The intent of this standard is to have buildings constructed with more traditional, first floor storefront windows. The proposed amendment offers more flexibility for developers while still meeting this intent.

This proposed amendment has been forwarded to CAN, CIBO, and CREIA.

Pros –

- These amendments would offer greater flexibility and encourage future development within the NCD district.
- The buffer amendment would allow staff to find creative solutions for providing appropriate buffers against adjacent residential properties.

Cons –

- It is hoped that these amendments will promote multi-story, mixed-use development along key corridors. Certain people perceive this type of development to be incompatible with adjacent residential areas.
- Certain people may also prefer a firm standard to the allowance of flexible options for landscaped buffers.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of these code amendments on December 1, 2004, by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of reducing the amount of windows required on the front and side facades of buildings in the Neighborhood Corridor District and to allow alternative forms of landscape buffering to better accommodate development in the Neighborhood Corridor District.

Rounding Up Figures when Calculating Multi-Family Residential Densities

Mr. Joe Heard, Director of Development Services with the Planning & Development Department said that this is the consideration of an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of calculating maximum residential density requirements for multi-family residential development by rounding up.

This proposed ordinance amendment is intended to change the manner in which maximum residential densities are calculated in the UDO. In situations where the number of dwelling units allowed on a property is a fractional number, the proposed amendment states that all fractions of one-half or greater will be rounded up to the nearest number. For example, a property on which 8.4 units could be constructed would be limited to eight (8) units, but a property on which 8.5 units could be constructed would net nine (9) units, as the “.5” or higher is rounded up. This amendment would only apply to multi-family residential development of five (5) units or greater, not to duplexes, triplexes, and quadraplexes. To encourage mixed-use development along key corridors, the amendment is also proposed to apply to any level of multi-family residential use in the Neighborhood Corridor (NCD) and Urban Residential (UR) districts.

This amendment is consistent with the City of Asheville’s adopted definition of “Smart Growth” as it would encourage higher density, infill development. This amendment is also consistent with policies recommended by the Affordable Housing Task Force as it would allow for a minor increase in housing density under certain circumstances.

This proposed amendment has been forwarded to CAN, CIBO, and CREIA.

-12-

Pros –

- This amendment is consistent with the City’s adopted “Smart Growth” policies.
- This amendment is consistent with recommendations of the Affordable Housing Task Force.
- This amendment could encourage infill housing by allowing a minor increase in housing density under certain circumstances.

Con –

- Certain people may be opposed to this allowance for additional residential density.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of these code amendments on December 1, 2004, by a unanimous vote of 6-0.

Staff recommends approval of the amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for the purpose of calculating

maximum residential density requirements for multi-family residential development by rounding up.

Addition of Wedding Chapels as a Specific Use and Establish Parking Standards for this Type of Use

Mr. Joe Heard, Director of Development Services with the Planning & Development Department said that this is the consideration of an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of establishing development standards for commercial wedding chapels.

Planning & Development staff has received several inquiries regarding the establishment of wedding chapels in the City of Asheville. It has been difficult to review these requests, because commercial wedding chapels are not presently listed as specific uses in the UDO. Staff has studied the potential impact of these uses and researched standards for wedding chapels in other communities in developing this proposal.

This proposed amendment has been forwarded to CAN, CIBO, and CREIA.

Pros –

- This amendment would set clear, firm standards for commercial wedding chapels in the UDO for anyone seeking to establish this type of use.
- The proposed standards treat wedding chapels in a fair manner – allowing them in office or commercial districts while limiting their encroachment into residentially zoned areas.

Cons –

- Certain people may not agree with the standards proposed for wedding chapels.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of these code amendments on January 5, 2005, by a unanimous vote of 7-0.

Increase the Maximum Length of Cul-De-Sac Streets

Mr. Joe Heard, Director of Development Services with the Planning & Development Department said that this is the consideration of an ordinance to amend the Unified Development Ordinance for the purpose of allowing longer cul-de-sac streets within manufactured home parks.

While reviewing the potential development of a manufactured home park in the extraterritorial jurisdiction area, a concern arose about the maximum length of 300 feet for cul-de-sac streets in a manufactured home park. Within typical residential subdivisions, a maximum

-13-

length of 1,000 feet for cul-de-sac streets is established based on N.C. Fire Code standards. Although streets within manufactured home parks are typically privately owned, they must be constructed to a similar standard as residential subdivision streets. After conferring with Engineering and Fire Department representatives and noting no issues, staff decided that it would be appropriate to consider similar cul-de-sac street lengths within manufactured home parks.

This proposed amendment has been forwarded to CAN, CIBO, and CREIA.

Pros –

- This amendment would set consistent cul-de-sac street length standards in the UDO for a variety of residential uses.
- The proposed standards would allow for additional development to take place in certain situations.

Cons –

- The proposed amendment would potentially encourage a more linear pattern of development with fewer connections between streets.

The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of this code amendment on January 6, 2005, by a unanimous vote of 7-0.

City staff recommends approval of the amendment to the UDO for the purpose of allowing longer cul-de-sac streets within manufactured home parks.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower asked that the record show that City Council received this information and instructed the City Manager to place these public hearings on the next formal City Council agenda.

ASTON PARK

Mr. Irby Brinson, Director of Parks & Recreation, said that this report is to provide information to City Council in regard to the transfer of Aston Park from Buncombe County to the City of Asheville.

On November 16, 2004, Buncombe County Commissioners unanimously approved the transfer of Aston Park back to the City of Asheville. During this discussion, the Commissioners stated that the park would be submitted to the City "as is" and contingent upon the City accepting the current employee at the facility (which current employee resigned on January 15, 2005) and not charging a non-City resident fee until the Water Agreement has been resolved. On December 13, 2004, the City Manager addressed this issue with the County Manager and expressed concern over the removal of the playground equipment by the County several months prior to this. The estimated cost of this playground equipment is \$80,000. In addition, the City Manager expressed concern about the non-City resident fee issue and the fact that this additional fee would help the City off-set costs incurred for operation.

The Parks and Recreation Department has been working on a Park and Recreation Trust Fund grant for Aston Park that would be used in conjunction with the Dick and Irene Covington Foundation funds. These funds would be used for improvements to the Aston Park facility including the construction of a new tennis center as well as the installation of a new playground. One of the key issues in regard to this grant involves the City having the title to the property. The title would be necessary in order for the grant process to proceed, which is due on January 31, 2005. Staff, however, does feel that the City should be compensated for the cost of the playground and that staff be able to set differential fees for City residents beginning in July of 2005.

-14-

Pros:

- The transfer of the facility will allow the City to apply for a Parks and Recreation Trust Fund grant that will make improvements to Aston Park without any City financial contribution.
- The transfer of the facility will occur prior to the tennis season for 2005.
- Transferring this facility prior to other County facilities will set the standard for how the overall transition occurs.

Cons:

- The replacement of the playground equipment will become an obligation of the City if the County fails to pay for replacement or reinstallation.
- Transferring this facility prior to other County facilities will set the standard for how the overall transition occurs.

This transfer relates to the City of Asheville Strategic Plan regarding steps necessary to resolve the Water Agreement.

The Parks and Recreation Department recommends the transfer of Aston Park to the City of Asheville effective February 1, 2005, if Buncombe County agrees to pay for the operating costs for the Park through June 30, 2005. The City would then be willing to forgive the cost or reinstallation of the playground equipment and implementation of differential rates for non-City residents until July 1, 2005.

Discussion occurred around the playground equipment and the injustice to the area residents (who are also County residents) of not replacing the equipment, especially since the equipment has been in storage for approximately a year.

Mr. Brinson said that if Council proceeds with the transfer, a budget amendment will be necessary, in the amount of \$63,548 for expenditures and \$25,000 for anticipated revenue, for the operating costs for five months.

Mr. Brinson responded to questions from Councilwoman Jones about the sidewalk on the South French Broad side of Aston Park.

It was the consensus of Council to have Mayor Worley write a formal letter to Chairman Ramsey asking that the playground equipment be reinstalled in Aston Park, and if not, asking them to outline some of their reasoning why the equipment will not be replaced.

Budget Amendment for Club House at Aston Park from Covington Foundation Funds

Mr. Irby Brinson, Director of Parks & Recreation, said that this is the consideration of a budget amendment, in the amount of \$262,576.05, from the Irene and Dick Covington Foundation for the construction of a club house at Aston Park.

Several years ago, the Irene and Dick Covington Foundation was established in order to preserve the memorabilia from Dick Covington's life and tennis career and to construct a new club house at Aston Park. This Foundation was a dream of the Covington's, and at Dick Covington's death his entire estate was placed in this Foundation. Since Aston Park was operated by the County, in 2002 the Foundation approved the transfer of these funds to Buncombe County to construct this facility. Delays occurred in this construction to the point where the Covington Foundation requested from both the City and the County that this process be expedited by transferring the funds back to the City of Asheville. Now that the County has approved the transfer of Aston Park back to the City of Asheville, this process can continue and

-15-

be completed. The total amount that was originally sent to the County totaled \$278,709.56. There were expenditures for architectural services that came out of this account.

Pros:

- The facility will be built prior to the 2006 City of Asheville Open Tennis Tournament in July.
- The City will have complete control over construction.

Cons:

- The Covington Foundation has been very frustrated in the delay of this construction and will be monitoring progress.
- Actual costs for construction will be higher than available funds.

The Parks and Recreation Department recommends City Council approve a budget amendment, in the amount of \$262,576.05, to appropriate funds into the Capital Fund in order to enter into a contract for the construction of a new club house at Aston Park.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower asked that the record show that City Council received this information and instructed the City Manager to place these items on the next formal City Council agenda.

At 5:20 p.m., Vice-Mayor Mumpower announced a short break.

UPDATE ON YOUTH PROPOSAL

Mr. Butch Kisiah, Recreation Division Supervisor, said that this is the consideration of a resolution authorizing the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the Mountain Area Workforce Development Board for the 2005 Summer Youth Development Program.

The Parks and Recreation Department contacted the Mountain Area Workforce Development Board (MAWDB) on the campus of A-B Technical College to determine the feasibility of organizing and administering a summer youth employment program for 2005. The MAWDB has actively administered and delivered career development services, remedial education, job skills training and subsidized employment opportunities for Asheville's economically disadvantaged youth for more than 30 years.

Highlights of the proposal:

- Employment of 55 disadvantaged youth from the City of Asheville.
- Summer employment period of June 8, 2005 – July 29, 2005 (8 weeks)
- Youth Employees between the ages of 14 and 17 years old.
- Specific application process and selection procedures mutually agreed upon by the City and MAWDB.
- Education and training components aimed at assisting youth to move forward in school and toward a successful productive life.
- MAWDB will develop, organize, administer supervise and evaluate the program through an agreement with the city including recruitment of youth, development of worksite agreements, orientation and training of worksite supervisors and employees, monitoring and counseling of youth employees and program accounting and oversight.
- The City of Asheville will provide payroll services and worker's compensation insurance.

This action is in keeping with the City Council Strategic Plan's economic development goal #4 of providing vocational training opportunities for teenage youth and the plan's critical

services and infrastructure goal #4 of reducing drug related crime activities through holistic approaches targeting at-risk and economically disadvantaged youth. The Parks and Recreation Department recommends entering into an agreement with the MAWDB for the delivery of a youth development program that combine the opportunities for summer employment with meaningful training and education in the areas of job success skills, career planning, life skills, personal financial management and development of teamwork and interpersonal relations on the job.

Pros:

- History of proven professional administration of youth employment programs in Asheville by MAWDB for over 30 years.
- Cooperative agency approach to providing youth development activities.
- Ability to integrate the City's youth employment program with the efforts of the MAWDB career development programs.
- Existing connections to public and private agencies through the MAWFDB "workforce board partners program" which allows for better recruitment of disadvantaged youth and potential worksites.
- Allows for program over site by City staff without the extensive time commitment necessary to actually administer a program of this magnitude.

Cons:

- More students may apply than are funds available.

The Parks and Recreation Department recommends that City Council accept the proposal and authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the Mountain Area Workforce Development Board for the 2005 summer youth development program.

Mr. Kisiah responded to various questions/comments from Council, some being, but are not limited to: why is preferential hiring treatment being given to youth who have previously volunteered as a Counselor in Training; what age do you have to be when you are hired for a position; what good will a background check on juveniles; some youth may not be able to document their involvement in the community, church or school because they have to help with smaller children after school; will computers be made available for the written essay portion of the application; will work site recruitment be a part of the contract; will the program be expanded to private employers; we should be more stringent about the participation in the program, other than the screening process; what is the breakdown in terms of working/education; how will the productivity of the youth be ensured; and how will discipline be administered.

Councilwoman Jones felt that in terms of retention of these employees, we should have some type of bonus at the end of the program as an incentive to complete the entire 8 weeks.

Councilwoman Bellamy suggested some information be placed on our Government Channel, like how to dress for an interview, etc.

It was the consensus of City Council to (put it as an optional) not disqualify a youth who is not able to provide a letter documenting their involvement in a community, church or school activity of no less than six hours in duration and signed by the leader of the activity.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower asked that the record show that City Council received this information and instructed the City Manager to place this item on the next formal City Council agenda.

At 5:50 p.m., Councilwoman Jones moved to excuse Councilwoman Bellamy from the meeting. This motion was seconded by Councilman Davis and carried unanimously.

PROFESSIONAL WATERSHED MANAGEMENT SERVICES

Interim Water Resources Director David Hanks said that this is the consideration of a resolution entering into a contract with Woolpert, Inc., to prepare the second phase of the Watershed Management Plan for North Fork and Bee Tree Watersheds.

City Council approved a watershed management plan in July, 2004 and a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the second

phase of the plan in September, 2004. The RFP was distributed to 36 watershed and forestry management consultant firms. Four proposals were submitted and deemed qualified to do such work.

Each proposal received was reviewed for content, scope of services provided, professional certifications and background of principals in charge and project management, and cost of services offered.

The proposals received were detailed and followed the scope of the RFP. Each of the four submittals reflected in-depth professional knowledge of watershed and forestry management practices. Furthermore, due to the size of the watershed, respondents estimated it will require approximately five years to inspect, section, survey and prepare a comprehensive management plan for the entire watershed.

Annually, the Tree Commission has offered to conduct a technical review of each phase of the Watershed Master Plan and advise City staff and the City Manager, who will in turn present a final report to City Council for approval as part of the annual budget process.

Following is a list of proposals amortized over a five-year period:

	<u>Average Annual Cost</u>	<u>5-Year Cost</u>
• Woolpert, Inc.:	\$56,908	\$284,540
• Greenleaf Forest Management:	\$51,400	\$257,000
• Mattern & Craig:	\$90,168	\$450,840
	(estimated)	(estimated)
• Equinox Environmental Consultation & Design:	\$77,910	\$389,549

Pros of the submitted proposals – Each proposal demonstrates professional watershed and forestry management knowledge by the company and the principals involved. Three of the proposals, Woolpert, Inc., Mattern & Craig, and Equinox Environmental Consultation and Design, Inc. were very detailed and listed a team strategy of watershed management. The fourth proposal, Greenleaf Forest Management, is a local forester who also demonstrated professional knowledge in his proposal. The submittals accurately address the scope of the RFP as requested.

While Woolpert was not the low bid, this partnership has the experience and professional credentials to prepare a master watershed management plan, per contract. The low bid is a local forester who does not have the assets and professional staff that is required to complete the watershed management plan that Woolpert, LLP demonstrated in their proposal.

Cons of the submitted proposals – Management of the watershed has become a controversial issue, which has taken away from the importance of establishing a methodology for insuring the continued use of the City-owned property to collect and filter water.

-18-

City staff recommends City Council approve the second phase of Watershed Management Plan as detailed in the Request for Proposals and award a contract to Woolpert, Inc.

Councilman Davis clarified that this second phase was to inspect, survey and prepare a management plan for the entire watershed in increments of five years. Mr. Hanks said that the RFP covered 18 separate items, with the most important item was to make sure that the water quality was maintained. Some of the other items covered were to ensure that everything that is done through this management plan is in compliance with the N.C. Conservation Trust easement that is currently on the watershed and also with the viewshed of the Blue Ridge Parkway.

In response to Councilman Davis, Mr. Hanks said that Woolpert would not be responsible for the actual action that would take place. They would put together a management plan, which would be reviewed on several levels and then brought back to Council for formal action as to what would be done. If it is something as simple as just moving a log, we would do that anyway as part of our normal operations. But anything that does require further action or monetary expense would be brought back to Council as part of the annual budget process for review and action to be taken either before or against.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower asked if we are required to award a contract having issued an RFP. Mr. Hanks said that as part of the RFP, there may or may not be a contract awarded.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower was concerned about the complexities, costs and length of time involved. He would like to see the City drop back some and reconsider this matter. We are talking about a planning process of five years at an annual cost of \$56,000 - just for planning and no direct service. He suggested we step back and ask our Water Resources Department staff to look into the possibility of maintaining our access roads, removing the invasive species, and having a plan for catastrophic events. He wondered if we can take the information in hand and develop a plan. And, if we can, do we have the resources, or can we get the resources, to do that on some kind of cost effective basis.

Mr. Hanks said that currently we do not have the resources to do that with our current staff. Basically we have one person assigned to our watershed and it is not a full-time job for that person. We do not have the assets to maintain the watershed, other than the very minimum, which we do around the water plants. Back in July, the three proposals before Council were to move forward with a plan, do nothing as we have been doing for the past 10-15 years, or proceed on a more limited basis by adding staff.

City Manager Westbrook said that he would not want to go into the watershed with just staff and chainsaws, without a plan of some sort because the watershed is sensitive and we could make errors. If Council wants to have a less comprehensive plan, we can certainly come back with something else. This proposal, however, would satisfy all our needs for a long period of time.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower said that back in 1992 a plan was provided to Council. He wondered if we can take that plan, our own expertise and any additional information acquired since then, and have staff develop some kind of comprehensive plan that is workable.

Councilman Davis felt the watershed management plan prepared by Mr. Hicks in July of 2004 was a good plan. He too felt the current proposal was a lot of planning money.

City Manager Westbrook said that we can pull all that information together but he would prefer to have an independent third party review it to make sure it is reasonable. Whatever Council decides, he strongly felt that we need some independent oversight on it or some

-19-

independent quality control on it. Vice-Mayor Mumpower suggested the third party be Mr. Edward Hicks, a forester that the City has used in the past.

City Manager Westbrook asked for guidance from Council if they want a different proposal. He said they may be able to negotiate with the existing firm or with other firms for a different proposal.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower said that Councilwoman Bellamy and Councilman Dunn shared with him that they are both in favor of asking staff to come back with a modified plan that is at a different scale, along the lines of what we discussed – that is, handled in-house, emphasizes activity over planning (recognizing we need planning), and keeping things more simple.

Councilman Newman was astounded about how well our watershed property withstood the two hurricanes that came through Asheville in September of 2004. He felt this may be a process without a rationale. If our goal is clean water then the natural processes do a very good job maintaining clean water.

When Councilman Newman asked about a management plan prepared in the early 1990's, Mr. Hanks said that he was not aware of that plan. Then, when a copy was given to him he showed his staff and they were not aware of it either.

Councilman Newman said that the plan prepared in the early 1990's have some good ideas about how we maintain the road network with pretty specific recommendations, e.g., how many people are needed to mow the watershed and how long it would take them. He wondered if we should hire one more person part-time, which would be cheaper than the kind of course of action we are looking at now.

In response to Councilman Newman about repairing the bridges, Mr. Hanks said that we received \$20,000 from FEMA. We did have another engineering firm come in and look at the watershed and bridges and they gave us an overall cost estimate to do all the bridges, to the point of where they would not wash out again, of \$500,000. Since we would not be able to get that kind of money, we started looking at what we could do internally. We then

asked the firm what else we could do, so we have started putting culverts in instead of rebuilding bridges in some of the areas. We are trying to mitigate the cost factors and get the accessibility back up and into the watershed.

Councilman Newman supported dramatically scaling back what is presented to Council. He said the role of whether or not we will be timber harvesting on the watershed was a legitimate question, and he felt that was reasonable to talk about. He feels at this time it is pretty clear that Council is not that interested in doing anything very aggressive in terms of logging the watershed. He felt we need to focus on taking care of exotic species, maintaining the road and fixing the bridges.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower appreciated staff raising the concerns on the watershed. His concern was not with the need for management, it's the extent to which we might be pursuing management.

Councilwoman Jones supported scaling back the plan and didn't want it to be construed that she would not support Mr. Hicks as being the third-party.

In response to Councilwoman Jones, Mr. Hanks said that Mr. Hicks' contract was \$8,500.

Vice-Mayor Mumpower felt that if we used Mr. Hicks as a resource, and we can get him on a cost effective basis, he would certainly advocate for him just from that prospective.

-20-

Councilman Newman was disappointed in the first phase of the plan, not only because of some of the specific management recommendations, but just the fact that Mr. Hicks' first plan recommended things that were in violation of the conservation easement. He felt that Mr. Hicks' failure to do some research created more confusion than illumination for Council.

It was the consensus of Council to instruct City staff to create a scaled back management plan recommendation to Council.

Upon inquiry of Vice-Mayor Mumpower, City Manager Westbrook said that staff will have to look and see how much work we have to do and then advise Council on whether we can get it in the budget or come back a little bit later afterwards.

QUARTERLY REPORT ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Assistant City Manager Jeff Richardson said that this multi-year plan document outlines seven (7) key focus areas that City Council has identified as critical to the overall long-term positive growth and vibrancy of the Asheville community. Within those seven key focus areas, 45 goals and 94 operational tasks are identified. Timeframes were identified for each of the tasks. This report outlines staff progress in the second 90 days after adoption of this plan for those tasks with timeframes conducive to this fiscal year.

Pros: City Council will continue to receive quarterly updates to insure city staff is progressing as directed by City Council.

Cons: None noted.

No formal action is required. City Council may provide direction as necessary for tasks as appropriate.

There was a brief discussion, initiated by Councilwoman Jones, about allocating a percentage of Community Development Block Grant funding to small business development. At this point she felt we may advocate for that task to be deleted when the Strategic Operating Plan is revisited.

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS:

It was the consensus of City Council to reappoint Tom Muncy (Regular), Beverly Robinson (Regular) and David Brown (Alternate) to the Board of Adjustment:

It was the consensus of City Council to interview the following individuals for a vacancy on the Civic Center Commission: Linda Fowler, W.E. Lack, Brian Turner and Jean Ann Taylor.

It was the consensus of City Council to reappoint Leslie Hennessee and Dan Comer (if he is interested in reappointment) to the Asheville-Buncombe Community Relations Council:

It was the consensus of City Council to reappoint Christiana Tugman and Jim McCulley to the Asheville-Buncombe Fair Housing Commission:

It was the consensus of City Council to reappoint Paula Robbins and Scott Jackson to the Greenway Commission:

It was the consensus of City Council to interview W. Louis Bissette Jr. for a vacancy on the Metropolitan Sewerage District Board.

-21-

It was the consensus of City Council to reappoint W.F. Michie Jr. and interview the following individuals for vacancies on the Transit Commission: Kim MacQueen, Yuri Koslen, Thomas Hilgendorf, Robert Mair and Neal Jackson.

It was the consensus of City Council to interview the following individuals for vacancies on the Tree Commission: Robert Oast, Parker Andes, Richard Koerber and Jay Marino.

SCHOOL BOARD

City Council narrowed down the questions to ask candidates for vacancies on the Asheville School Board. It was also the consensus of City Council to have all candidates live in the Asheville School District.

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice-Mayor Mumpower adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

CITY CLERK

MAYOR