

**Town of Montreat
Planning & Zoning Commission (P&Z)
Meeting Agenda
October 15, 2026, 10:30 a.m.
Town Hall 1210 Montreat Road, Montreat, NC 28757**

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
 - Welcome
 - Moment of Silence
- II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
 - **Suggested Motion:** To adopt the meeting agenda as presented/amended
- III. ADOPTION OF August 6, 2026, MEETING MINUTES**
 - **Suggested Motion:** To adopt the August 6, 2026, Meeting Minutes as drafted/amended.
- IV. OLD BUSINESS**
- V. NEW BUSINESS**
 - **WELCOME NEW BOARD MEMBER – OATH OF OFFICE**
 - **STORMWATER SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES & DISCUSSION**
 - **ZONING ADMINISTRATOR UPDATES & DISCUSSION**
- VI. REMINDER OF NEXT MEETING DATE**
 - **January 14, 2027**
- VII. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting

August 6, 2026, 10:30 a.m.

Special Meeting Minutes

Commission Members in Attendance:

Julie Schell, Chair
Clay Hamilton, Vice-Chair
Eleanor James
Bill Tucker
Sally Jenkins
Gayle Sawyer, Alternate Member

Commission Members Absent

Mike Broussard
Allen Crawford, ETJ Member

Town Staff in Attendance:

Alexis Baker, Interim Zoning Administrator
Angie Murphy, Town Clerk
Brandon Freeman, Town Attorney

Members of the Public in Attendance:

Approximately 35 - 40 people

Call To Order

Chair Julie Schell called the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting to order at 10:30 AM. A moment of silence was observed.

Adoption Of Agenda

The agenda was presented without amendments.

Motion to adopt the agenda as presented was made by Commission Member Bill Tucker and seconded by Commission Member Gail Sawyer. The motion carried unanimously.

Adoption Of July 16, 2026, Meeting Minutes

Two amendments to the July 16, 2026, meeting minutes were identified prior to adoption:

- Commission Member Sally Jenkins' designation was to be updated to remove the designation of "alternate member," as her status had changed.

- The time of the Call to Order was to be corrected from PM to AM.

Motion to adopt the July 16, 2026, meeting minutes as amended was made by Commission Member Eleanor James and seconded by Commission Member Sally Jenkins. The motion carried unanimously.

Old Business

Planned Unit Development Zoning Request & Public Hearing — Continued from July 16, 2026

Chair Schell outlined the procedure for the continued hearing on the Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning request from applicant Richard Dubose on behalf of property owner Mountain Retreat Association (MRA). The property in question is located at 309 Collegiate Circle (PIN: 0710963451000000), and the request seeks a rezoning from the Institutional Residential (IR) zoning district to a PUD zoning district. Chair Schell noted that the public hearing had remained open from the prior meeting and reminded speakers to limit comments to five minutes and to provide their local address when approaching the microphone.

Chair Schell also clarified that any vote by the Commission would consist of two parts: (1) a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners to approve, approve with conditions, or decline the application; and (2) a determination as to whether the proposed PUD is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan, noting that while such a finding is required, consistency is not mandated by North Carolina legislation.

Staff Presentation

Interim Zoning Administrator Alexis Baker briefly introduced the continuation of the hearing. She noted that the applicant had submitted several updated documents since the July 16th meeting, including an updated master plan, revised development standards, and a document responding to issues raised during the prior public hearing. She indicated the updated materials would be most appropriately addressed by the applicant directly and that she would remain available for Commission questions.

Applicant Presentation

Richard Dubose, applicant on behalf of the MRA, addressed the Commission. He opened by acknowledging four key groups that have shaped the project: future facility users (conference guests, church groups, and staff); donors funding the project, many of whom are Montreat property owners; the MRA Board; and neighboring property owners currently in litigation with the MRA. He explained that the MRA Board, at its March meeting, reaffirmed its commitment to the already-permitted 40-room lodge (Option 1) while also expressing a strong preference for Option 2 — the larger PUD proposal before the Commission. He noted the Board had not yet formally ratified Option 2, as doing so would require a complete understanding of costs, funding, and any conditions established by the Town or commitments arising from ongoing neighbor negotiations.

Mr. Dubose then addressed seven specific items from the Commission's prior meeting, supplemented by one clarifying request:

Item 5 — Building Design: Mr. Dubose described the proposed development standard requiring the Zoning Administrator to determine whether building permit drawings are substantially in conformity with the architectural renderings presented to the Commission on July 16, 2026. He acknowledged the community's interest in design and stated the response appropriately reflects that concern.

Item 6 — Stormwater Management: Mr. Dubose stated that the MRA commits to submitting a stormwater management plan with its building permit application and to meeting the requirements of the Town's stormwater management ordinance. He addressed a request from a community member at the prior meeting to require a standard exceeding the Town's one-year storm requirement. While he argued it would be inappropriate for the Commission to require an applicant to exceed the legally adopted ordinance as a condition of approval, he indicated that MRA's engineering evaluations suggest the project can be designed to manage a two-year storm event, and that MRA has verbally committed to that enhanced standard as part of its ongoing neighbor negotiations. Commission Member Clay Hamilton and Interim Zoning Administrator Baker confirmed that stormwater management requirements are the same for all applicants, residential and commercial, once the 10,000 square foot disturbance threshold is reached.

Item 7 — Parking Requirements: Mr. Dubose stated the MRA commits to providing a minimum of 21 underground parking spaces beneath the new lodge, consistent with the parking formula in MZO Section 702.4 (one space per 1,000 square feet). He acknowledged that the design process remains ongoing and that additional spaces may prove feasible but could not be guaranteed at this time. He noted that factors such as subsurface rock conditions, stormwater infrastructure, tree preservation, and circulation requirements all bear on the final parking count. He also noted that, depending on the full build-out of the site, total parking could approach the 62 spaces previously contemplated under the Special Use Permit. Discussion touched on the proximity of the Anderson Auditorium parking lot across Assembly Drive as supplemental parking, as well as existing overflow solutions for summer conferences. Commission Member Hamilton suggested that parking may warrant a broader, holistic review as a town-wide issue.

Item 3 — Construction Vibration: Mr. Dubose addressed the possibility of rock removal during excavation. He stated that blasting is considered very unlikely based on preliminary subsurface investigations and the project's valley location, though it cannot be ruled out entirely. He noted that any blasting would require a separate permit. The MRA's contractor, Blum Construction, has committed to vibration monitoring at the site perimeter and at adjacent properties where warranted, with particular attention to the Hayner property to the east and potentially the Kimball residence. Chuck Krekelberg of Altura Architects clarified that formal vibration monitoring is most typically associated with blasting scenarios, though the MRA's negotiations with neighbors may result in monitoring commencing earlier in the construction process. He noted the importance of pre-construction photographic documentation of existing conditions at neighboring structures. Commission Member Eleanor James asked what would occur if vibration levels exceeded thresholds, and Mr. Dubose confirmed that construction would halt and alternative methods would be evaluated. Commission Member Hamilton noted that the contractor's bond insurance provides a financial incentive for care.

East Boundary Buffer: Mr. Dubose described a 10-foot no-go buffer zone along the shared eastern property line with the Hayner family, which he stated would be reflected in the final site plan. He noted ongoing discussions with neighbors about the content and character of the

required vegetative buffer, with interest from both parties in a more naturalistic planting approach rather than a simple row of evergreen shrubs.

Item 4 — Tree Protection: Mr. Dubose stated the MRA will submit a formal tree protection plan with its building permit application, consistent with MZO Section 904. He presented a draft tree protection plan prepared by the MRA's landscape architect, noting it was a work in progress. Mr. Krekelberg walked the Planning & Zoning Commission through the plan's four categories: trees to remain, required trees (per MZO), additional proposed trees, and trees requiring protection (designated with fencing). He explained the area of disturbance — delineated by a red dashed line — within which tree roots cannot be fully protected, though silt fencing and delineation measures would restrict contractor activity. He acknowledged that some trees on or near the eastern property line may lose up to 50 percent of their root systems within the disturbance zone. Mr. Dubose confirmed that any trees lost due to construction would be replanted as part of the MRA's commitment to developing the site as a woodland setting with native plantings. Commission Member Sally Jenkins summarized that the MRA is committing to the spirit of the plan while acknowledging that engineering realities may affect specific outcomes. Discussion also addressed the use of permeable versus impermeable surfaces along Georgia Terrace, with the conclusion that gravel, contrary to appearance, is generally treated as impermeable and that gravel entering the stormwater system during heavy rain events could compromise its function. The preferred solution for the turnaround court is a permeable paver system.

Item 1 — Permitted Uses: Mr. Dubose addressed the question of which uses would be listed in the PUD development standards. He explained that the Town's MZO (Section 511.551) requires a completed application to include a list of permitted uses. The original application retained all IR district uses; a submission earlier in the week had proposed deleting several of them. However, following a Friday executive committee meeting, the MRA is now withdrawing those proposed deletions, wishing to retain the full list of IR-district uses in the new PUD zone. Town Attorney Brandon Freeman clarified that the PUD constitutes a new zoning district, meaning only those uses listed become permitted; uses that are shown on the master plan's building footprints would be permitted in that location without requiring further amendment, provided no exterior changes result. Commission Member Jenkins confirmed that any use change not reflected in the master plan's exterior appearance would be permissible without further action, but a materially new use requiring physical changes would require a new application. The following sentence was proposed for inclusion in the master plan: "All buildings can be used for all permitted uses by right in the PUD development standards." Commission Member Hamilton expressed concern about clarity, noting that the prior meeting's discussion of this issue had been lengthy, and requesting that the language be made plain to any reader.

Clarifying Request — Minor Administrative Modifications: Mr. Dubose requested the addition of language permitting the Zoning Administrator to authorize minor changes in the location, siding, or character of buildings and structures without requiring Commission review, provided no change: increases the size of any building by more than 10 percent; moves any building by more than 10 feet in any direction; or exceeds the minimum or maximum requirements of the PUD development standards or MZO. He noted this is consistent with existing authority granted to the Zoning Administrator for Special Use Permits under MZO Section 310.644, and that comparable provisions exist in neighboring jurisdictions including Black Mountain, Asheville, and Buncombe County. He offered an illustrative example of adding an elevator shaft to a cottage as the kind of minor modification this provision would address.

The Commission engaged in substantive discussion regarding this request. Commission Member Hamilton raised concern that a 10-foot movement provision, read literally, could allow the lodge to be moved closer to the eastern property line, potentially undermining the agreed 10-foot buffer. Town Attorney Freeman clarified that a setback established in the PUD development standards becomes a district standard and cannot be varied administratively; a variance application would be required. He recommended that the Commission, for added clarity, include language stating that "in no event may an administrative change allow encroachment into a setback." The Commission and applicant agreed to this addition. Commission Member Jenkins raised concern about the word "character" in the proposed language, noting its subjectivity. Town Attorney Freeman agreed that character determinations are not appropriately made by staff and recommended the word be stricken. The applicant concurred.

Chair Schell summarized the proposed changes to the application arising from the day's discussion:

- Reversal of the proposed deletions to the list of permitted IR-district uses (packet page 23);
- Addition of the sentence: "All buildings can be used for all permitted uses by right in the PUD development standards" (as reflected on packet page 19);
- Addition of the minor administrative modification provision (packet page 20), amended to: (a) delete the word "character" from the scope of authorized changes, and (b) add the clarification that no administrative change may allow encroachment into a setback.

Chair Julie Schell called for a break which lasted from approximately 12:01 p.m. until 12:12 p.m.

Public Comment

Powell Jones, 314 North Carolina Terrace, speaking on behalf of the Montreat Stewards — a group he stated represents more than one-third of Montreat homeowners — expressed appreciation for the Commission's careful attention to the application. He acknowledged the ongoing and constructive dialogue between the Stewards and the MRA. He noted the significance of this being the first PUD proposed for Montreat and cautioned that the project will bring substantial disruption and the loss of mature trees, which residents should be prepared for. He urged the Commission not to approve any site plan that includes use of town rights-of-way or green space without confirming that all applicable town codes are met. He requested that the MRA have the surveyor mark property lines clearly so all residents can identify them.

In response, Mr. Krekelberg confirmed that the PUD master plan is contained entirely within the property boundaries as established by survey. Zoning Administrator Baker noted that at the zoning compliance stage, rights-of-way and utilities would be shown, as they bear on site access. Mr. Krekelberg added that utility connections — specifically the new sewer line — would necessarily extend beyond the property line, but this is distinct from the PUD zoning itself.

Nancy Fox, 314 North Carolina Terrace, addressed the Commission on the subject of tree protection. She expressed appreciation for the draft tree protection plan shared by the MRA. She raised three specific questions: (1) what exact measures will be taken to protect designated trees and how will the protocol be implemented; (2) how will the plan be

monitored to ensure compliance, noting that arborists she had consulted identified monitoring as the most common failure point in tree protection plans; and (3) whether the protection plan would apply to all potentially affected trees, including those on the Georgia Terrace island (town property) and trees just east of the property line at 319 Assembly Drive.

Harry T. Jones, 300 North Carolina Terrace, presented a one-page summary of the Montreat Stewards' outstanding concerns, which was distributed to Commission members. He addressed three issues: (1) Stormwater — urging the MRA to expand its stormwater capacity to meet the two-year, 24-hour storm event standard, citing post-Hurricane Helene realities; (2) Minor Administrative Modifications — expressing opposition to the proposed provision allowing buildings to be moved by 10 feet or increased in size by 10 percent without Commission review, characterizing those as major changes that should require formal reapproval; and (3) Vibration — stressing that vibration risk extends beyond blasting to all heavy excavation and construction equipment, and requesting that the Commission continue to insist on rigorous protections.

Beth Fountain, 132 Kanawa, offered comments in support of the MRA's application. She spoke to the MRA's history of responsiveness to neighbor concerns throughout the project's development, including prompt action on the buffer request. She emphasized the MRA's role as a financial and community backbone of Montreat, noting that hospitality revenue is central to the MRA's ability to maintain its ministry and community amenities. She expressed particular support for the accessibility features included in the proposed lodge design and urged the Commission to support the application.

Cackie Dowd, 325 North Carolina Terrace, raised the issue of value engineering. She asked whether a construction budget had been provided by Blum Construction, and what elements of the plan would be subject to reduction if costs increased during construction. Chair Schell noted that a budget had not been submitted as part of the application and that such a submission would not typically be part of a standard PUD application.

In response to a question about whether a project budget was required, Richard DuBose, representing the Montreat Conference Center/MRA applicant team, stated that a budget was not a condition of the PUD application. He said the applicant has a budget, but not a final guaranteed maximum price. He added that developing that level of detail is costly and is best done once there is some assurance the project can proceed.

Rick Giles of 426 Kentucky Road, an MRA board member, spoke on the administrative-change provisions. He stated that his earlier project led to the text amendment allowing minor modifications to be approved administratively. Staff had supplied language from at least five other municipalities at that time. He acknowledged Mr. Jones's concern that changes of around 10 percent could be considered major, but said the language is common and was developed with considerable thought. He encouraged the Commission not to stray from it.

Betsy Shoenfelt of 213 Louisiana Road, speaking as an MRA board member but stating that her comments were her own, described her family's long history in Montreat. She outlined MRA's stewardship of private property open to the public, including the Montreat gate, Robert Lake Park, trails, recreational facilities, and approximately 2,500 acres in conservation easement, all without public funding. She stated that MRA's 2024 dredging of Lake Susan, which removed approximately 24,000 cubic yards of sediment at a cost of about \$1.4 million, was the largest stormwater mitigation effort in Montreat in more than 100 years. She said it would be irrational for MRA to then pollute Flat Creek. She noted that MRA is a private property owner, having transferred its municipal authority to the Town in 1967, and that it is entitled to the same consideration as other private property owners. She stated that

MRA has been transparent about its plans for more than six years, has adapted the cottage plan to community concerns, and already holds SUP approval for the original Option 1 plan, which would be the default if the PUD were not approved. She asked the Commission to support the PUD.

Katherine Morton Achtemeier of 206 Virginia Road spoke in support of the MRA request. She encouraged the Commission to trust MRA in the months ahead, given its demonstrated good faith.

Richard DuBose then addressed the second required determination, consistency with the Town's strategic plan. He noted his participation in the most recent plan revision. He stated that both the 2008 plan and the later update contain consistent language that the Town will collaborate with institutional partners for the good of the community. He added that the 2008 plan explicitly identified this property as prime property for lodging guests.

No further public comment was offered. The Chair stated that the public hearing would remain open and that commissioners could ask further questions of the applicant or speakers during deliberations.

Deliberations

Deliberations on the seven themes. The Chair framed deliberations around the seven themes drawn from community and stakeholder feedback, and the MRA's responses to them. Commissioners agreed to review each theme for clarity.

Theme 1 – Additional uses. The Chair summarized the application including the reversals of the prior deletions, so that the buildings on the PUD master plan could be used for any of the uses already permitted by right in the Institutional/Recreational district. Any new building not shown on the master plan would require a new approval. Commission Member Sally Jenkins observed that the language had changed from addressing "if at all" to addressing "construction." Attorney Freeman confirmed that he believed the issue had been clarified.

Minor modifications and administrative authority. Commission Member Eleanor James asked who determines the difference between minor and major changes. Attorney Freeman explained that the applicant's request is an express grant of discretion to the zoning administrator to approve minor modifications of up to 10 percent or 10 feet. He said this is similar to other Montreat ordinances and other jurisdictions. The language does not require the administrator to approve any such request. Commission Member James said she believed MRA was not attempting to disguise major changes as minor ones. She expressed concern that a new zoning administrator would be adjudicating the first PUD in Town history, after Ms. Baker's departure at the end of the month, without the background gathered in these proceedings. Commission Member Jenkins suggested that the Town commit to bringing the incoming administrator up to speed. Commission Member Hamilton noted that the new administrator would be responsible to the Town Manager and Mayor, who would be expected to ensure this.

Chair Schell cautioned against establishing double standards. She said that holding MRA to a stricter standard than comparable private property owners, whether on the modification percentage or on stormwater, could invite later challenges. She noted that other municipalities use 10 percent, which gives the request legitimacy and precedent. Commission Member Hamilton asked whether a PUD is comparable to a single-family home and said distinctions should be drawn carefully, as with something unusual like a 50-foot Ferris wheel.

Stormwater. Mr. DuBose stated that the reference point should be the Town's existing stormwater ordinance. He said any changes to standards, including lessons learned from Hurricane Helene, belong in the Commission's planned review of that ordinance rather than in this application.

The Chair said she was struggling with the issue. She said Helene's impacts underscored the opportunity to "future proof a bit more," while recognizing the need for objective, single standards and the Commission's limited technical expertise. Commission Member James questioned whether the Commission could require more than the current regulations. In response, Attorney Freeman confirmed that the Commission may include an increase in stormwater capacity as a recommendation. Commission Member Hamilton said the more important question was whether the designers are accounting for lessons from Helene, since industry practice often adapts faster than regulation. He noted that techniques such as sheeting of water may be as effective as storage tanks. Commission Member Jenkins said she was comforted that MRA had committed, without being asked, to do more than required, and that the process had built trust.

Chuck Krekelberg of Altura Architects, speaking for the applicant and noting he is not a civil engineer, stated that the new stormwater design differs from the SUP design in its inlet locations, swale configuration, and interconnection among three smaller buildings. The detention location and the amount of impervious surface are unchanged. He said the narrower building width leaves more room for the swale to accommodate water coming from upslope. He stated that MRA is examining the financial feasibility of accommodating a two-year storm instead of the one-year storm, but that the application requests adherence to the one-year standard in the ordinance. Mr. DuBose confirmed that the plan had been updated to meet the current one-year standard, but not specifically in response to Helene. Commission Hamilton noted that the interplay between stormwater management and tree protection could conflict, and that MRA would try to balance the two.

Theme 2 – Construction vibration. The Chair noted that the proposal does not change the application but states that MRA would give neighbors advance notice. She welcomed the vibration monitoring, and neighbor dialogue Mr. DuBose had described. She said she remained concerned about the volume of construction equipment entering the neighborhood over many months. Commission Member Hamilton cited Freeland Hall, built to high standards, and the Town plan's maps indicating stable ground in the area. Chair Schell supported monitoring and the proposed cataloging of surrounding structures as an early indicator of any shifting.

Themes 3 and 4 – East boundary buffer and tree protection. No additional comments were offered.

Theme 5 – Design - The Chair stated that the submitted renderings were helpful. Mr. DuBose noted that communication with the new zoning administrator would be important. The Chair said the minutes should capture the back-and-forth and the areas of concern.

Theme 6 – Stormwater management. No further comments beyond those above.

Theme 7 – Parking congestion. Commission Member Hamilton appreciated the planned increase in parking and said Montreat as a whole could benefit from an overall parking plan, and Commission Member James agreed. Commission Member Jenkins noted sensitivity around staff and visitor parking near Phelan Hall during and after construction.

Changes to the application. The Chair read the proposed changes, which would become conditions or clarifications to the recommendation:

- Reverse the deletions made to the application on packet page 23.
- Add a sentence clarifying that all buildings may be used for all uses permitted by right.
- Provide the zoning administrator with discretion, but not a requirement, to approve administrative changes of up to 10 percent.
- Provide that in no event may any administrative change allow encroachment into a setback.
- Strike the language stating that such discretion includes the character of the buildings.

Commission Member Hamilton asked whether the Chair still wished to add a condition requiring a two-year storm plan. The Chair said she remained conflicted. She was concerned that such a condition might be a paper change rather than a practical one. She added that she was encouraged by the collaboration among stakeholders.

Motion to accept the changes to the application as read and to recommend approval of the PUD to the Board of Commissioners was made by Commission Member Eleanor James and seconded by Commissioner Member Clay Hamilton. The motion carried unanimously.

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. The Chair reviewed the environmental, development, and transportation vision statements of the Town's comprehensive plan. She stated that the renderings and the reduction from a 40-room to a 24-room lodge reflect consideration of surrounding architecture, and that replacement plantings would help regrow the canopy. Commission Member James noted that development cannot occur without some tree loss. Commission Member Hamilton added that accessibility is also relevant. Commission Member Tucker cited MRA's central role in the strategic plan and its record of stewardship.

Motion that the proposed plan be considered consistent with the Town of Montreat Comprehensive Plan was made by Commission Member Tucker and seconded by Commission Member Jenkins. The motion carried unanimously.

Written recommendation and consistency statement. Interim Zoning Administrator Baker noted that the consistency statement must be in writing and must reflect the Commission's action when it goes to the Board of Commissioners. Attorney Freeman identified two options: continue the meeting to a date certain to review the written documents, or authorize one member, usually the Chair, to execute the written recommendation and plan consistency statement consistent with today's votes. He confirmed that the documents could be shared among members by email provided no deliberation occurs outside a public meeting, consistent with open meetings law.

Motion to authorize the Chair to prepare and execute the written recommendation and plan consistency statement on behalf of the Commission, and to share the draft with members by email without group discussion, was made by Commission Member James and seconded by Commission Member Hamilton. The motion carried.

Ms. Baker advised that the Board of Commissioners will set the timing, that legislative public-notice requirements apply, and that September was the earliest likely date. Commission Member Jenkins asked about the wording; it was confirmed that the Planning & Zoning Commission is recommending that the Board approve the application with the changes discussed.

The Chair thanked the Commission, staff, and community members for their work and participation.

Motion to close consideration of the PUD application and the public hearing was made by Commission Member James and seconded by Commission Member Tucker. The motion carried unanimously.

New Business

Stormwater Subcommittee Updates & Discussion

Commission Member Tuckers, James, and Jenkins agreed to serve on the subcommittee. The subcommittee will meet in the Town boardroom with public notice published by Town staff so that the public may attend. Commission Member James suggested meeting immediately before the October 15th P&Z Commission meeting. Commission Member Tucker said he would be out of the country on that date, and members agreed to coordinate scheduling among themselves and with staff.

Members discussed gathering the Black Mountain and Buncombe County stormwater ordinances for reference. Ms. Baker noted that Buncombe County's requirements are less strict because Montreat is an NPDES Phase 2 municipality, and she cited differences in inspection frequency. The Chair advised that the subcommittee should elect a chair, vice chair, and secretary at its first meeting. Summary minutes should be kept, and the meeting should be properly noticed. She also advised that members avoid deliberating by email or offline and that Ms. Baker's participation in establishing objectives would be valuable before her departure.

Ms. Baker recommended consulting a stormwater expert. Attorney Freeman reported that the Town is considering a League of Municipalities program to help municipalities reevaluate their stormwater programs, which the Town Manager is believed to be reviewing. Ms. Baker also suggested her supervisor at Land of Sky, Mary Roderick, who has assisted other area towns with stormwater updates. Members agreed to copy the Town Manager, Savannah Parrish, on related correspondence.

Zoning Administrator Updates & Discussion

Interim Zoning Administrator Baker stated that she will remain with the Town for a few more weeks before taking a full-time position as town planner in Clyde. She posted the open zoning administrator position on a North Carolina zoning official list serve. She reported no known movement on the signage ordinance.

Commission Member Hamilton asked whether the Board of Commissioners might want a workshop on the PUD, similar to the one held for the signage ordinance. Ms. Baker said she had not heard of any such interest but would ask the Town Manager. The Chair asked that staff notify her if the Board expressed interest, and commissioners indicated their willingness to participate.

Reminder Of Next Meeting Date

The next meeting was confirmed for October 15, 2026. Commission Member Tucker had declined attendance for that date. The Chair asked members to notify her of absences so that she can track a quorum. Commission Member Mike Broussard was reported to have a work conflict, and the reason for Commission Member Allen Crawford's absence was not known. Commission Member Hamilton asked about filling the second alternate position. The Chair

stated that she knew of and would contact an interested candidate and email the Town Manager, and that the Board of Commissioners might appoint another alternate by the September meeting.

Public Comment

The Chair invited additional public comment. None was offered.

Adjournment

Commission Member Clay Hamilton moved to adjourn the meeting. Commission Member Bill Tucker seconded and the motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:53 p.m.

Julie Schell, Chair

Angie Murphy, Town Clerk



TOWN OF MONTREAT

P. O. Box 423
Montreat, NC 28757
Tel: (828)669-8002 Fax: (828)669-3810
www.townofmontreat.org

OATH OF OFFICE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

"I, Larry Arney swear (or affirm) that I will well and truly execute the duties of alternate membership of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Montreat according to the best of my knowledge and ability; so help me God."

Effective this 15th day of October, 2026.

Larry Arney

Town Clerk