# Town of Montreat <br> Board of Adjustment (BOA) <br> Meeting Agenda <br> February 22, 2024, 5:00 p.m. <br> Montreat Town Hall <br> 1210 Montreat Rd., Black Mountain, NC 28711 <br> Meeting also held via Zoom: https://bit.ly/3oFiacv 

I. CALL TO ORDER

- Welcome
- Moment of Silence


## II. CERTIFICATION OF QUORUM

III. AGENDA ADOPTION (Packet pages 1-2)

- Suggested Motion: To adopt the meeting agenda as presented/amended


## IV. SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS

- If present at this meeting, swear in Ed Kramer as a Regular Member of the Town of Montreat's Board of Adjustment.
V. ADOPTION OF JANUARY 25, 2024, MEETING MINUTES (Packet pages PENDING)
- Suggested Motion: To adopt the January 25, 2024, Meeting Minutes as drafted/amended.


## VI. EVIDENTIARY HEARING

- Variance Request (VA-2023-03)* - A Variance Request (VA-2023-03) submitted by John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat, LLC) to Chapter K Article IV Section II(4)(a) of the Montreat General Ordinance to increase the Approved Graded Area from 40\% to 85.2\% and to Chapter K Article IV Section II(4)(j) of the Montreat General Ordinance to increase the approved development intensity ratio from 0.30 to 0.472 on property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 within the Town of Montreat.

Suggested Motion: To grant/grant with conditions/deny VA-2023-03.
Applicant materials (Packet pages 3-8)
Staff materials (Packet pages 9-15)

* This case was continued from the January 25, 2024, Board of Adjustment meeting to this
meeting to allow the Applicant to revise their site plan.
- Special Use Permit Request (SUP-2023-02) - A Special Use Permit (SUP-2023-02) to allow a 1,010 square-foot detached Garage (Accessory Building) with a final height taller than ten feet to be placed in the front yard of a single-family dwelling unit submitted by John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd, Montreat, LLC) on property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace


## Town of Montreat <br> Board of Adjustment (BOA)

Meeting Agenda
February 22, 2024, 5:00 p.m.
Montreat Town Hall
1210 Montreat Rd., Black Mountain, NC 28711
Meeting also held via Zoom: https://bit.ly/3oFiacv
and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 within the Town of Montreat.
Suggested Motion: To grant/grant with conditions/deny SUP-2023-02.
Applicant materials (Packet pages 16-66)
Staff materials (Packet pages 67-86)

## VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

February 8, 2024

Variance Request for 325 North Carolina Terrace, Montreat NC

Site plan Revision \#1:

In accordance with the request at the Board of Adjustments meeting on January $25^{\text {th }}$, we have agreed to make the following changes to the site plan and subsequently the variance request for 325 North Carolina Terrace:

1. The proposed garage structure has been removed from the project.
2. The parking area at the lower end of the driveway has been adjusted to provide the minimum adequate space for parking and turn around.
3. The water management plans have been changed to accommodate the request from the adjoining property owner.
4. The changes and adjustments above have changed the site calculations by:
Impervious area has changed from 44\% to 47.2\%.
Grading area limit has changed from 89.3\% to 85.2\%.
Lastly, I like to note that the day after the hearing I receive a call from our neighbor Charlie Morris. We discussed the proposed adjustments to our storm water management plan, and he was appreciative that we were willing to make the changes in response to their concerns. He also stated that they wanted to be good neighbors and wished us luck with our project.





## Staff Report VA-2023-03

Variance Request (VA-2023-03) - A Variance request submitted by John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat LLC) to Chapter K Article IV Section II(4)(a) of the Montreat General Ordinance to increase the Approved Graded Area from $40 \%$ to $85.2 \%$ and to Chapter K Article IV Section II(4)(j) of the Montreat General Ordinance to increase the approved development intensity ratio from 0.30 to 0.472 on property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 within the Town of Montreat.
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## STAFF REPORT

See STAFF FINDINGS (i.e. Kayla DiCristina, AICP, Montreat Zoning Administrator) in addition to applicant-provided materials. STAFF FINDINGS contain references to the Montreat Zoning Ordinance (MZO) and Montreat General Ordinance (MGO) where noted. Only those findings relevant to the variance requested are included in this staff report.

## Application Summary

The following report summarizes the Zoning Administrator's review of an application for a Variance submitted by John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat LLC) to Chapter K Article IV Section II(4)(a) of the Montreat General Ordinance to increase the Approved Graded Area from $40 \%$ to $85.2 \%$ and to Chapter K Article IV Section II(4)(j) of the MGO to increase the approved development intensity ratio from 0.30 to 0.472 on property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 within the Town of Montreat.

This application was first heard at the January 25, 2024, Board of Adjustment meeting. The Board of Adjustment continued the hearing to the February 22, 2024, meeting to allow the applicant to revise their site plan showing the removal of the proposed detached garage, recalculation of the proposed approved graded area and impervious surface figures, and additional stormwater management measures on the western side of the Subject Property. The Applicant submitted the revised plans on February 8, 2024.

## Property Summary

Parcel Identifier Number (PIN): 071096598200000
Address: 325 North Carolina Terrace, Montreat, NC 28757
Owner: Dowd Montreat LLC
1905 Fendall Ave, Charlottesville, VA, 22903
Applicant: John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat LLC)
Zoning: R-2
Current Land Use: Single-family dwellings
Acres: 0.395 acres


Figure 1: Subject Property Aerial

## Public Notice

Staff mailed notice to properties within 250 feet of the Subject Property on January 11, 2024 (see Variance Request). Staff posted the Subject Property on January 11, 2024. The BOA Hearing was scheduled for January 25, 2024. The hearing continuance was announced during the Board of Adjustment's January 25, 2024, meeting stating the time, location, and purpose of the hearing. However, staff mailed notice to properties within 250 feet of the Subject Property on February 8, 2024 (see Variance Request) and posted the Subject Property on February 8, 2024, for the continued BOA Hearing scheduled for February 22, 2024.


Figure 2: 250 feet Public Notice for Variance Request

## Staff Findings

## Revised Site Plan

The Applicant's revised site plan was submitted to the Zoning Administrator on February 8, 2024. The site plan shows...

1. The removal of the detached garage.
2. The reconfiguration of the parking area to allow three parking spaces with space to turn around.
3. The addition of new drains in the driveway and parking area. New $12^{\prime \prime}$ pipes direct stormwater to the existing 7 -foot storage tank and an additional 7 -foot storage tank in the parking area.
4. The redirection of stormwater on the western side of the proposed addition to a rain barrel with a 12 " pipe leading water eastward to the main swale and detention basin.

## Post-Construction Stormwater Measures

The Applicant's new site plan proposes to manage the stormwater on the Subject Property using a series of stormwater conveyance measures leading water from the new driveway to two seven-foot storage tanks that drain into a river rock-lined swale and a 120 -square-foot detention basin with a six-foot stone weir. Rain barrels and downspouts are proposed on each side of the new addition directing stormwater toward the main swale and detention basin.

For purposes of this Variance application, the Applicant's proposed stormwater management system sufficiently details how post-development stormwater run-off will be controlled and managed. Prior to permit issuance, the Applicant will be required to obtain a Stormwater Control Permit and comply with the Town of Montreat's General Ordinance (MGO) Chapter K Article III.

## Hillside Development Ordinance

The Subject Property has a slope of $44.8 \%$ per the Buncombe County Steep Slope Calculator (Exhibit A). Therefore, it is subject to the MGO Chapter K Article IV. The Subject Property is considered a NonConforming Improved Lot. A Non-Conforming Improved Lot is defined as any improved lot in existence prior to adoption of the Hillside Development Ordinance (adopted 6/11/2009) that, whether by aggregate graded area and/or existing impervious area, exceeds the permitted limits established in the Hillside Development Ordinance.

The Applicant's new site plan shows the following as part of the overall development plan.

## GRADED AREAS

* Retain 10,750 square feet of graded area, which includes the two single-family dwellings on the south side of the Subject Property. 2,800 square feet of this existing grading area is within the boundaries of the new construction.
* Add 3,910 square feet of graded area in the form of a driveway, parking area, and addition on the north side of the Subject Property. This figure does not include the existing 2,800 square feet of existing grading area within the boundaries of the new construction.


## IMPERVIOUS AREA

* Retain 5,199 square feet of the existing impervious surface, which includes the two single-family dwellings on the south side of the Subject Property.
* Remove 2,360 square feet of the existing impervious surface, which includes the single-family dwelling on the north side of the Subject Property.
* Add 5,285 square feet of new impervious surface in the form of a driveway and parking area on the north side of the Subject Property.

In sum, the Applicant is permitted to have a graded area of $40 \%$, currently has a graded area of $62 \%$, and requested a Variance to permit a graded area of $85.2 \%$ to construct the proposed driveway, parking area, and addition. Additionally, the Applicant is permitted to have a development intensity ratio of 0.30 , currently has a development intensity ratio of 0.44 , and requested a Variance to permit a development intensity ratio of 0.472 to permit the proposed driveway, parking area, and addition. At the time of permitting, the Applicant would be required to demonstrate conformance to all applicable standards in the Hillside Development Ordinance.

The Applicant's new site plan shows...

1. The removal of the detached garage.
2. The reconfiguration of the parking area to allow three parking spaces with space to turn around.
3. The addition of two new drains in the driveway and parking area with 12 " pipes directing stormwater to the existing 7 -foot storage tank. The Applicant also proposes an additional 7foot storage tank in the parking area to capture stormwater.
4. The redirection of stormwater on the western side of the proposed addition to a rain barrel with a 12 " pipe leading water eastward to the main swale and detention basin.
5. Compared to the site plan submitted for the January 25,2024 , meeting, a decrease in the requested graded area from $89.3 \%$ to $85.2 \%$ and a decrease in the requested development intensity ratio from 0.49 to 0.472 .

## Template Variance Decision Language

The Board is welcome to use the language below to issue a decision on the Variance Request. Prior to making the approval motion, the Board must state the specific findings that lead to the approval of each finding of fact as required by Section 310.42 of the MZO.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board finds that unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the Ordinance because...
2. The Board finds that the hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property because...
3. The Board finds that hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner because...
4. The Board finds that the variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance ...
5. The Board finds that the variance requested is the minimum variance that will make possible the requested use of the land because...
6. The Board finds that the variance is not a request to permit a use of land that is not permitted in the applicable Zoning District as the variance request is for...

Motion for Decision: "I move that the Board [approve/approve with conditions/deny] the Variance Request VA-2023-03 to Chapter K Section II(4)(a) of the Montreat General Ordinance to increase the Approved Graded Area from $40 \%$ to $85.2 \%$ and to Chapter K Section II(4)(j) of the Montreat General Ordinance to increase the approved development intensity ratio from 0.30 to 0.472 on property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 within the Town of Montreat [List any conditions of approval in the motion, if applicable]

## SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION

Town of Montreat Planning and Zoning<br>1210 Montreat Road, Black Mountain, NC 28711 | (828) 669-8002

REQUIRED FEE: \$300.00 (CASH OR CHECK)

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

$\qquad$
MAILING ADDRESS: 1905 Fendall Ave
TELEPHONE:540-319-0500
EMAIL:johnbhennis@gmail.com

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

PLEASE NOTE: A RECORDED SURVEY MAP, DEED, Or OfFER TO PURCHASE MAY BE REQUIRED AT THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DISCRETION.

property owner: Dowd Montreat LLC
telephone: 540-319-0500

MAling address: 1905 Fendall Ave Charlottesville VA 22903

## PROPOSED LAND USE

TYPE OF LAND USE: $\triangle$ Residential
 Non-Residential $\square$ Other
description of proposed development: Request is for a Special Use Permit to allow a 1010 SF detached garage (Accessory Building) with a final height taller than ten feet to be placed in the front yard of a single-family dwelling unit.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

THE TOWN OF MONTREAT'S BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT WILL RENDER A DECISION ON THIS APPLICATION AT A PUBLIC HEARING. IN APPROVING THE REQUEST, THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT WILL EXAMINE THE APPLICATION AND MUST FIND THAT THE FOLLOWING SIX ELEMENTS ARE SATISFIED IN THE PROPOSAL:

MZO 310.621 The use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare if located where proposed and developed according to the plan as submitted and approved.

MZO 310.622 The use meets or will meet all the required and applicable development standards and conditions of the Town of Montreat of the zoning district in which the subject property is located (including without limitation all development standards, conditions, and requirements related to utilities, parking, access, and stormwater drainage).

MZO 310.623 The use will not substantially diminish and impair the value of any property any portion of which is located within two hundred fifty feet ( $250^{\prime}$ ) of the boundary of the subject property.

MZO 310.624 The location and character of the use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property, for the purposes already permitted, within the area in which it is located.

MZO 310.625 The location and character of the use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in general conformity with the adopted policies and plans, including the comprehensive plan of the Town of Montreat.

MZO 310.626 Adequate measures have been taken or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize congestion in the public streets.

## ATTACHMENTS

## THIS APPLICATION MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS:

1. A response to the six findings listed above and found in the Montreat Zoning Ordinance Sections 310.621 through 310.626.
2. A to scale site plan showing the existing property conditions, the proposed locations, dimensions, and setbacks of any structure to be built or modified, existing and proposed impervious areas, proposed areas of disturbance, and parking areas.

## SIGNATURES AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

,John B. Hennis
hereby certify that all of the information set forth above is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.


Zoning Administrator Signature

Printed Name of Zoning Administrator

Fee: $\qquad$ Paid:


Payment Method: $\qquad$

Scheduled Board of Adjustment Meeting Date: $\qquad$

# Town Of Montreat - Special Use Permit Application for 325 North Carolina 

 Terrace:December 13, 2023

Applicant: John B. Hennis, Owner's Representative for Dowd Montreat LLC

Findings of Fact:
310.621 The Use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare if located where proposed and developed according to the plan as submitted and approved.
(A) This proposed project will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare when completed. As evident from the preliminary drawings submitted, the design team has developed a plan that includes utilizing the existing entrance off West Virginia Terrace. Additionally, we are maintaining a similar site footprint by replacing an existing structure with a garage, minimizing the impact on the surrounding area.
310.622 The Use meets or will meet all the required and applicable development standards and conditions of the Town of Montreat (including without limitation all development standards, conditions, and requirements related to utilities, parking, access, and stormwater drainage).
(B) The proposed project will meet all required and applicable development standards and conditions of the Town of Montreat. The proposed design for the project has addressed all requirements related to utilities, parking, access and stormwater retention. Provisions have been made to address parking requirements and a storm water management on the property. See addendum $A$ for additional information.
310.623 The Use will not substantially diminish and impair the value of any property any portion of which is located within two hundred fifty feet (250') of the boundary of the subject property.
(C) This project will not substantially diminish or impair the value of any property any portion of which is located within $250^{\prime}$. The development of the hillside adjacent to West Virginia Terrace and construction of the garage with upgraded exterior façade features of the principal building including premium siding, trim and metal roof in low LRV finishes that will prevent the diminishment or impairment of value of surrounding properties.
310.624 The location and character of the use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property, for the purposes already permitted, within the area in which it is located.
(D) When completed this project will be in harmony with the area and will not be injurious to other property owners. By maintaining a similar site footprint by replacing an unused aging structure with a modern garage the design team has created a plan that echoes the surrounding area with minimal impact on adjacent property owners.
310.625 That the location and character of the Use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in general conformity with the adopted policies and plans, including the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Montreat.
(E) As submitted, the project will be in general conformity with the adopted policies and plans, including the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Montreat. The design of this project incorporated many characteristics including exterior finishes such as premium exterior siding, trim and metal roof that exist on adjoining properties and throughout the Town.
310.626 That adequate measures have been taken or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize congestion in the public streets.
(F) The design of this project and specifically the new driveway have been designed to minimize any impact of traffic as it relates to West Virginia Terrace.

## Addendum A:

Montreat Zoning Ordinance Section 606.2: Garages in Front Yard
606.21: The zoning Administrator finds this requirement to be met, as referenced in the staff report.
606.22: The garage will be constructed of materials that will meet or exceed the quality and appearance of the principal building. These materials include premium siding, trim and metal roof that will match the principal house.
606.23: The garage will be enclosed and be equipped with an operable garage door and will be maintained in good working order.
606.24: The garage doors will be kept closed when the house is unoccupied for more than one day.
606.25: The property owner will maintain the garage and its appearance in the condition it was when completed and approved by the Building Inspector.



Enter in appropriate block for each party: name, address, and, if appropriate, character of entity, e.q. corporation or partnership.
The designation Grantor and Grantee as used herein shall include said parties, their heirs, successors, and assigns, and shall include singular, plural, masculine, feminine or neuter as required by context.

WITNESSETH, that the Grantor, for a valuable consideration paid by the Grantee, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, has and by these presents does grant, bargain, sell and convey unto the Grantee in fee simple, all that certain lot or parcel of land situated in the City of $\qquad$ Black Mountain Township, Buncombe County, North Carolina and more particularly described as follows:

[^0]The property hereinabove described was acquired by Grantor by instrument recorded in

A map showing the above described property is recorded in Plat Book
..... page
TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the aforesaid lot or parcel of land and all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging to the Grantee in fee simple.
And the Grantor covenants with the Grantee, that Grantor is seized of the premises in fee simple, has the right to convey the same in fee simple, that title is marketable and free and clear of all encumbrances, and that Grantor will warrant and defend the title against the lawful claims of all persons whomsoever except for the exceptions hereinafter stated.
Title to the property hereinabove described is subject to the following exceptions:
1999 ad valorem taxes
Easement, restrictions, covenants and conditions of record

Anne Waters Dowd joins in the execution of this deed for the sole purpose of releasing her marital rights to the property and does not join in the covenants and warranties contained herein.
 corporate neme nit
Rbove written.



Being all of Lot 308 and part of Lot 309, as shown on a plat of Mountain Retreat Association, which plat is recorded in the Office of the Register of Deeds for Buncombe County in Plat Book 154 at page 1, and re-recorded in Plat Book 16 at page 95, and being more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a stake in the northern margin of Carolina (North Carolina) Terrace, at the southeast corner of Lot 307 of said plat; and runs thence with the dividing line between said Lots 307 and 308, North 7-10 West 132.33 feet to a stake in the southern margin of West Virginia Terrace; and ruins thence with said margin of said last mentioned Terrace, the following two courses and distances: North 68-49 East 90 feet and North 64-19 East'35.5 feet to a stake; thence South 17 West 138 feet to a stake in the northern margin of Carolina (North Carolina) Terrace, and runs thence with said margin of Carolina (North Carolina) Terrace, the following two courses and distances: South 66-22 West 37 feet and South 72-12 West 110.4 feet to the place of BEGINNING.

Being the same property that was conveyed to W. Frank Dowd, Jr. and wife, Sally Carson Dowd, by Deed dated December 9, 1980, and recorded in the Office of the Register of Deeds for Buncombe County, North Carolina.

## END

!
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Mr. Chris Brock

Report of Hand Auger Boring Exploration<br>Hennis Residence - 325 North Carolina Terrace - New Driveway/Garage<br>Montreat, North Carolina<br>KEG Project No. JA23-4732-01

## Mr. Brock:

Kessel Engineering Group, PLLC (KEG) is pleased to submit this report of hand auger boring exploration for the proposed new driveway and garage construction at the existing Hennis residence located at 325 North Carolina Terrace in Montreat, North Carolina. The purpose of this exploration was to determine general subsurface conditions at the site and to provide preliminary global stability analyses and general geotechnical recommendations for the proposed driveway / site retaining wall design and site preparation. Our services were provided in general accordance with our Proposal No. PA23-4097-01, and receieved/authorized December 4, 2023.

## PROJECT INFORMATION

Initial project information was provided by Mr. Chris Brock via email and telephone correspondences with our Mr. Ian Johnson, P.E. Additional information was gathered during multiple visits to the project site by Mr. Johnson. We have also been provided with the following digital documents:

- Survey and Base Maps: Dowd Montreat, LLC, Sheet L1, by Creative Development Solutions, dated September 7, 2023.
- Site Plan and Detail Site Plan: Dowd Montreat, LLC, Sheets L2 and L2.1, by Creative Development Solutions, dated September 7, 2023.
- Grading Plan: Dowd Montreat, LLC, Sheet L3, by Creative Development Solutions, dated September 7, 2023, and showing proposed driveway grading and associated site retaining walls, as well as existing topographic contours.

The project site is located at the existing residence at 325 North Carolina Terrace in Montreat, North Carolina (see Figure 1). Three separate residential buildings are located on the property. The area of proposed construction is on the north/uphill portion of the property adjacent to West Virginia Terrace and is generally sloping and grassed. A gravel driveway is present near the upper/north side, and a stone walkway/stair cuts through the center. Based on our review of the provided topographic information, the area of proposed construction generally slopes downhill to the south at overall inclinations on the order of 2H:1V (horizontal to vertical). Stacked stone site retaining walls are present along the north sides of each existing structure and presumably retain earthwork cuts. Maximum exposed heights of these existing site retaining walls are on the order of 5 to 10 feet. At this time, no documentation has been provided regarding design or construction of these existing stacked stone site retaining walls.

Project plans include demolition of the northernmost structure at the site and construction of a new garage building in the same general area. Also planned are construction of a driveway and two associated site retaining walls at the north half of the parcel accessed from West Virginia Terrace. Based on information provided on Sheet L2, the proposed site retaining walls will each have maximum heights on the order of 9
to 10 feet, and will retain earthwork cuts and/or fills. Redi-rock type wall systems are indicated on project plans.

For the purpose of this report, the new site retaining walls will be identified as Wall $1 \mathrm{~A} / 1 \mathrm{~B}$, and Wall 2. Wall $1 \mathrm{~A} / 1 \mathrm{~B}$ is shown as an approximately 170 feet long site retaining wall which will be located within the north, west, and south portions of the proposed construction footprint, with Wall 1A comprising the northern portion (retaining earthwork cuts), and Wall 1B comprising the southern portion (retaining earthwork fills). Wall 2 is shown as an approximately 50 feet long site retaining wall retaining earthwork cuts adjacent the northwest corner of the proposed garage building.

Additional project plans include expansion of the existing 2-story structure (main house) located at the southwest corner of the property. This expansion will include foundation construction to the north of the existing structure and will span over the existing stacked stone site retaining wall in the area. We understand the expansion will be constructed over a crawl space, and that the existing stacked stone site retaining wall in this area is to remain in place.

## SITE GEOLOGY

The project site is located in the Blue Ridge Physiographic Province. The bedrock in this region is a complex crystalline formation that has been faulted and contorted by past tectonic movements. The rock has weathered to residual soils which form the mantle for the hillsides and hilltops. The typical residual soil profile in areas not disturbed by erosion or grading consists of clayey soils near the surface where weathering is more advanced, underlain by sandy silts and silty sands.

The boundary between soil and rock is not sharply defined and there is often a transitional zone, termed "partially weathered rock" overlying the parent bedrock. Partially weathered rock (PWR) is defined, for engineering purposes, as residual material with a standard penetration resistance in excess of 100 blows per foot. Weathering is facilitated by fractures, joints, and the presence of less resistant rock types. Consequently, the profile of the partially weathered rock is irregular even over short horizontal distances. Also, it is not unusual to find lenses and boulders of hard rock and/or zones of partially weathered rock within the soil mantle, well above the general bedrock level.

Soils from higher elevations slough and slide down the slopes through the action of gravity. Soils deposited in such a manner are referred to as colluvial soils. Accumulated colluvial soils, or colluvial deposits, may contain features such as perched ground water and planes of weakness on which sliding took place.

## FIELD EXPLORATION

The site was explored by performing a series of five hand auger borings (HAB-1 to HAB-5) at the approximate locations shown on the attached Field Exploration Plan (see Figure 2). The hand auger boring locations were determined by our Mr. Johnson by referencing identifiable site features and scaling distances from the provided site plan. The soils encountered by the hand auger borings were identified in the field from cuttings brought to the surface by the auger equipment. Representative samples of the encountered materials were also collected and transported to the laboratory. In the laboratory, the samples were examined by a geotechnical engineer to verify the soil classifications made in the field. Hand auger borings were backfilled at the completion of the field work.

At regular intervals, the soil consistency of the encountered materials was measured by performing the Dynamic Cone Penetrometer test (DCP). The conical point was first seated to penetrate any loose cuttings and was then driven increments of $13 / 4$ inches with blows from a 15 -pound hammer dropped from a height of 20 inches. The number of blows required to achieve the penetration is recorded. The number of blows is then used as an index to the soil strength and foundation supporting capability. Soil descriptions and test data are tabulated on the attached hand auger boring logs.

## SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Hand auger borings performed during this exploration typically encountered approximately 8 to 12 inches of surficial topsoil. Hand auger boring HAB-3 was performed in the old gravel driveway footprint and encountered approximately 12 inches of surficial gravel blended with topsoil. Surficial topsoil was underlain by colluvial soils at hand auger borings HAB-1 and HAB-4. The encountered colluvial soils extended to depths of approximately 1.5 to 2 feet below the existing ground surface and consisted of loose silty sands (SM). Colluvial soils at HAB-1 and HAB-4 were underlain by residual soils. Surficial gravel/topsoil encountered at HAB-3 was underlain by existing fill soils. Existing fill soils consisted of very loose to loose silty sands with trace organics and extended to a depth of approximate 6 feet, after which residual soils were encountered. Existing fill soils were noted to be slightly moist.

Residual soils were encountered directly below the topsoil layer at HAB-2 and HAB-5, below the colluvial layer at HAB-1 and HAB-4, and below the existing fill layer at HAB-3. The encountered residual soils generally consisted of loose to very firm silty sands (SM). Firm sandy silts (ML) were encountered at HAB-2 and HAB-5 to depths of approximately 2 feet. Trace mica content was encountered in some of the residual soils.

Multiple offsets were performed at hand auger borings HAB-1, HAB-2, and HAB-3 due to shallow refusal prior to encountering residuum. Hand auger borings HAB-1, HAB-3, and HAB-4 extended to their assigned termination depths of 9 feet. Hand auger borings HAB-2 and HAB-5 encountered auger refusal at depths of 6.5 and 7.5 feet below the existing ground surface.

Refusal materials encountered in hand auger borings during this exploration are those materials which are sufficiently hard to prevent the vertical advancement of the auger equipment. Refusal may result from very dense soils, partially weathered rock, boulders, lenses, ledges, or layers of relatively hard rock underlain by partially weathered rock or residual soil; refusal may also represent the surface of relatively continuous bedrock. Power drilling and core drilling procedures are required to penetrate refusal materials and to determine their character and continuity. Power drilling and core drilling were beyond the scope of this exploration.

Groundwater was not encountered in the hand auger borings performed during this exploration. Groundwater levels may fluctuate several feet with season and rainfall variations. Normally, the highest groundwater levels occur in late winter and spring and the lowest levels occur in late summer and fall.

The above descriptions and Table 1 below provide a general summary of the subsurface conditions encountered. The attached logs contain detailed information recorded at each hand auger boring location. These logs represent our interpretation of the field logs based on engineering examination of the field samples. The lines designating the interfaces between various strata represent approximate boundaries and the transition between strata may be gradual. Soil conditions may vary between the hand auger boring locations. Locations and elevations provided in this report should be considered approximate.

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS ENCOUNTERED BY HAND AUGER BORINGS (MEASURED IN FEET BELOW THE EXISTING GROUND SURFACE)

| Hand Auger Boring No. | Surficial Materials (feet) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing Fill } \\ & \text { (feet) } \end{aligned}$ | Colluvium (feet) | Residual Soil (feet) |  | Refusal / Termination Depth (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Loose Silty SANDS | Firm to V. <br> Firm Silty <br> SANDS or <br> Sandy SILTS |  |
| HAB-1 | 0 to 0.8 | - | 0.8 to 1.5 | 1.5 to 4 | 4 to 9 | 9 (t) |
| HAB-2 | 0 to 1 | - | - | - | 1 to 6.5 | 6.5 (r) |
| HAB-3 | 0 to 1 | 1 to 6 | - | 6 to 8 | 8 to 9 | 9 (t) |
| HAB-4 | 0 to 1 | - | 1 to 2 | - | 2 to 9 | 9 (t) |
| HAB-5 | 0 to 0.7 | - | - | 2 to 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \text { to } 2, \\ & 6 \text { to } 7.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7.5 (r) |

- Material not encountered in hand auger boring.
* See Figure 2 for approximate locations. See logs for surficial materials.


## ANALYSES AND PRELIMINARY DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

## General Overview and Specifications Review

Careful coordination during design and construction will be required at the project site. In particular, new construction associated with driveway retaining Wall 1 B and the main house addition will need to be carefully coordinated such that all structural elements are compatible and properly sequenced into the construction schedule. Furthermore, construction of these items should take place such that they do not negatively impact existing site retaining walls or foundations that are to be left in place. Demolition of the existing northernmost structure and performance of earthwork cuts at the site should be sequenced such that they do not destabilize the project site. We recommend that we be retained to make a review of the foundation and earthwork plans and specifications prepared from the recommendations presented in this report. We would then suggest any modifications so that our recommendations are properly interpreted and implemented. An additional fee would apply for review of plans and specifications.

## Topsoil, Colluvium, and Existing Fill

Hand auger borings performed within the proposed construction footprint typically encountered surficial topsoil to depths of 1 foot or less. Surficial topsoil was underlain by existing fill at HAB-3, and colluvium at HAB-1 and HAB-4. Retaining walls, building foundations, driveway pavements, and earthwork fills should not bear on surficial topsoil, existing fill, or colluvium. These materials are susceptible to excessive settlement and instability. Removal of these materials will be required to accommodate the proposed construction. We anticipate a majority of these materials will be removed during proposed grading associated with driveway, site retaining wall, and garage construction.

## Shallow Foundations - Garage Building \& Site Retaining Walls

Based on the hand auger boring data and our experience with similar subsurface conditions, residuum encountered at the project site is suitable for shallow foundation support of the proposed site retaining wall and garage footing construction. Foundations bearing in residuum similar to that encountered in the hand auger borings with DCP n-values of 7 or better may be sized for an allowable bearing pressure of $2,500 \mathrm{psf}$. Satisfactory performance of the shallow foundations is subject to the design and site preparation recommendations contained in this report. Some isolated subgrade remediation may be required if pockets of looser/softer residual soils are encountered in foundation excavations. Remediation would likely include localized undercutting and replacement by overpouring with lean concrete. We do not recommend backfilling foundation undercutting on sloping lots with washed stone. Foundations should not be constructed atop topsoil, colluvial soils, existing fill or very loose residual soils. If encountered, these materials should be undercut to approved residuum.

We recommend that the minimum widths for individual column and continuous wall footings be 30 and 24 inches, respectively. The minimum widths are considered advisable to provide a margin of safety against a local or punching shear failure of the foundation soils. Footings should bear at least 30 inches into approved residuum to develop the recommended bearing pressures, provide frost protection, and provide protective embedment. We recommend that walls be provided with regular movement joints to accommodate some possible differential settlement.

Building footings constructed adjacent slopes (on the downhill side) require additional embedment. We recommend that building footings constructed adjacent sloped areas be embedded such that the horizontal distance between the bottom of the footing and the slope surface is a minimum of 8 feet. This could require foundation embedment depths of approximately 4 feet along the south garage footing depending on final site layout.

While not anticipated, if refusal materials and/or rock are encountered prior to meeting the aforementioned minimum foundation embedment depths, then pinning to underlying rock may be required. Foundations which are pinned (doweled) to rock should be designed by the structural or wall engineer to resist sliding. We recommend the use of epoxy-coated or stainless steel dowels grouted into place with a minimum embedment of 12 inches into rock. Longer dowel embedment lengths may be required if the rock is fractured or seamy. The dowels should be placed perpendicular to the face of the rock. Foundations bearing directly on uneven rock surfaces may be susceptible to radial cracking when bearing conditions differ across the footing. This type of cosmetic cracking should be expected. If encountered at the base of foundation excavations, refusal materials and/or rock should be observed by the geotechnical engineer to determine that they are competent for pinning, and geotechnical recommendations for construction atop refusal materials and/or rock should be developed at that time.

Exposure to the environment may weaken the soils at the footing bearing level if the foundation excavations remain open for long periods of time. Therefore, we recommend that once each footing excavation is extended to final grade, the footing be constructed as soon as possible in order to minimize the potential for damage to bearing soils. The foundation bearing area should be level or benched and free of loose soil, ponded water and debris. Foundation concrete should not be placed on soils that have been disturbed by seepage. If surface water intrusion or exposure softens the bearing soils, the softened soils must be removed from the foundation excavation bottom prior to placement of concrete. If the excavations must remain open for an extended period of time, or if rainfall becomes imminent while the bearing soils are exposed, we recommend that a 2 -inch to 4 -inch mudmat of lean ( $2,000 \mathrm{psi}$ ) concrete be placed on the bearing soils before the placement of reinforcing steel for protection.

In order to verify that the soils encountered in footing excavations are similar to the approved residuum encountered by the hand auger borings, we recommend that foundation excavations be examined and checked with a dynamic cone penetrometer by an engineering technician working under the direction of the geotechnical engineer.

## Deep Foundations - Proposed Main House Expansion

As previously described, the proposed main house expansion will span over an existing stacked rock site retaining wall located to the north of the building. Due to the unknown conditions associated with design and construction of the existing stacked rock site retaining wall, construction of shallow foundations within this wall's retained soil zone could lead to excess lateral loading of the wall and subsequent distress and/or instability. Therefore, we recommend that the proposed main house expansion be supported by deep foundations. This recommendation is provided in order to transfer expansion foundation loading to a deeper bearing strata such that additional lateral loading from the expansion upon the existing stacked rock site retaining wall is eliminated.

The proposed main house expansion can be supported on pile caps and/or grade beams supported by helical piles. Helical piles consist of single flights of screw helix along a shaft installed with rotary installation equipment. They can be installed in relatively rapidly, and the installation produces minimal vibration. The shafts are designed to withstand the compressive and tensile foundation loads which are then transferred to suitable bearing materials (i.e., underlying very firm / dense residual soils, partially weathered rock and/or refusal materials). Should the soils be corrosive, special coatings are applied at the time of installation or cathodic protection can be used. Torque value should be monitored during installation to estimate soil consistency as the helix penetrates through the different subsurface strata.

Allowable capacities on the order of 15 to 20 kips per pile can be utilized in initial feasibility planning; however, the final design capacity should be determined by the pile design engineer. Helical piles should be designed to limit total and differential settlement of foundations to 1 -inch and $1 / 2$-inch, respectively. A minimum center-to-center spacing of 3 pile diameters is recommended. Battered piles may be required to take up lateral loads. Piles should be sufficiently stiff to develop the required lateral capacity, if applicable.

We recommend that a specialty contractor with experience in helical pile design and installation and working under a "design/build performance" specification be retained to install the foundation system. The helical pile design should be provided by a professional engineer licensed in the State of North Carolina. The pile spacing, sizing, proposed depths, and connections to proposed pile caps and/or grade beams should be determined/designed by the design engineer. The bidding foundation contractors should be provided a copy of this report. The helical pile installation QC program should be monitored full time by a Kessel Engineering Group representative within the scope of the project Statement of Special Inspections. The QC program would include conducting verification of placement, installation depths, and observed torque/pressure. These items should be documented for each helical pile element installed to provide a complete record of foundation quality. We recommend Kessel Engineering Group be consulted to review the design developed from the recommendations provided in our report. We would then suggest any modifications so that our recommendations are properly interpreted and implemented.

If partially weathered rock (PWR) or bedrock are encountered during helical pile installation, these materials may inhibit the ability of the helical pile contractor to successfully install the piles to the design torque and/or depths. If this condition is encountered, an alternative deep foundation system such as micropiles may be required. Alternatively, the use of special lead sections designed to penetrate rockier soils could be attempted at the specialty contractor's discretion and risk. Determining the depth to PWR and/or bedrock would require mobilizing a drill rig to the project site, which was beyond the scope of this exploration.

## Preliminary Global Slope Stability Analyses

Preliminary global slope stability analyses were conducted by Spencer's limit equilibrium method using SLOPE/W software developed by Geo-Slope International. Analyzed slope geometries were estimated from the provided site grading plan. Slope stability analyses were used to estimate the factor of safety against global slope failure for two cross-sections of the proposed construction area shown on Figure 2 (CS-1 to CS-2). A traffic loading condition of 250 psf was utilized where applicable. It is our opinion that Wall 1B (retaining earthwork fills) will require geogrid reinforcement in order to satisfy global stability requirements. Required geogrid reinforcement lengths will likely be at least 1.5 times the wall heights at most locations.

The soil strength parameters used in the analyses were estimated based on our experience with similar soils. A summary of the effective stress shear strength parameters utilized in our analyses are provided below in the attachments to this report. We assumed the south portion of West Virginia Terrace was constructed primarily on fill soils. Based on our experience, the most likely type of slope failure for these conditions would be a circular failure arc. Generally, we recommend a factor of safety $\mathrm{FS} \geq 1.5$ for critical slopes retaining structures, and a FS $\geq 1.3$ for slopes retaining roadways and for transient (i.e. traffic) loading conditions. A factor of safety $\mathrm{FS} \leq 1.0$ is indicative of failure.

The results of our slope stability analyses at each cross-section are presented in the attachments to this report. Based on available project information, data obtained from our field exploration, our experience with similar subsurface conditions, and our preliminary global slope stability analyses, it is our opinion that, if performed in accordance with the recommendations provided in this report, the proposed driveway and garage construction will have an adequate industry-standard factor of safety with respect to overall site global stability.

## Retaining Walls

The design of foundation basement retaining walls and site retaining walls constructed on sloping sites is often governed by global stability. Sloping conditions should be considered during retaining wall design. Retaining wall design parameters including backfill requirements (such as select backfill) will likely be affected by the sloping conditions at the site. At a minimum, retaining wall foundations should adhere to the recommendations set forth in the Shallow Foundations - Garage Building \& Site Retaining Walls section of this report. We note that detailed retaining wall stability analyses and designs are beyond our current scope of service. Site retaining walls should be designed by a professional engineer licensed in the State of North Carolina and should consider localized stability and global stability.

Site retaining walls must be capable of resisting the lateral earth pressures that will be imposed on them. Based on our experience with similar soils, the following shear strength effective stress parameters are recommended for use during preliminary site retaining wall design. For walls retaining undisturbed residuum similar to that encountered in the borings, we recommend an angle of internal friction value of 32 degrees, a cohesion value of 100 psf , and a soil unit weight of 115 pcf . For low plasticity ( $\mathrm{PI}<10$ ), onsite or offsite silty sands similar to those encountered in the borings and used as engineered fill, we recommend an angle of internal friction value of 30 degrees, a cohesion value of 0 psf , and a soil unit weight of 125 pcf be utilized to calculate lateral earth pressure coefficients. Laboratory testing should be performed prior to construction to confirm the utilized design values are appropriate.

In lieu of using soil backfill, select backfill consisting of No. 57 stone may be used to reduce lateral earth pressures on the walls. No. 57 stone placed against retaining walls as select fill should extend from the base of the walls in a wedge with an angle of 45 degrees or shallower from horizontal in order that the following parameters may be used to reduce lateral earth pressures. For select backfill consisting of No. 57 stone, we recommend an angle of internal friction value of 38 degrees, a cohesion value of 0 psf , and a soil unit weight of 105 pcf be utilized to estimated lateral earth pressure coefficients. Passive earth pressures should not be developed with No. 57 stone. Non-woven, needle-punched geotextile filter fabric (such as Mirafi 140 N or equivalent) should be used to separate No. 57 stone from adjacent soils and
prevent migration of fines into the stone. No. 57 stone must be placed such that it is permanently confined. No. 57 stone should be placed and compacted in maximum 12 -inch lifts. This is recommended to help reduce the potential for settlement within deeper placements of No. 57 stone.

Frictional resistance along the base of wall foundations may be used to resist sliding. We recommend a coefficient of frictional resistance ( $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{s}}$ ) value of 0.39 for retaining wall foundations bearing in undisturbed on-site residual soils.

Lateral pressure arising from sloping fill surfaces, surcharge loading, earthquake loading, and groundwater (not expected within wall construction depths) will dramatically influence the earth pressure coefficients and should be included in the calculation of the total lateral pressures that the walls must resist. In addition, transient loads imposed on the walls by construction equipment during grading should be taken into consideration during design and construction. Excessively heavy grading equipment should not be allowed within about 10 horizontal feet of the walls. The design of site retaining walls should take global stability into account, especially where walls are located on/adjacent to slopes or are retaining sloping backfills.

Provisions for the drainage of water which collects behind the retaining structures must be provided. The drainage system should have sufficient capacity to prevent the buildup of excess hydrostatic head behind the walls. The drainage system should incorporate appropriately graded sand or aggregate material and geotextile fabric to prevent the loss of fines which could be transported in the drainage system. Drain cleanouts should be provided.

The preceding values are based on our experience and testing of reasonably similar soils. Sloping backfill (or sloping soil surfaces in front of a footing when considering passive resistance) will dramatically influence lateral earth pressures. Kessel Engineering Group should be consulted concerning applicable earth pressure coefficients where sloping soil surfaces may be present.

## Grade Slabs

Based on the hand auger boring data and our experience with similar soils, approved onsite residual soils ( n -value of 7 or better) and newly placed engineered fill are suitable for support of grade slabs and pavements assuming that the site is prepared in accordance with the recommendations in this report. Topsoil, colluvium, and existing fill soils are not suitable for support of grade slabs and pavements and should be undercut to approved residuum and brought back to design grade with engineered fill. Areas to support grade slabs and pavements should be evaluated as directed by the geotechnical engineer prior to grade slab or pavement construction. The implementation of remedial measures, such as undercutting and replacing with new engineered fill, will be required if unsuitable soils are encountered.

We recommend that consideration be given to constructing the project driveway as a concrete reinforced grade slab in multiple sections in lieu of utilizing asphaltic pavements. It is our experience that significant difficulties may be experienced when attempting to place and properly compact asphaltic pavements on projects with relatively steep grades and tight curves such as the proposed project driveway. Poorly constructed asphaltic pavements may experience short- and/or long-term distress, especially where vehicular traffic is regularly braking and turning.

Building grade slabs should be jointed around columns and along footing supported walls so that the slab and foundations can settle differentially without damage. If slab thickness permits, joints containing dowels or keys may be used in the slab to permit movement between parts of the slab without cracking or sharp vertical displacements. Completed slabs should be protected from excessive surface moisture prior to and during periods of prolonged below-freezing temperatures to prevent subgrade freezing and resulting heave. For grade slabs bearing on a combination of engineered fill and refusal materials (if encountered), over-excavation of the refusal materials approximately 12 -inches and replacement with compacted engineered fill to provide a cushion is recommended.

If the driveway or garage pad subgrades are to be exposed to construction traffic or inclement weather for an extended period of time, it may be advantageous to overbuild the pad during initial grading or to place a granular material (such as an aggregate base course material) across the subgrade to help minimize deterioration.

Floor slabs supported on grade which will be carpeted, tiled, painted, or receive some other covering or sealant should incorporate a vapor barrier. At a minimum, the vapor barrier should be installed in accordance with the guidelines outlined in Chapter 3 of ACI Publication 302.1 (Guide for Concrete Floor and Slab Construction).

## Difficult Excavations

Refusal materials were encountered within the residual soil strata in hand auger borings HAB-2 and HAB-5 at depths of approximately 6.5 and 7.5 feet below the existing ground surface, respectively. Refusal materials encountered by hand auger boring equipment can sometimes be due to the physical limitations of hand auger equipment, and it is our experience that these materials are often able to be excavated with standard excavation equipment.

However, refusal materials can also signify transition into more resistant materials as noted in the Subsurface Conditions section of this report. Difficult excavations should be anticipated if more resistant refusal materials are encountered within proposed construction depths. Heavy excavation equipment and heavy excavation equipment with ripping tools will be able to remove some of these materials. Foundation excavations could require some pneumatic hammering to excavate seams of more resistant rock, if encountered. The ease of excavation of these materials cannot be specifically quantified and depends on the quality of grading equipment, skill of the equipment operators and geologic structure of the material itself, such as the direction of bedding, planes of weakness and spacing between discontinuities.

## Groundwater and Surface Water

As previously described in the Subsurface Conditions section of this report, groundwater was not encountered within the proposed construction footprint during this exploration. If groundwater is encountered during site grading or construction, the geotechnical engineer and wall design engineer should be contacted immediately to develop recommendations for subsurface drainage control. The contractor should be prepared to promptly remove surface water from the construction area by means of gravity ditches and pumping from gravel-lined cased sumps.

## Secondary Design Considerations

The following secondary design considerations are known to generally enhance performance of structural systems. Roof drainage should be collected by a system of gutters and downspouts and piped away from structures and slopes. Site grading and paving should result in positive drainage away from structures, site retaining walls, and slopes. Water should not be allowed to pond around structures or in such locations that would lead to saturation of their subgrade. A minimum slope of approximately $1 / 4$ to $1 / 2$-inch per foot should provide adequate drainage. Backfill for utility lines should be placed in accordance with the requirements for engineered fill to minimize the potential for differential settlement.

## SITE PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION RECOMMENDATIONS

## Clearing and Grubbing

Existing topsoil, vegetation, disturbed soils, limbs, stumps, and surface soils containing organic matter or other deleterious materials should be removed from the area of the proposed construction. Topsoil and organic soils may be stockpiled for later use in areas to be landscaped. Stumps and other deleterious materials should be disposed of offsite or in areas of the site that will not be developed. Further construction of structures or pavement in areas containing limbs or stumps, organic soils, burn pit residue or other deleterious materials will first require that these materials be removed.

## Proofrolling

If feasible, we recommend that areas to provide support for grade slabs, pavements, and earthwork fills be observed and proofrolled by an engineering technician working under the supervision of the geotechnical engineer. For mountainside residential sites, where heavy excavation equipment encounters difficult site access, the general method of proofrolling should consist of rolling the exposed subgrade using a loaded dump truck, if feasible. Areas which wave, rut, or deflect excessively and continue to do so after several passes of the proofroller, or are otherwise deemed unsuitable, should be excavated to firmer soils and backfilled with engineered fill placed and compacted as recommended in this report. Proofrolling should not be performed on wet, frozen, or saturated subgrade or immediately following periods of precipitation.

## Engineered Fill

Fill used for site retaining wall backfill or raising site grades should be uniformly compacted in thin (6inch to 12 -inch) horizontal lifts to at least 95 percent of the standard Proctor maximum dry density (ASTM D-698) and within 3 percent of optimum moisture. The upper 18 inches below grade slabs and concrete pavements should be compacted to at least $98 \%$ of the same standard. Based on visual examination and our experience with similar soils, the on-site soils consisting of residuum and colluvium are generally suitable for re-use as engineered fill, provided they are free of organics and are moisture conditioned. Existing fill soils (such as that encountered at HAB-3) are marginal for reuse as existing fill due to moisture conditions and some organic content, and will likely need to be exported offsite. Soils with particle sizes larger than 6 inches should generally not be reused for engineered fill.

In general, soils having a Plasticity Index (PI) greater than 30 (less than 15 is preferable) should not be used for fill. Soils utilized as engineered fill should have a maximum dry density as determined in accordance with ASTM D698 (Standard Proctor test) of 90 pcf or higher ( 95 pcf or higher preferred). Before filling operations begin, representative samples of each proposed fill material should be collected and tested to determine the compaction and classification characteristics. Once compaction begins, a sufficient number of density tests should be performed by an engineering technician working under the direction of the geotechnical engineer to measure the degree of compaction being obtained.

Engineered fill should be placed in horizontal lifts. Prior to each lift of fill placement, the sloped area should be benched with a level pad into residuum. The level pad will allow for better compaction of the fill materials. The resulting series of level benches will also serve to break the potential slip plane between the temporary slope and backfill materials.

The surface of compacted subgrade soils can deteriorate and lose its support capabilities when exposed to environmental changes or construction activity. Deterioration can occur from, but is not limited to, the effects of freezing temperatures, the formation of erosion gullies, exposure to extreme wetting/drying conditions, long term exposure to natural elements, and rutting caused by construction traffic. We recommend that surfaces of the subgrade that have deteriorated or softened be recompacted immediately prior to construction of grade slabs or pavements. Additionally, excavations through the subgrade soils, such as utility trenches, should be properly backfilled with compacted lifts of engineered fill. Recompaction of subgrade surfaces and compaction of backfill should be checked with a sufficient number of density tests to determine if adequate compaction is being achieved.

## Slopes and Excavations

Confined excavations such as for footing or utility installation should conform to OSHA regulations. For excavations that are not confined (i.e. cut slopes), our experience suggests that temporary excavation side slopes through undisturbed residuum should be laid back at a $0.75 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ (horizontal:vertical) slope, or flatter, with maximum heights of 8 feet or less. Our experience suggests that permanent excavation side slopes through residuum at the site should be laid back at a $1.5 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$, or flatter, with maximum heights of 8 feet or less. Permanent fill slopes are not anticipated at the project site. Cut and fill slope surfaces should be protected from erosion by grassing or by other means. Permanent slopes of $3 \mathrm{H}: 1 \mathrm{~V}$ or flatter may be desirable for mowing.

## BASIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations presented in this report are based on our understanding of the project information, data obtained in our exploration, and our experience on similar projects. The general subsurface conditions utilized in our evaluation have been based on interpolation of the subsurface data between the widely spaced hand auger borings. Subsurface conditions between the hand auger boring locations may differ. If the project information is incorrect, please contact us so that our recommendations can be reviewed. Significantly different subsurface conditions may be present at portions of the site not explored during this hand auger boring exploration, and additional subsurface data should be gathered to develop revised recommendations if the location of the proposed construction footprint is significantly modified from that described herein.

The discovery of site or subsurface conditions during construction which deviate from the data obtained in this exploration should be reported to us for our evaluation. The assessment of site environmental conditions for the presence or absence of pollutants in the soil, rock, or groundwater of the sites is also beyond the scope of this exploration. The assessment of existing building and site retaining wall foundation bearing conditions, existing site retaining wall stability, and site slopes beyond the proposed driveway construction footprint at the site is beyond the scope of this exploration. Detailed site retaining wall design and finalized global stability analyses are beyond our current scope of service.

We appreciate the opportunity to offer our professional services on this project. If you have any questions concerning this report, please do not hesitate to contact us. We hope that you will give KEG consideration to providing construction materials testing services during the construction phase of this project.

Sincerely,
KESSEL ENGINEERING GROUP, PLLLC,(NC Firm License No. P-0420)


Caitlin Warner, P.E.
Senior Engineer
Registered, North Carolina 41503

Attachments: Figure 1 - Site Location Plan
Figure 2 - Field Exploration Plan
Hand Auger Borings Logs (HAB-1 to HAB-5)
Key to Soil Classifications and Consistency Descriptions
Slope Stability Analyses (cross sections CS-1 to CS-2)
Distribution: Mr. Chris Brock, Brock Builders, Inc.; via email at chris@,brockbuildersinc.com
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| Cone Penetrometer Resistance <br> Average blows over 3-1/2 in. increment <br> SANDS | Relative <br> Density |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 to 4 |  |
| 5 to 15 | Very Loose |
| 16 to 29 | Loose |
| over 30 | Firm |
|  |  |
|  | Very Firm |

## Particle Size Identification

Boulder: Greater than 300 mm Cobble: 75 to 300 mm Gravel:
Coarse - 19 to 75 mm
Fine -4.75 to 19 mm Sand:
Coarse - 2 to 75 mm
Medium - 0.425 to 2 mm
Fine -0.075 to 0.425 mm Silts \& Clay: Less than 0.075 mm

Cone Penetrometer Resistance Average blows over 3-1/2 in. increment
1 to 4
5 to 9
10 to 29 over 30

SILTS and CLAYS

Consistency
Soft
Firm
Stiff

## KEY TO DRILLING SYMBOLS



Grab Sample
$\quad$ Groundwater Table at Time of Drilling
Split Spoon Sample

Undisturbed Sample
V Groundwater Table 24 Hours after Completion of Drilling

## KEY TO SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS



PRELIMINARY GLOBAL SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


PRELIMINARY GLOBAL SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



Hennis Residence - New Driveway
325 NC Terrace, Montreat, NC
KEG Project No. JA23-4732-01
Analyzed by: IJ
December 8, 2023
Cross-section CS-1
HAB-3, HAB-4
Static Conditions
No Surcharge
FS Lower Wall $1 \mathrm{~B}=1.52>1.5$ req'd

PRELIMINARY GLOBAL SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION




2NDFLOORDEMOPLAN
$\operatorname{SCALE} 1 / 4=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$




SIDEELEVATON SCALE $1 / 4=1^{\prime}-O^{\prime \prime}$






## Exterior Colors- 325 North Carolina Terrace



Sample elevation


Main House Color: Benjamin Moore-Garden Green 699. LRV 25
https://www.benjaminmoore.com/en-us/paint-colors/color/699/garden-oasis


## BURNISHED SLATE • ■

Metal Roof Color (House trim to match): Appalachian Metal, Burnished Slate. LRV 10.57
https://kpa3c3.p3cdn1.secureserver.net/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Appalachian-Metal-Sales-ColorChart.pdf


Shingles: Nichiha, Sierra Premium Shake-Prefinished Maple
https://www.nichiha.com/products/premium-plank-siding?colors=Light-Brown


Exterior Window Finish: Andersen Windows, Terratone finish. LRV 14.93
Alternate shingle stain colors below:
https://www.behr.com/consumer/colors/wood-stain/explore/solid-color
(Top) California Rustic SC -130 LRV 12.64
(Left) Curry SC-134 LRV 20.14
(Right)Redwood Naturaltone SC-122 LRV 15.74
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# Staff Report SUP-2023-02 

Special Use Permit Request (SUP-2023-02) - A Special Use Permit to allow a 1,010 squarefoot detached Garage (Accessory Building) with a final height taller than ten feet to be placed in the front yard of a single-family dwelling unit submitted by John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat, LLC) on property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 within the Town of Montreat.

Kayla DiCristina, AICP
Zoning Administrator
Town of Montreat

Created for:

Montreat Board of Adjustment
February 22, 2024
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## STAFF REPORT

See STAFF FINDINGS made by Kayla DiCristina, AICP ("Zoning Administrator") in addition to Applicant-provided materials. STAFF FINDINGS contain references to the Montreat Zoning Ordinance ("MZO") where noted. Only those findings relevant to the Special Use Permit requested are included in this staff report.

## Application Summary

The following report summarizes the Zoning Administrator's review of an application for a Special Use Permit submitted by John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat, LLC) on property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 within the Town of Montreat. The Applicant's request is to allow a 1,010 squarefoot Garage (Accessory Building) with a final height taller than ten feet to be placed in the front yard of a single-family dwelling unit. The MZO requires a Special Use Permit in the R-2 Zoning District ("R2") for Accessory Buildings constructed in the front yard of a lot's principal structure, for Accessory Buildings larger than 500-square-feet, and for Accessory Buildings taller than ten feet.

This Application was originally proposed to be heard at the January 25, 2024, Board of Adjustment meeting. Due to the necessity of a Variance to permit this Special Use Permit, the case was moved to the February 22, 2024, meeting.

## Subject Property Summary

Parcel Identifier Number (PIN): 071096598200000
Address: 325 North Carolina Terrace, Montreat, NC 28757
Owner: Dowd Montreat LLC
1905 Fendall Ave, Charlottesville, VA, 22903
Applicant: John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat, LLC)
Zoning: R-2
Current Land Use: Single-family dwellings
Utilities: Town of Montreat water and Buncombe County MSD sewer approved on the Subject Property for the existing single-family dwellings.

Acres: 0.395 acres


Figure 1: Subject Property Aerial

## Public Notice

Staff mailed notice to properties within 250 feet of the Subject Property on January 11, 2024 (see
Request). Staff posted the Subject Property on January 11, 2024. The BOA Hearing was initially scheduled for January 25, 2024. This case was moved to the subsequent meeting and scheduled to be heard at the February 22, 2024 meeting. Staff mailed notice to properties within 250 feet of the Subject Property on February 8, 2024 and posted the Subject Property on February 8, 2024.


Figure 2: 250 feet Public Notice for Special Use Permit Request

## Staff Findings

## Subject Property Summary

* The Subject Property is 0.395 acres and is improved with three existing single-family dwelling units. The existing single-family dwelling units are considered non-conforming as their construction pre-dates the establishment of the MZO.
* The Subject Property abuts North Carolina Terrace, a public road maintained by the Town of Montreat to the south, and West Virginia Terrace, a public road maintained by the Town of Montreat, to the north.
* There are no streams or floodplain on the Subject Property. The Subject Property has a slope of 44.8\% per the Buncombe County Steep Slope Calculator (Exhibit A).


## Use

The Subject Property is zoned R-2. It is currently improved with three single-family dwellings. Singlefamily dwellings are allowed by-right in R-2. The existing single-family dwelling units are considered non-conforming as their construction pre-dates the establishment of the MZO. One existing singlefamily dwelling is proposed to be demolished as part of this development.

The surrounding properties are zoned $\mathrm{R}-1$ Residential Zoning ( $\mathrm{R}-1$ ), $\mathrm{R}-2$, and Institutional (I).

- To the north is West Virginia Terrace, a public road maintained by the Town of Montreat, with properties zoned R-1 containing single-family dwellings.
- To the east is an existing lodging structure (the William Black Lodge) zoned I.
- To the south is North Carolina Terrace, a public road maintained by the Town of Montreat, with properties zoned R-2 containing single-family dwellings.
- To the west is an existing single-family dwelling zoned $\mathrm{R}-2$.

The Applicant is proposing to construct a Detached Garage on the north side of the Subject Property, adjacent to West Virginia Terrace. Per the MZO, a Detached Garage is considered an Accessory Building. Due to the proposed location of the detached Garage on the Subject Property and the Subject Property's residential zoning district, Section 606.2 of the MZO requires the Applicant to obtain a Special Use Permit. Garages in front yards are also required to get a Special Use Permit per the MZO Table of Permitted Uses in Article V. The Applicant's proposed structure must comply with the requirements of Section 606 and 606.2 of the MZO. As a note, the Applicant is also proposing a 1,088-square-foot addition as part of the overall development plan, but this addition is not the subject of this application.

The proposed Accessory Building is a two-story 1,010 square feet Structure containing two car parking spaces on the ground floor and a storage space above. The final height of the Structure will be approximately 24 feet.

If an Accessory Building includes complete kitchen facilities including a stove or cooktop and a full bath including a lavatory, water closet, and tub or shower (or combination) then the structure is considered an Accessory Dwelling Unit. The Applicant's architectural plans for the Accessory Building do not show the aforementioned elements. Should the Board of Adjustment grant its
approval of this application as currently proposed, the Applicant would be permitted to construct an Accessory Building, not an Accessory Dwelling Unit.


Figure 3: Subject Property Zoning

## Setbacks and Lot Size

The Subject Property is an existing Lot and no subdivision activities are proposed with this application. Therefore, lot size requirements do not apply.

Per Section 606.14 of the MZO, Accessory Buildings must meet the minimum Setbacks required by the applicable Zoning District. Subject Property is located in R-2 and is considered a double frontage lot. Double frontage lots are defined in the MZO as lots that have lot frontage on two separate streets. The Applicant's proposed addition to the existing single-family dwelling and Accessory Building are subject to the setback requirements of a double frontage lot in R-2. The Applicant's proposed addition and Accessory Building intend to meet the required setbacks of the Subject Property.

|  | Required R-2 Zoning <br> District Setback | Proposed Accessory <br> Building Setback | Proposed Addition Setbacks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Front <br> (North Carolina <br> Terrace) | 30 feet | Approx. 81 feet | From existing house $=22$ feet* <br> From addition $=59$ feet |
| Side (L/R) | 10 feet/10 feet | Approx. 87 feet $/ 12$ <br> feet 3 inches | 14 feet 5 inches $/$ <br> From existing house $=73$ feet <br> From addition $=78$ feet |
| Front <br> $\left(\begin{array}{c}\text { West Virginia } \\ \text { Terrace) }\end{array}\right.$$\quad 30$ feet | 30 feet 3 inches | 53 feet 2 inches |  |

* The existing single-family dwelling onto which the addition is proposed is considered a NonConforming Structure per Section 1000.2 of the MZO. Non-Conforming Structures may be expanded in accordance with all Setback and other requirements of the MZO (and other development ordinances). While the existing single-family dwelling does not meet the required front setback from West Virginia Terrace per the R-2 Zoning District, the addition does and is therefore permitted.


## Special Requirements

Section 606.2 of the MZO lists the following special requirements for Detached Garages in Front Yards in residential Zoning Districts:

1. The Zoning Administrator determines this will reduce damage to the natural topography, trees and natural green space, or where the topography will create a hardship that would result in significant damage to the topography, trees and plant life without such relief;
2. The Garage will be constructed of materials that meet or exceed the quality and appearance of the principal Building;
3. The Garage must be enclosed by an operable Garage door to be maintained in good working order, excluding carports;
4. The Garage doors shall be kept closed when the house is unoccupied for more than one day; and;
5. The property owner shall maintain the Garage and its appearance to reasonably remain in the condition it is in when completed and approved by the Building Inspector. The Zoning Administrator shall determine when this provision has been violated.

The Applicant's narrative addresses the above requirements. Regarding Section 606.21, the Zoning Administrator finds the location of the proposed Detached Garage to be preferable on the site as this location would reduce damage to the natural topography, trees and natural green space associated with this project. The area within which the new structure is proposed is currently occupied by one of the existing single-family dwellings and has been since the mid-1900s. This existing structure is proposed to be demolished as part of the construction. The land in this area has already been disturbed, vegetation already removed, and stabilization already constructed. Locating the Detached Garage in this area will be less damaging to the natural topography, trees and natural green space compared to other development scenarios that locate the new structure outside of the front yard setback, as this proposal swaps one structure for another. The new structure will meet today's MZO standards, which the existing structure did not have to comply with. Locating the Detached Garage in one of the side setbacks, negating the need for a Special Use Permit for the location, would require the disturbance of previously undisturbed land and likely extensive grading.

## Parking

Per Section 700 of the MZO, parking requirements are only applied to structures constructed after November 14, 1985. As the construction of all three of the existing single-family dwellings predates this time period, only new construction on the site is subject to parking requirements. The Applicant
is proposing to construct a 1,010 square footage Accessory Building, of which none is heated square footage. Therefore, with this construction, no additional parking spaces are required. However, the Applicant is proposing to provide five spaces, two in the Detached Garage and three in the new driveway. As a note, the Applicant's final development plan includes a 1,088 -square-foot addition onto one of the existing single-family dwellings on the site. This addition is not the subject of this Special Use Permit application, but the Applicant is providing enough parking to satisfy this requirement for the addition.

## Landscaping and Trees

Per Section 900.2 of the MZO, landscaping provisions are not applicable to the Subject Property as it is zoned R-2. As a note, no trees or vegetation or proposed to be removed from the Town of Montreat's right-of-way with the construction of the proposed Accessory Building.

## Post-Construction Stormwater Measures

As part of the Applicant's overall development plan, the Applicant will manage stormwater using a series of stormwater conveyance measures leading water to river rock lined swales, a seven-foot storage tank, and a 120 square foot detention basin with a six-foot stone weir. Rain barrels are proposed throughout the new construction areas where gutters and downspouts terminate. For purposes of this Variance application, the Applicant's proposed stormwater management system sufficiently detail how post-development stormwater run-off will be controlled and managed. Prior to permit issuance, the Applicant will be required to obtain a Stormwater Control Permit and comply with the Town of Montreat's General Ordinance (MGO) Chapter K Article III.

## Hillside Development Ordinance

The Subject Property has a slope of $44.8 \%$ per the Buncombe County Steep Slope Calculator (Exhibit A). Therefore, it is subject to the MGO Chapter K Article IV. At the time of permitting, the Applicant must demonstrate conformance to all applicable standards in the Hillside Development Ordinance. Conformance will be determined by staff. However, staff felt it important to outline several of the provisions in this ordinance in this staff report as they are relevant to the Applicant's requested Special Use Permit.

In general, the Subject Property slopes downward from north (West Virginia Terrace) to south (North Carolina Terrace) as indicated by the decreasing contour values as one travels southward away from the northern side of the Subject Property. Shaper decreases in slope, as indicated by contour lines that are closer together, occur along the eastern side of the Subject Property.


Figure 4: Subject Property Topography

MGO Chapter K Article IV Section(I)(1) states the purpose of the Hillside Development Ordinance as follows:

The hillside development regulations of this article shall establish guidelines for responsible land use addressing both aesthetics (the "viewscape") and slope stability, utilizing approved methods of erosion prevention and stormwater control. Montreat contains intensely varied topography within a relatively small area, involving significant regions that transition abruptly from gentle slope to steep gradient. These factors pose unique challenges for the location and installation of structures while preserving the natural aesthetic characteristic of the Town. It has been determined that measures must be taken to ensure the stability of our hillsides while permitting continued low-impact development.

The Subject Property is considered a Non-Conforming Improved Lot. The existing improvements on the Subject Property predate the enactment of the Hillside Development Ordinance and exceed the approved graded area per MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(a) and the permitted impervious surface area MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(i). Currently, the Subject Property contains 10,750 square feet of graded area, or $62 \%$ of the total area, but, under the MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(a), is only permitted to grade $40 \%$ of the total lot area, or 6,882 square feet. Additionally, the Subject Property contains 7,559 square feet of impervious surface, but is only permitted to have 5,162 square feet per the MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(i). The Applicant submitted a Variance application to MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(a) and (i) concurrently with this Special Use Permit application, per MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(h), to increase the approved graded area from $40 \%$ to $89.3 \%$ and to increase the approved development intensity ratio
from
0.30
to
0.49 .

## Comprehensive Plan

The Town of Montreat's comprehensive plan, Montreat Tomorrow, does not contain a future land use map. The following vision in Montreat Tomorrow may be relevant to this application:

Development: Montreat will be a community that respects buildings with historic value, encourages new development to consider the surrounding architecture, and strives for resilience in the face of a changing climate.

## Template Special Use Permit Decision Language

The Board is welcome to use the language below to issue a decision on the Special Use Permit Request. Prior to making the approval motion, the Board must state the specific findings that lead to the approval of the four findings of fact as required by Section 310.62.

1. The Use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare if located where proposed and developed according to the plan as submitted and approved because...
2. The Use meets or will meet all the required and applicable development standards and conditions of the Town of Montreat unless modified by this Board because...
3. The Use will not substantially diminish and impair the value of any property any portion of which is located within two hundred fifty feet of the boundary of the Subject Property...
4. The location and character of the Use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property, for the purposes already permitted, within the area in which it is located because...
5. The location and character of the Use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in general conformity with the adopted policies and plans, including the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Montreat because...
6. Adequate measures have been taken or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize congestion in the public streets because...

Motion for Decision: "I move that the Board [approve/approve with conditions/deny] SUP-2023-02 to permit a 1,010 square foot Detached Garage (Accessory Building) with a final height taller than ten feet in the front yard of property in the R-2 Zoning District located at 325 North Carolina Terrace approximately 960 feet east of the intersection of North Carolina Terrace and West Virginia Terrace and described as PIN\# 071096598200000 . [List any conditions of approval in the motion, if applicable]

## Exhibits

Exhibit A: Buncombe County Steep Slope Calculator Results

## Find Slope for a Parcel

1. Use SimpliCity (http://simplicity.ashevillenc.gov) or mapAsheville (https://arcgis.ashevillenc.gov/mapAsheville/) to find the PIN of the parcel you are interested calculating slope for.
2. Enter the 10 or 15 digit PIN below and click Calculate.

To calculate the slope of multiple parcels enter a comma separated list PINs.


## Jurisdiction: TOWN OF MONTREAT

Acres: 0.46978
Maximum Elevation: 2780
Percent Slope: 44.82


TOWN OF
MONTREAT
NORTH CAROLINA

# SUP-2023-02 Special Use Permit Request 

PIN \# 071096598200000
Montreat Board of Adjustment
February 22, 2024

## Subject Property Overview

PIN: 071096598200000
Address: 325 North Carolina Terr
Montreat, NC 28757
Owner: Dowd Montreat LLC
1905 Fendall Ave,
Charlottesville, VA, 22903
Size: 0.395 acres
Current Zoning and Use:
R-2 Zoning District; three existing single-family dwellings

$\xrightarrow{0.02 \text { Miles }}$
$\square$ Subject Property
$\square$ Parcels
$\square$ Roads


From North Carolina looking north


From West Virginia looking south
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Zoning \& Land Use

## Application Overview

Applicant: John Hennis (on behalf of the Property Owners, Dowd Montreat, LLC)

## Application Summary:

* Approval for a Special Use Permit to allow a 1,010 square-foot Detached Garage (Accessory Building) with a final height taller than ten feet to be placed in the front yard of a single-family dwelling unit
* Garages constructed in the front yards of residential Zoning Districts require a Special Use Permit (MZO Section 606.2 \& Article V).
* Accessory Buildings larger than six hundred square feet or exceeding ten feet in height require a Special Use Permit (MZO Section 606.13).


## Staff Findings

## USE \& ZONING

* The Subject Property is currently improved with three single-family dwellings constructed prior to the enactment of the Montreat Zoning Ordinance.
* Garages constructed in the front yards of residential Zoning Districts require a Special Use Permit (MZO Section 606.2 \& Article V).
* Accessory Buildings larger than six hundred square feet or exceeding ten feet in height require a Special Use Permit (MZO Section 606.13).


## SETBACKS \& LOT SIZE

* The Subject Property is an existing lot, so lot size requirements do not apply.
* The Subject Property is considered a double frontage lot. The addition and Detached Garage must comply with the required setbacks in the R-2 Zoning District on a double frontage lot.
* The Applicant intends to meet all required setbacks.

|  | Required R-2 Zoning <br> District Setback | Proposed Accessory <br> Building Setback | Proposed Addition Setbacks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Front <br> (North Carolina <br> Terrace) | 30 feet | Approx. 81 feet | From existing house $=22$ feet <br> From addition $=59$ feet |
| Side (L/R) | 10 feet $/ 10$ feet | Approx. 87 feet $/ 12$ feet 3 <br> inches | 14 feet 5 inches $/$ <br> From existing house $=73$ feet <br> From addition $=78$ feet |
| Front <br> (West Virginia <br> Terrace) | 30 feet | 30 feet 3 inches | 53 feet 2 inches |

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

* The following vision in Montreat Tomorrow may be relevant to this application:

Development: Montreat will be a community that respects buildings with historic value, encourages new development to consider the surrounding architecture, and strives for resilience in the face of a changing climate.
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## Staff Findings

SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS (MZO Section 606.2)

* Detached Garages in residential Zoning Districts must meet the following requirements.

1. The Zoning Administrator determines this will reduce damage to the natural topography, trees and natural green space, or where the topography will create a hardship that would result in significant damage to the topography, trees and plant life without such relief;
2. The Garage will be constructed of materials that meet or exceed the quality and appearance of the principal Building;
3. The Garage must be enclosed by an operable Garage door to be maintained in good working order, excluding carports;
4. The Garage doors shall be kept closed when the house is unoccupied for more than one day; and;
5. The property owner shall maintain the Garage and its appearance to reasonably remain in the condition it is in when completed and approved by the Building Inspector. The Zoning Administrator shall determine when this provision has been violated.

## Staff Findings

## PARKING

* The single-family dwellings predate the Montreat Zoning Ordinance. Per Section 700, only the heated square footage of new construction on the Subject Property is subject to parking requirements.
* The Applicant is proposing to add no heated square footage with the Detached Garage, so no additional parking spaces are required.
* However, the Applicant proposes to provide five parking spaces with two on the ground floor of the Detached Garage and three spaces in the new driveway to accommodate the new development.


## LANDSCAPING AND TREES

* Landscaping requirements of Section 900.2 of the MZO do not apply.
* No trees or vegetation are proposed to be removed within the Town's right-of-way.


## Staff Findings <br> HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

* The Subject Property has a slope of $44.8 \%$ and is subject to the Hillside Development Ordinance.
* Full conformance to standards will be determined by staff at the time of permitting.
* In general, the Subject Property slopes downward from north (West Virginia Terrace) to south (North Carolina Terrace) and has sharper decreases in slope on the eastern side of the lot.

* Properties subjected to the Hillside Development Ordinance are limited in the amount of grading permitted on site by the Approved Graded Area. This is measured based on the total lot area.
* Per the MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(a), grading on the Subject Property is limited to $40 \%$ of the total lot area, or 6,882 square feet. Currently, the Subject Property contains 10,750 square feet of graded area or $62 \%$ of the total area. The existing graded area exceeds the permitted graded area per the HDO.To resolve this discrepancy, the MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(h) requires the Subject Property to be combined with adjacent properties in the same ownership. If this is not possible, a Variance must be requested
 from the Board of Adjustment.


## IMPERVIOUS SURFACE

* Properties subjected to the Hillside Development Ordinance are limited in the amount of impervious surface permitted on site by the development intensity ratio. The development intensity ratio is the permitted ratio of unimproved areas to developed or improved areas.
* Per the MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(i), the Subject Property is only permitted to have 5,162 square feet of impervious surface and a development intensity ratio of 0.30 . The Subject Property currently contains 7,559 square feet of impervious surface and has a development intensity ratio of 0.44 . The existing impervious surface exceeds the allowed impervious surface limit per the HDO.
* To resolve this discrepancy, the MGO Chapter K Article IV Section (II)(4)(h) requires the Subject Property to be combined with adjacent properties in the same ownership. If this is not possible, a Variance must be requested from the Board of Adjustment. The Applicant submitted a Variance request for both grading and impervious surface limits concurrently with this application.
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## IMPERVIOUS SURFACE

* The Applicant proposes to...
* Retain $\mathbf{5 , 1 9 9}$ square feet of the existing impervious surface, which includes the two single-family dwellings on the south side of the Subject Property.
* Remove 2,360 square feet of the existing impervious surface, which includes the single-family dwelling on the north side of the Subject Property.
* Add 3,243 square feet of new impervious surface in the form of a driveway and Detached Garage on the north side of the Subject Property.
* The final impervious surface figure is $\mathbf{8 , 4 4 2}$ square feet and a development intensity ratio of 0.49. 5,199 square feet is existing impervious surface.
* In sum, the Applicant is permitted to have a development intensity ratio of 0.30 , currently has a development intensity ratio of 0.44 , and requested a Variance to permit a development intensity ratio of 0.49 to permit the proposed addition, driveway, and Detached Garage
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## Board of Adjustment Decision

The Board shall grant a Special Use Permit upon showing of all of the following per Section 310.6 of the MZO:

1. The Use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare if located where proposed and developed according to the plan as submitted and approved.
2. The Use meets or will meet all the required and applicable development standards and conditions of the Town of Montreat unless modified by this Board.
3. The Use will not substantially diminish and impair the value of any property any portion of which is located within two hundred fifty feet of the boundary of the Subject Property.
4. The location and character of the Use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property, for the purposes already permitted, within the area in which it is located.
5. The location and character of the Use, if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved, will be in general conformity with the adopted policies and plans, including the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Montreat.
6. Adequate measures have been taken or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize congestion in the public street.

In granting any Special Use Permit, the Board of Adjustment may prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards in conformity with any of the Town's land development Ordinances.

# m <br> Town OF MONTREAT NORTH CAROLINA <br> <br> SUP-2023-02 <br> <br> SUP-2023-02 Special Use Permit Request 

 Special Use Permit Request}

PIN \# 071096598200000
Montreat Board of Adjustment
January 25, 2024


[^0]:    See Exhibit A attached hereto.

