MINUTES
BREVARD PLANNING BOARD
June 23rd, 2026
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CITY HALL

The Brevard Planning Board met for a regular meeting Tuesday, June 23rd, 2026, at 5:30 PM in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

Members' Present:	Greg Hunter, Chair Karen Darity Reid Wood Jerry Yunker Alan Mercaldo Michael Hinds
Members' Absent:	Peter Chaveas
Staff Present:	Emily Brewer, Senior Planner Paul Ray, Planning Director Stephanie Holland, Planner Vith Gass, Board Clerk

I. Welcome

At 5:32PM, 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

R. Wood made a motion to approve the agenda. K. Darity seconded, unanimously carried.

V. Approval of Minutes

G. Hunter motioned to approve the May minutes. A. Mercaldo, second, passed unanimously.

VI. Public Comments

None.

DRAFT

VII. Unfinished Business

None.

VIII. New Business

a. TXT-26-0006 – Fats, Oil and Grease (FOG)

E. Brewer immediately introduced a proposed text amendment aimed at regulating Fats, Oils, and Grease (FOG) and presented her staff report, a portion of which follows:

> **Background & Discussion**
>
> FOG stands for fats, oils, and grease (e.g., meat fats, shortening, lard, cooking oils). These substances have the potential to cause clogs in the sanitary sewer/wastewater collection system, leading to sewer back-ups and sanitary sewer overflows. Most FOG is non-soluble, meaning it does not dissolve in water. FOG and other pollutants, including "flushable" wipes (which are not actually flushable), build up in the wastewater collection system, causing costly blockages and environmental degradation. Under North Carolina Division of Water Resources regulations, all municipalities operating a wastewater collection system are required to implement and enforce a Fats, Oils, and Grease (FOG) Program to protect public health and the environment. The City is currently developing a robust FOG reduction program to be implemented and monitored by wastewater treatment plant operators. These policy changes are underway and will live in the sewer usage regulations in the Code of Ordinances. As such, they do not need to be reviewed by the Planning Board. However, the UDO needs to be amended to include FOG program compliance as a required submittal in the development process. The proposed change is included as Attachment 1.
>
> Addressing policy alignment, E. Brewer explained that because FOG programs and wastewater treatment operations are not addressed in the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the amendment is technically neutral, neither consistent nor inconsistent with current adopted plans. She emphasized, however, that a FOG enforcement program is an explicit state law requirement, and amending the development regulations is a necessary step to bring the City into full legal compliance.

Following the delivery of the staff report, A. Mercaldo asked for clarification on whether the written regulations were complete. E. Brewer confirmed that no formal monitoring or enforcement mechanism exists yet, though the city does currently utilize an educational component. She emphasized that a full enforcement program is a new requirement under state law, which is why the comprehensive policy is currently under review. Brewer

explained that this minor, single-line amendment is a necessary step to pave the way for a much larger text amendment that will eventually live in the code of ordinances.

A. Mercaldo then clarified that the Board's role is purely procedural—giving a recommendation to reference a framework that is still being built—and noted that City Council would not officially act to adopt it as a whole until the Chapter 70 updates are entirely finished, with which Brewer agreed.

A. Mercaldo made a motion to adopt as written. The motion was seconded by M. Hinds and passed unanimously.

b. TXT-26-0007 Building Height

Emily Brewer introduced the agenda item as an ongoing work in progress intended for open, informal discussion. She clarified that staff have not yet prepared a final proposal; instead, the session's purpose is to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of various complex building height measurement methods. Brewer concluded by inviting continuous questions and feedback from the Board throughout the presentation.

E. Brewer delivered the staff report. An excerpt of the presentation follows:

> **Background:** Building height regulations play a critical role in shaping the scale and character of development and ensuring compatibility with surrounding properties. While height limits are commonly expressed as a maximum number of feet, the method used to calculate height can significantly affect the actual appearance and visual impact of a building, particularly in communities with varied topography. In mountainous areas, slopes can result in buildings that comply with a numerical height limit but appear substantially taller when viewed from lower elevations, adjacent properties, or public rights-of-way. Traditional height measurement methods may also lead to extensive grading or allow large, exposed walls that alter the natural landscape and community character. As development and redevelopment continue to occur on sites with varying terrain, it is important to evaluate whether the City's current approach to measuring building height adequately reflects the unique conditions present in the region. Alternative methods used by mountain communities often incorporate measurements from natural grade or limitations on exposed wall height to better address the visual impacts of development on sloping sites.
>
> **Case Studies and Illustrations:** E. Brewer detailed that building height regulations depend on linear height, ground-level elevation, and specific roof measurement

points, with sloped lots posing the greatest challenge to fair calculations. Current local ordinances define maximum height as the distance from the highest adjacent grade to the eave, parapet, or deck line, capping it at 35 feet in most districts and 50 feet in specific zones. Read the full analysis at Raleigh City Planning.

E. Brewer outlined that current steep slope regulations, which restrict height based on pre-development grades over 35%, fail to address the visual impact of structures from the downhill side. These regulations are limited to specific elevations, failing to regulate the perceived scale and roof design of buildings on slopes located elsewhere in town. To address these issues, a uniform slope-height calculation method and updated roof-type framework are needed for consistent enforcement.

S. Holland noted a potential conflict where mandated minimum roof pitches increase building height, which, if combined with measuring height to the ridge, places an unintended burden on development scale. Holland advised that forcing steeper roof pitches while strictly regulating ridge height requires careful coordination to avoid contradictory regulations. To proceed, consider integrating this analysis into a staff report or as part of a formal ordinance amendment discussion.

E. Brewer reframed the issue as an opportunity rather than a challenge. She emphasized the importance of aligning the building height regulations with the town's new architectural standards**.** Because elements like scale, proportion, setting, and form dictate a building's overall impact, she urged the board to integrate both frameworks into a cohesive policy.

R. Wood asked for clarification on whether the regulations apply to all roof pitches or just the main roof**.** S. Holland clarified that the ordinance makes a distinction, applying specific standards to the main roof while providing different allowances for secondary structures like dormers or shed roofs.

E. Brewer noted that updating the building height ordinance allows the town to overhaul historically ineffective developer incentives. By fixing the flawed calculation framework that previously made height bonuses unappealing, the town can introduce effective density and height bonuses to successfully encourage affordable housing and community development.

A. Mercaldo asked for clarification on whether the intent was to disincentivize high roofs. E. Brewer clarified that the goal is instead to use building height as an incentive for other public benefits. She explained that developers could receive a height allowance increase in exchange for providing affordable housing or exceeding open space requirements. R. Wood added that increased height also allows developers to build more units, which Brewer confirmed.

E. Brewer emphasized that building height limits require a balance between preserving community scale and allowing the density needed on a dwindling land supply. While strict rules artificially shrink building sizes—harming housing and commercial inventory—flexible height regulations can actually reduce grading and site disturbance on steep slopes. Brewer concluded that the initiative aims to uphold local architectural standards without creating administrative barriers on Brevard's unique, sloped terrain.

M. Hinds asked if the minimum height rules were intended to optimize local density. S. Holland clarified that while certain building types lack a strict minimum height, they do require a minimum number of stories. This standard ensures proper density and urban form in downtown and downtown-transition zones. Additionally, Holland explained that the minimum roof pitch requirements are purely aesthetic, meant to promote a traditional architectural look rather than low-sloped, modern styles.

E. Brewer and M. Hinds highlighted that public engagement for Brevard's architectural standards focused heavily on preserving the town's distinct visual identity. Because different areas require specific roof pitches to reflect local history—such as flat parapets downtown versus sloped roofs elsewhere—roof pitch was integrated as a critical design requirement rather than a tool to regulate density or color.

E. Brewer explained that downtown density requirements necessitate at least two stories, with a focus on form-based architectural standards rather than strict density. Using a comparative example between Virginia Beach and Norfolk, Virginia, she demonstrated how different regulatory methods for measuring building height from the lowest adjacent grade versus the front door to the roof midpoint can yield varied outcomes despite similar structural designs.

E. Brewer stated that current standards inadequately address diverse, modern roof designs, necessitating an ordinance update. She proposed a standardized, visual measurement method for various roof types—including flat, hip, gabled, and mansard—to ensure consistent building scale and improved regulatory accuracy. You can read the full analysis at E. Brewer's presentation.

G. Hunter requested clarification from S. Holland regarding the definition of "coping" and whether it is identical to a parapet wall. Holland clarified that coping specifically refers to the top cap or protective covering of a parapet wall.

DRAFT

E. Brewer noted that, across other cities, measuring from the base of the parapet (the roofline) is more common than measuring from the top of the parapet wall.

J. Yunker observed that, based on the illustrated diagram, hip and mansard roof designs would theoretically provide less usable interior space relative to the other three configurations. He raised concerns regarding the potential for the proposed regulations to become excessively complex, an assessment with which E. Brewer concurred.

E. Brewer introduced a 10-slide visual progression utilizing a baseline structure on a sloped parcel to illustrate variations among height calculation methodologies. Brewer emphasized that the exact locus of measurement on a roof structure represents a critical regulatory variable. She noted that while Brevard's current framework utilizes an eave calculation, most jurisdictions employ the midpoint of a sloped roof. Utilizing a baseline reference height of 35 feet—and noting a 50-foot allowance in alternative zoning districts—Brewer advised that numerical height limits may require reevaluation contingent upon the chosen methodology. She concluded that calculating height from the average finished grade to the roof midpoint is a widely accepted standard that remains simple to administer.

E. Brewer reviewed various baseline reference grade methods and their practical impacts on sloped terrain. She noted that Brevard's current framework—measuring from the highest adjacent grade to the eave - is uniquely restrictive and virtually nonexistent in other jurisdictions. Brewer contrasted this with other standard methodologies:

- *Lowest Adjacent Grade:* Measures the lowest point among the midpoints of each building facade. This method significantly restricts down-slope development and risk encouraging excessive site grading.

- *Midpoint of Highest and Lowest Grades:* Offers a balanced compromise between design flexibility and visual impact. It is easy to calculate for commercial or multi-family projects requiring formal plan reviews but poses administrative challenges for single-family homes where detailed grading plans are typically not required.

- *Exposed Wall Height:* Sets a strict cap (e.g., 30 feet) on any single facade to prevent towering, exposed walls on downward slopes.

- *Story-Based Calculations:* Focuses on the number of floors rather than total feet, though this approach would require precise definitions determining when basements or attics qualify as full or half stories.

E. Brewer highlighted a hybrid approach used by some Western North Carolina jurisdictions, such as Buncombe County.

E. Brewer stated that pairing an overall height allowance with an exposed wall height cap prevents massive, looming facades on downward slopes while enabling creative, terraced designs that step down with the natural topography. She suggested that the board will likely need to adopt a hybrid regulatory framework.

E. Brewer outlined two primary paths forward for the amendment:

1. *The Simplified Approach:* Modify the specific measurement points within the town's existing framework while fully maintaining Brevard's strict steep slope protections.

2. *The Hybrid Approach:* Implement a multi-layered calculation that sets a total building height limit alongside strict maximum exposed wall heights or story counts to control structural bulk and encourage architectural massing variations.

E. Brewer concluded by reminding the board that because Brevard's current regulations exclude roof height, transitioning to a midpoint calculation method would effectively reduce allowed building volumes. For example, if a standard roof adds 10 feet to a structure, measuring to the midpoint reduces a building's functional envelope by 5 feet. Consequently, the town must adjust its numerical height limits dynamically to avoid inadvertently shrinking future developments. She concluded by noting that height bonuses could serve as a valuable future development incentive and opened the floor for board discussion on the presented regulatory directions.

Following to E. Brewer's presentation, M. Hinds noted that managing building height on steep terrain presents unique challenges, citing local developments where structures on sloped parcels exhibit compliant front elevations but feature excessively tall, exposed walls on rear and side elevations. Brewer concurred, adding that regulatory efforts are significantly constrained by North Carolina land-use statutes. Under state law, municipalities are legally preempted from enforcing architectural or design standards on residential structures containing four units or fewer (single-family, duplex, triplex, and quadplex). As a result, Brewer emphasized that building height metrics represent the town's sole statutory mechanism for regulating structural mass and bulk within low-density residential zoning districts.

G. Hunter noted that the proposed hybrid model conforms with the board's prior consensus regarding terraced architectural configurations. Citing Jailhouse Hill as a localized case, Hunter stated that a terraced framework successfully mitigates the visual impact of

expansive, monolithic building facades on the streetscape, yielding a more compatible aesthetic scale. E. Brewer concurred, noting that the primary intent of the steep slope framework remains the minimization of site and natural grade disturbance. Brewer recommended utilizing finished grade metrics rather than pre-development natural grade calculations, specifically for developments situated below the 2,250-foot elevation threshold, to optimize administrative efficiency. She concluded that while the current height plane was originally calibrated to mirror natural topography, transitioning to finished grade standards provides a more enforceable administrative framework.

G. Hunter inquired about the scope of the proposed height restrictions, asking how much residential property would be impacted and if the affected areas would primarily be located on the north side of town. E. Brewer clarified that, realistically, very few residential properties would be impacted by the changes.

S. Holland asserted that the distinction would matter in the case of townhomes; while they are regulated under the single-family framework, they would be subject to these specific standards.

K. Darity requested clarification regarding irregular residential lots, inquiring if future single-family developments would be subject to a definitive height limitation framework. E. Brewer confirmed that managing these specific configurations is the primary objective of the proposed ordinance update. Brewer explained that because North Carolina statutory provisions preempt local governments from enforcing architectural design standards on lower-density configurations (single-family, duplex, triplex, and quadplex), height measurement parameters represent the town's sole legal mechanism to regulate structural bulk and scale.

E. Brewer noted that while baseline limits fluctuate by zoning district - including a 35-foot maximum in the General Residential district—a staff evaluation of a steep, irregular parcel revealed that the down-slope elevation variance was restricted to approximately five feet. She stated that while the lower facade of the structure measured between 35 and 40 feet, the minimal deviation underscores how the scale and slope of an exposed wall can profoundly impact a neighborhood's architectural character without necessitating expansive structural changes.

J. Yunker inquired about the case study’s roof pitch and any potential impacts on fire department operations. E. Brewer clarified the structure features a minimal pitch and confirmed that public safety officials consider the height changes an operational non-event due to their 100-foot ladder capabilities. Furthermore, S. Holland noted that the fire

department views road access and hydrant placement as far more critical operational constraints than vertical building height.

A. Mercaldo emphasized that height regulations should prioritize a development's public visual impact over technical formulas. He voiced concerns that tall, high-density structures at high elevations conflict with community character, and he endorsed a hybrid framework combining exposed wall height caps with terraced designs to prevent out-of-scale development on slopes.

R. Wood advised that height regulations must evaluate all structural elevations, cautioning against the assumption that a facade will remain permanently hidden. He noted that future demolition or site modifications on neighboring parcels could unexpectedly expose previously obscured walls, making it critical for the ordinance to account for visual impacts on all sides of a building.

P. Ray commented that the primary objective should be regulating the height and scale of expansive, blank walls. Both A. Mercaldo and R. Wood concurred with this assessment.

G. Hunter observed that the hybrid approach aligns with current slope frameworks and recalled that the standard 35-foot height cap was historically tied to the local courthouse eave line. He questioned whether the town should raise this baseline or introduce height incentives. P. Ray clarified that the 35-foot restriction is standard across all zone districts except for the Business Mixed-Use (BMX) district, which maintains a 50-foot allowance.

A. Mercaldo inquired if a variance was required for the hotel development due to its roof design, noting a public rumor regarding the proposed rooftop structure. P. Ray clarified that the rumor likely stemmed from a past variance granted to the French Broad Place building. Ray explained that the town measured heights differently at that time, and a variance was ultimately approved because the developer added an ornamental rooftop feature that exceeded the district's 50-foot height limit.

A. Mercaldo asked whether church steeples are exempt from the standard height regulations. E. Brewer confirmed that they are, noting that under the town's architectural standards, structures like church steeples and towers are permitted to exceed standard height allowances by a specific margin and are excluded from overall building height calculations.

G. Hunter inquired about the specific height parameters required to incentivize developers within 50-foot commercial zones. E. Brewer noted that because current height caps are not overly restrictive, local developers have never requested height bonuses. S. Holland clarified that if updated measurement methods inadvertently reduce allowable building envelopes

town-wide, a bonus framework should be introduced to allow developers to regain that lost capacity. Brewer added that while height is an industry-standard incentive used by other municipalities to secure community benefits like affordable housing, it remains a purely proactive consideration for Brevard's future ordinance updates.

G. Hunter brought the discussion back to the maximum exposed wall height, noting that under a hybrid model, it could reach up to 50 feet. E. Brewer responded by comparing this to a 35-foot example, which she noted is common across Western North Carolina outside of downtown areas. She proposed capping the maximum exposed wall height at 25 or 30 feet. Brewer explained that on flat sites, the exposed wall height is the actual limiting factor rather than the building height. By setting the limit to 25 or 30 feet, the regulation would successfully prompt architecturally be terracing and scaling on sloped sites, without artificially reducing the allowed building mass on flat sites.

A. Mercaldo opened the discussion by questioning the need to alter the current numbers, arguing that changes should not be made unless past instances have shown the existing figures to be problematic. E. Brewer offered a caveat, explaining that if the underlying calculation method changes, keeping the same numbers would significantly alter the real-world results. S. Holland supported this reasoning, pointing out that changing the definitions of the roof or what is being measured provides a valid reason to adjust the numbers. Brewer further illustrated this by noting that switching the measurement point from the roof eave to the midpoint of a sloped roof would naturally change the outcomes. It might not be a huge difference, but it could be a couple of feet. Because we are now counting part of the roof, maybe the number should be bumped up to 40 feet instead. That is an example of why we might want to tweak the numbers, especially if we start to alter these other definitions.

A. Mercaldo advocates for using simple, fixed points rather than complex, arbitrary averages to determine building heights, aiming to benefit both developers and the public. While E. Brewer agrees on seeking simplicity, she notes that while midpoints pose a greater challenge for residential development, they are manageable within the context of comprehensive commercial project plans.

G. Hunter and A. Mercaldo agree that measuring strictly from the eaves while allowing steeper roof pitches can create overly massive visual structures. To prevent this unwanted bulk without increasing height limits, Hunter suggests transitioning to measuring building height from the midpoint or the top of the roof.

R. Wood supports using the roof midpoint because it aligns with standard jurisdiction practices and fairly accounts for varying roof slopes. A. Mercaldo agrees that measuring a midpoint is simpler than calculating an average slope, while Wood notes that eave

measurements fail to capture the massive structural differences between steep and shallow roof pitches.

R. Wood endorsed the roof midpoint standard, noting its widespread use in other jurisdictions and ARB submittals as an effective way to account for varying slopes. A. Mercaldo observed that midpoint calculations are less complex than determining average slopes. Wood and Holland emphasized the impact on residential development, noting that eave-only measurements ignore the roof structure entirely. They highlighted that a steep 14:12 pitch can add a full story or story-and-a-half to a home's actual mass compared to a shallow 3:12 pitch.

J. Yunker suggested an alternative regulatory approach: utilizing a standardized ratio for the maximum exposed wall height rather than fixed footage limits like 25 or 30 feet. Yunker argued that a ratio (e.g., two-thirds or three-quarters) would introduce built-in flexibility and ensure the standard is perfectly scalable regardless of the building's overall size. By applying this consistent ratio to both the uphill and downhill slopes, the regulation would naturally preserve the same visual effect without bogging developers down in rigid number limits. E. Brewer supported this strategy, confirming it was an excellent idea to consider.

P. Ray shared a real-world example involving the City Camper project to illustrate that the current ordinance is broken. He noted that due to the lot's slope and the current calculation method, a planned four-story building was technically measured as being only eight feet tall. Ray also expressed interest in J. Yunker's proposed ratio approach, characterizing it as a flexible and interesting idea.

E. Brewer asked the committee for input on how to determine the reference elevation, noting the shared desire for an easily calculable method.

A. Mercaldo suggested utilizing the roof's midpoint on the lower side of the building. J. Yunker pointed out a vulnerability with using absolutely lowest or highest-grade points, explaining that developers can easily manipulate site designs to work around them. In contrast, Yunker noted that an average grade forces a design to truly fit the natural terrain. M. Hinds connected this back to the ratio concept, explaining that the ratio model requires a solid, fixed baseline to work properly. Hinds warned that an average grade could cause the ratio to fluctuate wildly between the front and back elevations, whereas pairing the ratio with a roof midpoint provides the stable, fixed baseline necessary to make the system function correctly.

DRAFT

A. Mercaldo clarified whether the "average grade" pertains strictly to the immediate structure itself rather than the broader lot or topography. He asked if the calculation only evaluates the adjacent grade between a building's opposing walls.

E. Brewer confirmed that it is always relative to the structure. She outlined a few standard compliance methods:

- *The Site Plan Method:* Averaging the individual elevations taken from the midpoints of each of the building's footprint lines to map a mathematical plane.

- *The Split Midpoint Method:* Locating a single midpoint between the highest and lowest adjacent grades, which is often simpler to calculate.

E. Brewer pointed out that while multiple methodologies exist, jurisdictions rarely rely on standalone highest or lowest grades. Using average or midpoint systems relative to the building footprint is standard practice.

G. Hunter compared the data requirements of the two calculation methods. He noted that an average grade requires at least four data points, providing a more accurate assessment than a midpoint, which only requires two and while analyzing that the averaging method would result in a significantly more complicated submittal process for single-family homeowners.

E. Brewer explained that a complex calculation method is feasible for steep slope developments because these projects are already subject to rigorous plan submittal requirements. She noted that it is much easier for staff to process complicated data within the framework of a commercial or steep slope application. The primary concern she reiterated arises when applying these complex standards to straightforward residential projects—such as an individual landowner looking to build a single house without the infrastructure of a large-scale development team.

G. Hunter proposed a dual standard to address the complexity issue, suggesting that the ordinance could require an average elevation calculation for commercial projects while utilizing a simpler midpoint calculation for residential developments. E. Brewer noted that while she has not personally seen the two sectors separated in this manner, it is a viable option. She supported the approach, confirming that it logically aligns regulatory standards with the existing submittal paperwork applicants are already preparing, thereby preventing any new administrative burdens for single-family homebuilders.

E. Brewer summarized the overarching direction of the committee, noting a shared consensus that the updated ordinance must effectively regulate building bulk and scale. She observed that the board favors moving away from standalone metrics like the highest adjacent grade, leaning instead toward a hybrid framework that utilizes midpoints or averages to actively manage structural mass alongside traditional height limits. Both A. Mercaldo and J. Yunker affirmed that this summary accurately captured the core intent and direction of their conversation.

IX. Final Remarks

M. Hinds closed the session on a lighter note, joking that the July recess effectively grants the board a 60-day window to deliberate on the complexities of the issue. Following laughter from the room, A. Mercaldo shared that he intends to drive around town during the break to visually gauge existing structures and evaluate how a 35-foot standard paired with a midpoint calculation would translate in practice. R. Wood added a final word of support for the ratio concept, calling it a highly innovative approach. Finally, K. Darity underscored the discussion by emphasizing the vital structural and administrative differences that must be maintained between residential and commercial frameworks.

X. Adjournment

The meeting concluded following a motion to adjourn from A. Mercaldo, which was seconded by R. Wood. The meeting officially adjourned at 6:35 PM.

_____
Greg Hunter, Chair

Date Signed: _____

_____
Edievith Gass, Board Clerk

DRAFT

CHAPTER 17. DEVELOPMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS

17.6. Construction document requirements.

The construction documents for site plans, conditional rezoning plans, special use plans, major subdivisions, vested rights, and master plans shall be submitted in accordance with the specifications of this section except where specifically noted. Construction documents shall constitute the complete submittal requirements for site plans and preliminary plats required prior to construction.

The size and number of completed application submittal copies required shall be set by the administrator. No certifications other than the certificate of survey and accuracy as in Section 17.7.J and the seal of the professional designer must be provided in connection with the submission.

Construction drawings must be drawn to the following specifications and must contain or be accompanied by the applicable information listed below. All plans shall be submitted at a scale not less than one inch = 50 feet unless otherwise authorized by the administrator. No processing or review of construction documents will proceed without all of the following information:

A. The boundary, as determined by survey, of the area to be subdivided with all bearings and distances shown and the location within the area, or contiguous to it, of any existing streets, railroad lines, water courses, easements, bridges, floodplains, or other significant features of the tract.

B. Scale in feet denoted both graphically and numerically with north arrow and declination.

C. A sketch vicinity map at a scale no smaller than one inch equals 1,200 feet showing the relationship between the proposed subdivision and surrounding area.

D. Environmental survey in accordance with Section 17.3.

E. Existing topography and finish grading with contours drawn at two foot intervals. This requirement may be waived for developments smaller than one acre or where insufficient topographic changes warrant such information.

F. Corporate limits and extraterritorial jurisdiction boundaries (where applicable).

G. The proposed names of the development and streets, the owner's name and address, signature of the owner or owner's duly authorized agent, the surveyor's name, the names of existing and proposed adjoining subdivisions or property owners, the names of the city, county, and state in which the development is located, the date of preparation, and the zoning classification of the tract to be developed and of adjoining properties.

H. Proposed lot lines, lot and block numbers, and exact dimensions.

I. The future ownership (dedication or reservation for public use to a governmental body; for owners to duly constituted home owners' associated, for tenant's remaining in subdivider's ownership of recreation and open space lands).

J. A statement from the City of Brevard regarding the availability of adequate water and sewer capacity for the proposed development.

K. The plans for utility layouts, including sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and water lines, illustrating connections to existing systems. All systems shall conform to current city standards.

L. The location and size of all utility lines, easements, and rights-of-way. Easements shall be provided on all construction documents as follows:

1. *Utility easements:* Easements for underground or above ground utilities shall be provided for and centered along rear or side lot lines, and shall be a minimum of ten feet in width. Easements for water lines, sanitary sewers, and storm drains shall be centered on the pipe and a minimum of 20 feet in width or as required by design manual.
2. *Drainage easements:* Where a development is crossed by a stream or drainage way, an easement shall be provided conforming with the lines of such stream and of sufficient width as shall be adequate to maintain the overall integrity of the drainage area and provide for its periodic maintenance.
3. *Landscape easements:* Landscape easements along streets should be designed in accordance with the provisions of CHAPTER 6 and CHAPTER 8. The city may require landscape easements for developments where industrial or commercial uses abut residential uses.
4. *Public access easements:* Public access easements shall be provided for sidewalks, trails, greenways, and other pedestrian and bicycle facilities that provide connections other than within public rights-of-way.

M. The location of proposed buildings, parking and loading areas, streets, alleys, lots, parks or other open spaces, reservations (i.e. school sites), property lines and building setback lines with street dimensions, tentative lot dimensions, and the location of any building restriction areas (i.e. flood hazard areas, watershed protection districts, and/or jurisdictional wetlands. Buildings shown for the purpose of measuring setbacks must reflect these elements when applicable.

N. Site calculations shall include total acreage of tract, acreage in parks and other non-residential uses, total number and acreage of parcels, the total number of housing units, area of all mixed-use and non-residential buildings, gross project density per acre, linear feet of streets, and the accurate locations and descriptions of all monuments, markers, and control points.

O. The location and dimensions of all off-street parking and loading spaces, and walkways indicating the type of surfacing, size, angle of stalls, width of aisles, and a specific.

P. Development permit and certification application with supporting documentation as required by the flood hazard prevention requirements of CHAPTER 34 of Brevard City Code.

Q. The location and dimensions of any sidewalks, curb cuts, curb and gutters to be installed along public street frontages, and other required street improvements designated in CHAPTER 11 of this ordinance, or as called for in the Brevard Transportation Plan, the Rural Planning Organization Thoroughfare Plan or Transportation Improvement Program, or other plan or policy of the city. Required right-of-way shall be drawn in the location shown on any official plan at the width specified in this ordinance.

R. Typical cross sections of proposed streets showing rights-of-way, pavement widths, grades, and design engineering data for all corners and curves. Where a proposed street is an extension of an existing street the profile of the street shall include 300 feet of the existing roadway, with a cross section of the existing street. Where a proposed street within the subdivision abuts a tract of land that adjoins the subdivision and where said street may be expected to extend into said adjoining tract of land, the profile shall be extended to include 300 feet of the said adjoining tract.

S. The location of any existing or proposed demolition landfills in the site. Such sites shall not be used for building.

T. A copy of the full soil erosion and sedimentation permit application including forms, plans, and calculations to be submitted to the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality-Erosion and Sediment Control Office, and a copy of the approval letter prior to site plan or preliminary plat approval.

U. Final proposed elevations of all non-single family and duplex buildings proposed for construction as part of this site plan approval. Subsequent buildings within the development may be handled as separate site plans. Such elevations shall include all facades visible from public streets.

V. Supplemental plans as applicable:

1. Landscape plan in accordance with Section 17.9.
2. Tree preservation plan in accordance with Section 17.9.
3. Lighting plan in accordance with Section 17.10.
4. Architectural plans in accordance with Section 17.11.
5. Traffic impact analysis (if required) in accordance with Section 17.12.
6. Floodplain development information (if required) in accordance with Section 17.13.
7. Stormwater management concept plan in accordance with Section 17.13.
8. Fats, oils, and grease (FOG) control plan in accordance with CHAPTER 70 of Brevard City Code of Ordinances.

W. The following statement shall be placed upon all final construction documents, as applicable:

"Areas delineated upon this plat or plan as a protection area or Special Flood Hazard Areas is subject to limitations upon development as set forth CHAPTER 34 of Brevard City Code, and any development, disturbance, or encroachment is prohibited except in accordance therewith."

In addition to the above required information, the following additional information may be necessary for specific sites as determined by the administrator:

X. Where a proposed water and sewer system does not contemplate the use of facilities owned and operated by the city, the proposed facility plans as approved by the appropriate agency, shall be submitted with the construction documents.

Y. Where public or community water supply and/or sewerage systems are not available or to be provided, a written statement from the Transylvania County Health Department shall be submitted with the construction documents indicating that each lot has adequate land area and soil conditions suitable to accommodate the proposed methods of water supply and sewage disposal.

COMMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
AND ANY OTHER OFFICIALLY ADOPTED APPLICABLE PLANS
TXT-26-0006

NCGS 160D-605 requires that the Planning Board shall advise and comment on whether the proposed amendment is consistent with any comprehensive plan prior to consideration by the Governing Board. The Planning Board shall provide a written recommendation to the Governing Board that addresses plan consistency and other matters as deemed appropriate by the Planning Board, but a comment by the Planning Board that a proposed amendment is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan shall not preclude consideration or approval of the proposed amendment by the Governing Board.

The Brevard Planning Board forwards this recommendation to City Council with a finding that the proposed amendment to the City's zoning regulations is **neither consistent nor inconsistent** with the City's adopted plans and policies, including the Building Brevard 2030 Comprehensive Land Use Plan.