



**BOLTON
& MENK**

Real People. Real Solutions.

1801 North Graham Street
Suite 320
Charlotte, NC 28206

Phone: (704) 376-1555
Bolton-Menk.com

Gen H Comprehensive Plan

Memo

July 26th, 2024

Matt Manley

RE: Gen H Comprehensive Plan
City of Hendersonville, NC
Project No. 4931

Our team at Bolton & Menk, Inc. has reviewed and incorporated comments provided by City Staff for Chapters 1-6, Appendices A-E, and the Future Land Use Map. In the Final Comments section, we detail the outstanding changes made, along with their corresponding page numbers.

We look forward to the pending adoption of the Gen H Comprehensive Plan and firmly believe that these refinements significantly enhance the Plan. We extend our gratitude to City Staff and all other contributors who took the time to thoroughly review and provide valuable input, which has been instrumental in refining the Plan in its final stage. Your collaboration and dedication are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Bolton & Menk, Inc.

Draft Gen H Comp Plan

General Recommendations:

Planning Board:

- 1) Look for ways to streamline the document
 - Staff recommendations have been included.
- 2) Consider different photos
 - Staff recommendations have been included. References to other cities have been removed except for case studies and image sources that have a city's name.

Chapter I.

Pg. 9:

- Planning Jurisdiction has been emphasized and notes City's corporate limits, its ETJ, and City/County Joint Planning Area.

Pg. 13:

- Appendix A has been emphasized in reference to the Policy Analysis.

Pg. 16: Strategic Housing Plan and Tree Canopy Assessment Report

- Updated: Strategic Housing Plan added.

Pg. 17: Add Strategic Housing Plan and Tree Canopy Assessment Report. For the Tree Canopy Assessment, Tree Board would like to note that the City has had some canopy decline.

- Updated: Tree Canopy Cover Assessment added.

Pg. 18: Adopted in May-ish. Double check.

- Updated Sustainability Strategic Plan to show it being adopted

Pg. 30: Dept is mixed in with the Boards and Committees. Update header to say "Governing Structure" or something to that effect.

- Updated: Changed subtitle to "Governing Structure"

Chapter II.

No notable changes were required for this chapter.

Chapter III.

Pg 55: Is "Other" Hispanic? Should this be updated

- Updated: Demographic graph has been changed to show the racial breakdown and Hispanic is included.

Pg 57: Enhance this section with a breakdown of the acres between existing city limits and ETJ.

- Updated: Added breakdown of the acres between existing city limits and ETJ.

Pg 64: These terms can be unclear to the lay reader. Consider another approach and/or additional clarity. Make sure any revisions are consistent with Ec Dev Appendix.

- Updated: Added descriptions of tapestry segments.

Pg 71: Could we build an Issue and Opportunity around "Attracting & Retaining Young Professionals, Work Force Development, etc... you know, good old Richard Florida stuff"

- Updated: Added "Attracting and retaining young professionals, families, and businesses" as an opportunity in the Sustainable and Resilient Future category.
- Updated: Affordable housing definition has been added to Housing category

Chapter IV.

All Focus Areas – Maps and Images

- Updated street names
- Added landmarks

Pg. 78-79:

- Descriptions added for Constrained, Underdeveloped and Constrained, Undeveloped
- Table added with acreages for land supply categories within city limits, ETJ, and Joint Planning Area
- Land supply updated to 3,413 acres for city and ETJ (updated GIS layer from city)

Pg. 79: Figure 4.4.2 (new) Land Supply Table

- Added table with acreage/percentage for: underdeveloped, undeveloped, constrained-underdeveloped, and constrained-vacant
- Partial parcels account for land supply in instances where they are constrained

Pg. 80: Figure 4.4.1 Land Supply Map

- Updated with categories and floodplain
- Added color to differentiate between: underdeveloped, undeveloped, constrained-underdeveloped, and constrained-vacant

Pg. 83: Figure 4.5 Residential Suitability Map

- McMurray Rd. Tract

Pg. 84: Figure 4.5 Commercial Suitability Map

- McMurray Rd. Tract

Pg. 85: Figure 4.6 Industrial Suitability Map

- McMurray Rd. Tract

Pg. 94:

- Updated first bullet to “Downtown remains the heart of the community and gathering spaces, like a central community park, are the focal point of civic activity and celebration” under Authentic Community Character

Pg. 109:

- Affordable housing definition has been included

Pg. 116-117:

- CTP reference included
- Vision Map has been updated to reflect staff directed changes
- Add definitions for City Limits, ETJ and City/County Joint Planning Area

Pg. 117: Figure 4.12.1 The Future Land Use and Conservation Map (Vision Map)

- Added parcel lines
- Added NCDOT Functional Class
- Removed large activity center circles
- Updated as directed by staff.

Pg. 119: Figure 14.12.2 (new) Focused Intensity Nodes

- Map of road network and key landmarks within activity centers – with activity center circles
- Caption: Concentrations of more intense development are envisioned for key nodes where “Mixed-Use Commercial Center (MU-C)” character areas are delineated on the Future Land Use Map. These nodes are intended to be the largest activity centers outside of downtown and support a broad range of compatible uses. Each MU-C is flanked by multiple character areas, some of which are encompassed by the centers shown on the map above. Within these centers, connectivity and compatible relationships should be prioritized to create seamless transitions between developments.

Pg. 120: Figure 14.13.1 Character Area Percentages

- Updated percentages based on Vision Map changes

Pg. 121: Figure 14.13.2 Character Area Percentages

- Updated percentages based on Vision Map changes

Pg. 122-123: Figure 14.14-17 Character Area Maps

- Updated percentages based on Vision Map changes

Pg. 126-127:

- Updated MGL per staff comments regarding building height and lot sizes.

Pg. 128:

- Updated MX-C per staff comments regarding intensity.
- Updated NC to include “limited amount of residential”.

Pg.130-131:

- Updated MX-E to include building height language.
- Updated PRO per staff comments regarding urban sawmills.
- Updated INST to include building height and master planned campus language.

Pg. 132-133: Figure 14.18 Character Area Crosswalk

- Updated per staff direction

Pg. 134:

- Reordered focus areas per staff direction.
- Pages 138-145 (Western Ecusta Trail) moved to Ch. 5.

Pg. 136-151: All Focus Areas – Maps and Images

- Updated street names
- Added landmarks

Chapter V.

All Focus Areas – Maps and Images:

- Updated street names
- Added landmarks

Pg. 178:

- Comment: In order to have a standalone Downtown Master Plan, we may need to consider adding in the relevant projects from Chapter VI that relate to downtown. I think there are some key projects in there that people will benefit from seeing alongside the info in this chapter as it stands.
 - These are addressed by district as opportunities and elements.

Pg. 180:

- Comment: We need a way to emphasize that the edge of the Downtown Edge should transition to an appropriate scale and uses. The nature of the west side in particular calls for uses to be tied to street typology. Residential 1 and 2 streets should not have commercial uses but could feature appropriately scaled multi-family/attached single-family.
 - Downtown edge transition to appropriate scale is addressed on pg. 260: Rear and Side Stepbacks for Development: Character District Transitions

- Street Typology: Addressed on pg. 218: Streetscape character typologies were developed based on existing street conditions, usage, context, and functionality.
- Land uses are defined by Character Areas – the west side is predominately MGL that allows for mixed residential development and a limited amount of small scaled neighborhood-serving commercial.

Pg. 181: Figure 5.2 Character Districts Map

- Updated to reflect new boundary
- Updated to reflect Vision Map character areas per staff comment

Pg. 206-213:

- Lower Trailhead (Western Ecusta Trail) moved to Ch. 5 (formerly pages 138-145)

Pg. 216: Figure 5.7 Functional Classification

- Updated to reflect new boundary

Pg. 220: Figure 5.8 Streetscape Character Table

- Updated table for streets that also have one-way conditions to have an asterisk hat says: *These streets also exhibit characteristics typical of a Downtown One-Way streetscape.
 - Those streets are N Main St, 6th Ave, US Hwy 64/4 Seasons Blvd, Buncombe St.
 - Streets that are entirely Downtown One-Way are Church St and King St.
- Updated table to include Fleming St, Elks Aly, N Justice St, N Oak St, and Powers Aly
 - Fleming St - Character: Residential 1, Class: Local, ROW: 40', Speed Limit: 20 mph
 - N Justice St - Character: Residential 1, Class: Local, ROW: 40', Speed Limit: 20 mph
 - N Oak St - Character: Residential 1, Class: Local, ROW: 40', Speed Limit: 25 mph
 - Elks Alley - Character: Alley, Class: Local, ROW: 20', Speed Limit: N/A
 - Powers Alley - Character: Alley, Class: Local, ROW: 10', Speed Limit: N/A
- Updated table to have S Main St be “Festival Street/Main Street” and Whitted St be “Festival Street/Downtown”
- Updated Allen, 1st Ave, 2nd Ave, 3rd Ave, 4th Ave to be “Downtown/Residential 1”
- Updated table to not include Private Streets, but rather list them out at the bottom.

Pg. 222: Streetscape Character Map

- Updated map boundary
- Updated streets colors/typologies to represent the table

Pg. 224-235: Streetscape Character

- Updated streetscape character key maps to match the streetscape character map
- Updated Festival Street dimensions from 40' to 40'-100'

Pg. 226: Streetscape Character

- Added language to minimize curb cuts on festival streets

Pg. 227: Recommended uses – tying land use to streetscape comment

- Without doing additional analysis, this recommendation would be better suited during the UDO development

Pg. 252: Signature Park

- Added signature park recommendation

Pg. 258-259: Building Heights Map

- Updated Building Heights Map per staff comments
- Added: Within the Main Street Historic District, building frontages along Main Street should not exceed a maximum height of 40', but may have a 10' rear step up to 54'.
- Comment: And transition areas within the Downtown Edge
 - This is addressed in the next section “Character District Transitions”
- Added: Main Street Historic District Building Height Diagram

Pg. 260: Rear and Side Stepbacks for Development

- Updated text: When development is located next to a district with a lower height maximum, the development should not exceed the height maximum of the adjacent district for the first 50 feet of building width.
-

Pg. 270:

- Added: 60% of all **ground floor** openings on or visible from a frontage shall be screened with architectural louvers and/or panels.

Pg. 271: Make a distinction between Main St and Downtown Edge. There are portions of Downtown Edge that should be residential only. This is also at odds with the amount of infill housing being proposed on the east side that is featured in the Downtown Edge Focus Area.

- Updated: Use of ground floors for private residences is discouraged within the Main Street and Downtown Edge districts, with exception for townhomes and brownstones, or for entry foyers to upper floor units.
- Updated: Private residence entries should incorporate features such as stoops, porches, etc.

Pg. 279 - Private residences are prohibited on primary frontages within Main Street and Downtown Edge districts.

- Comment: Consider allowing townhomes/brownstones in this district.
- Revision: Use of ground floors for private residences is discouraged within the Main Street and Downtown Edge districts, with exception for townhomes and brownstones, or for entry foyers to upper floor units.

Pg. 280: Need clarity of how this would function and look. Given the number of drive-throughs in this area, we need to make sure we understand this clearly.

- Updated to say “Within the Lower Trailhead district, drive-throughs are permitted but cannot be along the primary frontage. They shall be located to the **rear or side** of the building.”

Matt, Pg. 281: Is this correct? Consider removal as this is a major transportation hub and will continue to be an automobile oriented commercial area for some time...

- Updated - “monument signs” is removed from first bullet

Chapter VI.

Pg. 278: Is it possible to switch the Jenn Hensley photo on 278 with this one to give her photo a little more attention?

- The picture of Jenn Hensley is too blurry to be a full spread.

Pg. 288: Should the recommendation referenced on p. A-18 in the appendix be referenced in this project? It doesn't appear that this recommendation got carried over to this list of recommendations unless it is buried in 3.05. I would suggest shining more light on it

- Lew determined that no alteration to the recommendation is needed.

Pg. 290:

- Updated: 4.02: Codify Downtown Design Guidelines in Current Zoning Ordinance and UDO Updates (Project 4.01): Translate the Downtown Design Guidelines into enforceable standards for new development and redevelopment by integrating them into the current zoning ordinance and the new UDO.
- 4.05 – added to the short-term list

Appendices

Appendix A.

Pg. A4: Remove draft - Walk Hendo has been adopted

- Updated: removed “draft”

Pg. A5: In addition to the recommendation about the housing study, the City is in the process of developing a Strategic Housing Plan.

- Updated: replaced “As a result, the City...” with the above language

Pg. A4: Either make language more current or add a date that makes this the analysis as of Fall 2023

- Updated: added date to appendices covers

Pg. A4: Update numbers for 2024

- Policy Analysis was completed in Fall of 2023, added date to appendices covers

Pg. A6: Attracting and retaining young professionals

- Added: “such as attracting and retaining young professionals and families”

Pg. A22: Can you clarify that this is the City general fund budget? It reads like it's the total budget (which is 56 million).

- Clarified and updated to say: “the City general fund budget for this year is \$56 million, with a fund balance of 30.2% as of 6/30/22 and an FY24 tax rate of \$0.49 per \$100 valuation.”

Pg. A23: Is this in the implementation project list? (Plan Implementation Fund)

- Not explicitly. 10.03: Continue to promote City fiscal health by extending time horizon on CIP and staffing plan; 10.07 – Explore and advocate for additional revenue options...10.08 – Conduct analysis to ensure full alignment of adopted city plans

Pg. A24: Is this in the implementation project list? City-wide Innovation Fund

- Not explicitly. 10.07: Explore and advocate for additional revenue options, like 1/4-cent sales tax, grants, and loans Identify and pursue new revenue sources to help provide local public services.

Pg. A26: The text below does not correspond to this title

- Revised title to: Continued Progress

Pg. A27: Should this be located directly after info on A22?

- Moved to A.23

Pg. A28: See previous comment

- I’m not sure what the previous comment was but this one points to a table.

Appendix B.

Pg. B2: Do you want to tack on Saluda at the end of this list since it is shown in the map?

- Updated: Added “Saluda” to the end of the list.

Pg. B4: This feels like the way people used to describe Hendersonville. Or how it is described from a nostalgic perspective but avoids some realities. I wonder if we might want to update this to be more accurate to today...“the slower but growing pace of life”

- Updated: Changed language to “the serene pace of life that Hendersonville offers”

Pg. B6: Double check stats from Census

- Updated: Confirmed census numbers for 2022 with link provided by Matt for information available

Pg. B7: I believe this was supposed to say 51.9. Update stats and make sure they match what is in the narrative.

- Updated: Age graphic added

Pg. B8: -1%? Is “Other” Hispanic? This should be updated

- Updated: Demographic graph has been changed to show the racial breakdown and Hispanic is included.

Pg. B8: Pie graphs, legends, etc. very difficult to read

- Updated to be larger and have better legibility

Pg. B11: Font color goes lighter, maybe?

- Updated: Fill color is corrected

Pg. B13: Double checking for accuracy; Please add that Mud Creek, Bat Fork, Devils Fork, and Clear Creek are listed as impaired by the State

- Updated: Added new sentence that says, “Mud Creek, Bat Fork, Devils Fork, and Clear Creek are listed as impaired by the State.”

Pg. B13: Double checking for accuracy

- Updated: Resolved according to Acrobat document

Pg. B15: Different looking text compared to rest of page

- Updated: Resolved

Pg. B16: This link is broken. It would be better to use the tree board’s web address because the pdf for the tree list gets updated whenever they update the list.

<https://www.hendersonvillenc.gov/treeboard>

- Updated: Replaced hyperlink

Pg. B1: Is this accurate? Did Henderson Co do a tree assessment? We are not familiar with this. The language you have in here says the County studied the area in the county outside city limits but then it says they were identifying concentrations within city limits?? We need to make sure this is accurate and double check the numbers. Additionally, we would prefer that you lead off with the City Tree Canopy Assessment and then, IF the County did an assessment, you can say "Also, the County did one and these were the findings..."

- Revised with City Tree Canopy Assessment numbers

Pg. B16: Rhododendron

- Updated: Replaced “azaleas” with “rhododendron.”

Pg. B19: I am not sure this is accurate. Are they really protected for preservation or are there broad limitations for what can go on them? From what I can gather the limitations only apply on ridges above 3,000' and even then, it only limits the height of buildings to 35' tall in those places.

- [North Carolina Mountain Ridge Protection Act \(MRPA\) Ridgelines | NC OneMap](#)
- Updated: Added language – “Some ridges near the ETJ limits have established protections in the form of building height restrictions through the North Carolina Mountain Ridge Protection Act (MRPA) of 1983.”

Pg. B20: I am not sure this is relevant unless you are tying it to current conditions. I'd prefer this be a summary of our existing distribution of land uses. I am also not familiar with an "existing land use plan". The precursor to the Comp Plan was the "Land Development Plan." But again, I'm not sure that is relevant in this section unless you are tying those plans to the current distribution of land uses.

- Removed “plan”

Pg. B24: This map should match the color symbology of our current zoning map. You can match the colors in this one or just use a screenshot of it in its place:

https://www.hendersonvillenc.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/official_printing_zoning_map_june_2024.pdf

- Updated: Replaced the map with the City's current zoning map

Pg. B30: Provide analysis on how these constraints affect land availability. Could include the 50' Stream Buffer on all Blue Line Streams as a constraint too.

- Analysis for existing conditions has concluded and we are only updating text and figures within the context of accuracy vs. development of new figures or content for the appendices.

Pg. B29: Update this page to provide data provided on 7/16

- Updated with provided data

Pg. B38: Make sure map and text correspond. We believe that some of the roads are not identified correctly. Haywood Rd as a Principal? It's a two lane. Asheville Hwy is a Minor Arterial? It has the highest vpd. The text seems to be correct in some places but has some errors.

- The functional classification is from GIS and the roads identified in the text and on the map align with the NCDOT Functional Classification Map: [NCDOT Functional Class Map \(arcgis.com\)](#)

Pg. B39: I think Chadwick Avenue has intersections with Greenville Hwy, Spartanburg Hwy and Grove St. Not sure which intersection this is referring to - but Hwy 25 isn't called Asheville Hwy that far south. Maybe @MatthewManley can clarify this?

- Updated to “Greenville Highway near Chadwick Avenue”

Pg. B44: Could be linked to adopted plan chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgiclfefindmkaj/https://www.hendersonvillenc.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/departments/planning/WalkHendo/final_walk_hendo_plan.pdf

- Updated: Added hyperlink

Pg. B54: Seems like a better photo here would be one pertaining to streets/public works/trash collection vs. sewer treatment... Here is a photo of a garbage truck if needed
<https://hvlncgov.sharepoint.com/:i:/g/ETI2stBqEoJPPpBU3KxIR0MB8DQc01pTiVggutNiOUsiDQ?e=JqFKtR>

- Link provided is expired; therefore, the existing image was just realigned with text

Pg. B59: Is this correct? 11-30-2010

- Omitted

Pg. B67: Enhances community__?

- Updated: to “enhances a sense of community”

Pg. B68: Prevent__?

- Updated: Extended text box to not cut off sentence

Pg. B68: This link asked me for a long in in Esri

- Updated: Relinked hyperlink

Pg. B70: Text looks different than rest of page

- Updated: Fixed text style

Pg. B72: Incomplete sentence

- Updated: changed sentence to “Alongside the retail, shoppers may access various other commercial enterprises, including restaurants, cafes, entertainment venues, and professional services.”

Pg. B72: Will want to list Martin Luther King Jr Blvd. or M.L.K. Jr Blvd. as it is a portion of this corridor. From Grove to Dana is the MLK section.

- Updated

Pg. B75: Rework this sentence to highlight the undersupply of preschool and daycare. Currently reads as if there is an abundance.

- Updated to reflect supply/demand

Pg. B75: Should this be one block downtown? or a few blocks of the downtown area?

- Updated

Pg. B77: I would suggest adding the Hendersonville Police Department to this list since the Sheriff's Office and fire department are listed.

- Updated: Added HVL PD to the list

Pg. B78: D is a building and not a parking lot (Public Restrooms and office space)

- Updated on the map

Pg. B78: Add PD to map

- Updated on the map

Pg. B78: Add FS1 to the map

- Updated on the map

Pg. B78: Change title. This is only a map of city properties

- Updated: Changed title

Pg. B79: I'd remove this sentence. It doesn't add anything IMO and is out of place. "The medical district can be impacted by initiatives."

- Updated: Removed

Pg. B88: Could add kayaking, tubing, fishing if you want to include some water activities.

- Updated: Changed sentence to "Eco-tourists explore the natural beauty surrounding the city with activities like hiking, biking, kayaking, fishing, or picnicking.."

Pg. B87: you can strike this. Is it possible that you were confused with Flat Rock Playhouse (state theatre)?

- Updated

Pg. B90: 2013, 2017 and 2021.

- Updated: Changed sentence to "who was elected in November 2009 and re-elected in 2013, 2017, and 2021."

Pg. B89: The election schedule for City Council will change from odd to even years beginning in 2024 following NC General Assembly legislation.

- Updated: "The election schedule for City Council will change from odd to even years beginning in 2024 following NC General Assembly legislation."

Pg. B90: Add "B" in front of numbering for all this section.

- Updated

Appendix C.

Pg. C2: On the right photo caption - Gen H team member discusses scenarios with City Council members

- Updated: Changed caption

Pg. C7 & C11: Clarify this Call Out

- Updated: Moved location of callouts

Pg. C11: Utilities?

- Updated: Added “utilities”

Appendix D.

Pg. D4: Numbering drops “D” from this page on

- Updated

Pg. D5: Engage City Council, Boards, Committees

- Updated: adjusted wording to match Allison’s suggestion

Pg. D6: Should be its own bullet point

- Updated: made its own bullet point

Pg. D14: Too small to be legible. Consider page layout options to improve readability

- Adjusted slightly – limited based on original formatting and page constraints

Pg. D16: Added “Homeless Providers”

Pg. D18: Oklawaha Greenway, photo by Lu Ann Welter

- Updated: changed caption

Pg. D21: The project team hosted field trips at City Hall for Bruce Drysdale Elementary School students

- Updated: Changed caption to language that is suggested

Appendix E.

Pg. E15: Can we have a glossary for jargon? If not, please add an asterisk and explain at the bottom of the page.

- Added: “*A brownfield is a tract of land that has been developed for industrial purposes, polluted, and then abandoned| Source: Merriam-Webster”

Pg. E19: Is this correct or is it not to exceed 30,000?

- Updated: “not to exceed”