MINUTES
BREVARD PLANNING BOARD
AUGUST 26TH, 2025
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CITY HALL

The Brevard Planning Board met for a regular meeting Tuesday, August 26th, 2025 at 5:30 PM in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

Members Present:	Greg Hunter, Chair Reid Wood, Vice Chair Karen Darity Molly Jenkins Peter Chaveas
Members Absent:	Alan Mercaldo
Staff Present:	Madalin Baker, Board Clerk Emily Brewer, Senior Planner Aaron Bland, Assistant Planning Director Paul Ray, Planning Director

I. Welcome

At 5:32 PM, Greg Hunter, Chair, called the meeting to order.

II. Introduction of Planning Board Members

The Board introduced themselves.

III. Certification of Quorum

G. Hunter confirmed with the Board Clerk that a quorum from the Board was present.

IV. Approval of Agenda

P. Chaveas made a motion to approve the agenda. M. Jenkins seconded, unanimously carried.

V. Approval of Minutes

M. Jenkins motioned to approve the July minutes. R. Wood seconded, passed unanimously.

VI. Public Comments – None

VII. New Business

DRAFT

a. Consideration of ANN-25-002 – Cashiers Valley Road

Aaron Bland, Assistant Planning Director, presented his staff report, a portion of which follows:

Background: The City has initiated a contiguous annexation for a portion of a City-owned property on Cashiers Valley Road. The parcel lies adjacent to the City Public Works facility at the intersection of Cashiers Valley and Nicholson Creek Road, and is further identified by PIN 8585-19-5389-000.

Discussion: This parcel is currently vacant and partially inside the city limits. The proposal would include the entirety of the lot inside the city limits. On March 17, 2025, City Council adopted Resolution No. 2025-16 declaring three parcels of land as surplus property and approving the sale of the properties on the open market via the upset bid method of public property disposal. This parcel was included in that resolution and the intention of this annexation petition is to include the remainder of the parcel within city limits before selling it, with the revenue going towards supporting affordable housing initiatives.

Following his staff report, A. Bland opened to the Board for questions. P. chaveas inquired about procedure for selling the property—via private lister, etc. A. Bland noted it would follow the procedure outlined by state statutes. G. Hunter asked if adjacent property owners had any say, which A. Bland noted advertisements would be published ahead of City Council report but had not yet been posted. K. Darity asked about the property to the other side of the public works building, and E. Brewer noted it is already under development agreement.

M. Jenkins motioned to recommend the rezoning to council, R. Wood seconded, passed unanimously.

b. Consideration of Rezoning REZ-25-003

Aaron Bland, Assistant Planning Director, presented his staff report, a portion of which follows:

Background This is a City-initiated rezoning for the same City-owned property adjacent to the City Public Works facility at the intersection of Cashiers Valley and Nicholson Creek Road, further identified by PIN 8585-19-5389-000. This rezoning is being done concurrently with the previously discussed annexation. In addition to being only partially inside the city limits, this parcel is also split-zoned. The portion

DRAFT

currently inside the city limits is zoned General Residential 8 (GR8) and the portion outside is zoned General Residential 4 (GR4). This proposal would rezone the entire parcel to either GR8 or Neighborhood Mixed Use (NMX).

Discussion The intention of this rezoning is to upzone the parcel to make it more marketable before selling it, with the revenue going towards supporting affordable housing initiatives.

Policy Analysis The Future Land Use Map identifies this parcel as the Activity Center - Minor character area. The recommended zoning districts of Neighborhood Mixed Use and Residential Mixed Use (RMX). Because the adjacent Public Works facility is zoned NMX, this would be an option for the rezoning (RMX would not due to spot zoning concerns). However, there is the potential that rezoning to NMX would make the property not as marketable as GR8 because single-family houses are not permitted in NMX. Given the goal of maximizing the sale price to help fund affordable housing initiatives, thought must be given to this trade off. There are other differences to be considered as well, such as the higher density allowed by NMX (15 dwelling units per acre vs. 8). Staff requests the Board discuss these two options and come to consensus on a recommended district.

Following his staff report, A. Bland looked to the Board for questions.

The Board considered and clarified some of the differences between NMX and GR8 zoning. R. Wood motioned to recommend NMX zoning with reference to the consistency statement. P. Chaveas seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Remarks

None.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, M. Jenkins made a motion to adjourn seconded by P. Chaveas, the motion carried unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 5:47 PM.

_____
Greg Hunter, Chair

_____
Madalin Baker, Board Clerk

DRAFT