

Minutes of the Town of Huntersville Planning Board

The Town of Huntersville Planning Board met at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2025.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Sny called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Present: J. Sny, J. Henson, L. Hallman, G. Baber, S. Hensley, M. Pollard, J. Wright, C. Boyd & T. Loomis

Absent: None

Approval of Minutes

Item 2A: Consider approval of April 9, 2025, regular meeting minutes.

Motion: J. Wright made a Motion to Approve the April 9, 2025, minutes. S. Hensley seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (7-0-2) with M. Pollard and C. Boyd abstaining due to absence.

Item 2B: Consider approval of April 29, 2025, regular meeting minutes.

Motion: L. Hallman made a Motion to Approve the April 29, 2025, minutes. T. Loomis seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (8-0-1) with C. Boyd abstaining due to absence.

Public Comments: None

Action Items

Item 4A: Consider a recommendation for Petition #R25-01 to rezone 11.34 acres located at the intersection of Mt. Holly-Huntersville Road and Alexandriana Road for a multifamily development.

Disclosure: J. Henson disclosed that his firm has worked previously with this firm but is not working with them on this current project and he does not believe there is a conflict. No objections were made.

J. James, Principal Planner entered his staff report into the record, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference. Staff reviewed the proposed rezoning application and stated that staff is recommending approval of the rezoning application.

The Board asked about the Future Land Use map updates, proposed road improvements at the intersection of Mt. Holly-Huntersville and Hambright, and consideration of uses given the current uses on the southern side of Alexandriana that are within Charlotte zoning. Staff stated that the Town of Huntersville adopted very deliberately different zoning from Charlotte and considers the uses based on the long-range planning adopted for the Town of Huntersville.

B. Geisler, Treenail Development presented as the applicant and reviewed the proposed project.

J. Sny asked the applicant to expound on how they propose that the project would meet the TOD-R zoning.

S. Hensley asked the applicant about the engineering of solar into the project and asked what caused them to limit it to only certain buildings. The applicant said that it's a financial decision based on what their discussions with Duke.

J. Wright asked the applicant to explain the micro-transit system. The applicant stated that it is CATS version of something similar to Uber and the Park and Ride location is the main hub.

L. Hallman asked staff what the drawbacks would have been if the applicant requested Highway Commercial zoning verses TOD-R. Staff stated that HC only allows 30% attached and the applicant had a desire not to request a modification for 100% attached. L. Hallman followed up with questions to the applicant if they considered mixed-use at this location. The applicant responded that with the retail services going in up the street at Town 1 this site did not look like a good mixed-use development site for them.

C. Boyd asked staff to explain a pedestrian village format and what is currently missing from the proposed development to be considered that development style. Staff confirmed that it would require mixed-use.

L. Hallman asked staff if shorter blocks and improved connectivity would be more in keeping with a TOD-R zoning and if we have many apartment only complexes that are TOD-R. Staff responded that to meet the zoning you are either building a TOD or connecting to a TOD and the proposed site does not meet either of those requirements, the comments are elements that would be recommended if the TOD requirement was already being met. Town 1 and the development at the corner of Statesville Road Mixed-Use at Statesville and Hambright also has a greenway connectivity through the development.

M. Pollard commented that the zoning ordinance article 11.4.7.e states that there must be consistency which seems to mean commercial development would not be permitted at this site. He then went on to ask if the Huntersville 2040 Plan is prescriptive or performance based to determine if the Board should be reviewing this proposal under the guide that something 'shall' or 'must' be done, or if it should be considered as highly desirable. He then asked if a shuttle service to the Park and Ride center would be considered as a direct connection. The applicant responded that at the time of development the property will fall under the area serviced by the CATS shuttle service so it will be provided. J. Sny responded that it would be the equivalent of any development providing Uber services claiming that they are connected.

Motion: T. Loomis made the motion, "In considering the proposed rezoning petition, R25-01, Alex Yards, the Planning Board recommends denial and finds the proposal is inconsistent with the Huntersville 2040 Community Plan policies LU 1.1, LU7.1, LU8.3, EOS-4, EV1.2, and LU 8.2. It is not reasonable and in the public interest to rezone the approximate 11.34 acres and it is not consistent with the envisioned use and development patterns in the 2040 plan. The development as it is currently proposed lacks walkability and connectivity. It is also inconsistent with the character and existing development patterns in the surrounding area." S. Hensley seconded the motion.

T. Loomis commented that she likes the project but it is too early for her. The lack of walkability, if there were sidewalk connections, a coffee shop concept, something that supports the TOD or makes the connection.

S. Hensley commented that he believes the developers will do high quality work but he cannot get comfortable with this being the right development for this location. It is a key property, a gateway to Huntersville, and the applicant has done a good job separating themselves from Charlotte, which is a concern, and the land plan calls for this area to be 'Employment Center' which in his opinion needs to be protected for economic development.

J. Sny commented that his biggest issue with the proposed development is the connectivity as it relates to the sidewalk.

J. Wright commented that the residential use makes sense at this location with the proposed park in her opinion. The proposed rezoning request though does not match enough with the zoning category and there isn't really a safe walk for people here to get to another site.

J. Henson commented that when you look at the proposed project in the context of what surrounds it, this is a better fit in his opinion than the long-range plan of employment/industrial. The residents being able to have access to the park would be a great amenity. He encouraged the applicant to work hard with the Town on the sidewalk connection before the Town Board meeting so it could potentially be resolved.

M. Pollard commented that with the addition of the park this parcel is not consistent with industrial and would be a better fit in his opinion with the residential, it is a more inviting welcome to Huntersville than industrial, and the proposed project is reasonable while it could still use additional improvements to make it even better.

L. Hallman commented that he likes the proposed project and the look of it but where it is proposed would take employment center and while aesthetically a commercial use may not be as pleasing as this, there is a need to protect the tax base and he would not want to encourage additional residential in the area designated for employment center.

Vote: The motion for denial passed (5-4) with C. Boyd, J. Henson, J. Wright, and M. Pollard opposed.

Item 4B: Consider a recommendation on Petition #R24-07, a request to rezone 106 acres located east of the intersection of Hambright Road and Everette Keith Road to develop a single-family detached and attached house subdivision.

B. Priest, Assistant Planning Director entered his staff report into the record, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference. Staff reviewed the proposed rezoning application and stated that staff is recommending approval of the rezoning application.

M. Pollard asked staff to expound on the payment in lieu regarding incomplete street completion and stream crossing. Staff confirmed that the applicant is volunteering a donation to the future crossing of the stream that is on their land but that they are not required to complete as part of this project.

J. Henson asked staff if the areas that the plan complies with the 2040 Plan have been updated since the Public Hearing. Staff confirmed that they have not.

L. Hallman asked staff when the Eastfield Small Area Plan was completed and the age of Dogwood Estates and how the intensity is designed to address this. Staff confirmed that the Eastfield Small Area Plan was completed in 2014 and Dogwood Estates well predates all of the plans. The plans intensity is the highest in Parcel C and then reduces as it meets Dogwood Estates to be respectful of their existing density.

G. Baber asked staff if the lots that are adjacent to Dogwood represent this intensity and lot size now or if they need to be increased. Staff stated they are recommending that the lots be increased to be more in keeping with Dogwood Estates. The proposed density east of the stream is 1.5 units/acre versus the staff recommended 1.0 units/acre based on the Eastfield Road Small Area Plan recommendation. Staff stated that this recommendation would be more respectful of the existing neighborhood and reduce the overall density of the plan to more closely match what is permitted.

Sean Paone, Bolton Menk presented the proposed project as the consultant to the applicant.

T. Loomis asked what phasing is being proposed for the project. The applicant explained that the mix of product being offered requires more of an overall development to be able to offer enough variety at any one time. The applicant stated that they agree to a two-phase development and outlined what that would look like, with the connection to Dogwood Estates coming at the end of the project.

J. Wright asked how the homes adjacent to Dogwood would be oriented. The applicant confirmed that there are two existing homes that would face the proposed four new homes.

L. Hallman asked about the applicant to expound on the proposed density adjacent to Dogwood Estates. The applicant stated that the lots in Dogwood Estates are not actually 1 acre lots so they would like to focus on the larger lots that are in keeping with the existing lots for the 4 proposed homes on Dogwood Lane that would be opposite the 2 existing homes which combined 4 original lots, and then phase to the slightly smaller lots as you move into the development and away from the existing homes.

M. Pollard asked for clarification on the phasing to transfer the development to a new developer, and the Dogwood Lane calming efforts. The applicant stated that this may be in reference to a note that was placed and will be removed. The intent of the note was to manage the applicants for any potential future rezoning applications due to real-world constraints determined in construction, not to sell off bits of the development to other developers. The applicant stated that the Dogwood Lane calming efforts included a raised pedestrian crossing/speed table, and the mini traffic circle to discourage cut-thru traffic.

M. Pollard asked if the Town has considered the risk-management associated with the pond. Staff stated that it is not unusual for Parks and Recreations to have a pond. Hornet's Nest in Charlotte and Catawba in Cornelius both have ponds stocked with fish and the balance of the details are being worked out but the Parks and Recreation department is amenable to taking it on. M. Pollard followed up that he is

aware of the other properties, but this pond is more secluded, and risk management should also be mitigated in the decision.

J. Sny asked if the applicant can prohibit construction traffic from using Dogwood Lane to enter/exit the property and if the developer has experience with developing a community with this degree of amenities. Scott Monday, NVR Homes stated that they can request and advise the trades and vendors not to use the road but given that it is a public road they cannot explicitly prohibit anyone from using it. They are open to managing the request to all parties involved. The applicant stated that this degree of amenities is in keeping with their current development standards across Charlotte.

S. Hensley asked about the applicant's response to the alleyway connections versus staff's comments, and if the amount for the Hambright Road connection has been agreed upon. The applicant commented that they prioritized the open space over the connectivity and NCDOT has approved the connections shown which are less than what the applicant originally proposed. S. Monday stated that the plans have not entered civil design which is when the costs could be determined. Staff confirmed that the applicant has agreed to a note on the plans to commit to whatever that cost is when it is determined.

S. Hensley asked the applicant if the build-to lines have been agreed upon. The applicant stated that they are looking for something similar to Stoneybrook Station given the future plans of the road, and the proposed adjacent uses.

L. Hallman asked staff to review the outstanding items and determine what needs to be addressed. Staff reviewed the principles of what is lacking and stated that even with what has been discussed tonight, there is no commitment to those items as of yet by the applicant.

M. Pollard applauded the developer and staff for the proposed 10 affordable units and asked the applicant to consider 12 units. The applicant stated that these are the first for-sale affordable units in Huntersville, and they would like to see how it will work and how Huntersville will manage it.

Motion: L. Hallman made the amended motion, "In considering the proposed rezoning petition, R24-07, Everette Keith residential, the Planning Board recommends approval based on the plan being consistent with the Huntersville 2040 Community Plan policies LU 1.1, LU10, LU5, LU8.2, LU9. It is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the rezoning plan because the plan does follow the land recommendation uses of the Huntersville 2040 Community Plan." C. Boyd seconded the motion.

The Board discussed the conditions that they would like included in the motion. L. Hallman accepted the conditions and made an amended motion.

Amended Motion: L. Hallman made the amended motion, "In considering the proposed rezoning petition, R24-07, Everette Keith residential, the Planning Board recommends approval based on the plan being consistent with the Huntersville 2040 Community Plan policies LU 1.1, LU10, LU5, LU8.2, LU9 with the following conditions, increased connectivity through the development is achieved through working with staff on the alleys and accommodation of greenways in various segments; a phasing plan is submitted showing sequential and logical development of infrastructure; eight affordable housing units are spread out through the proposed development and deed restricted for 30-years; utility connection

feasibility is secured; dedication of the pond land to the Town is accepted; modification of the condition subdivision note; and other minor comments as directed by staff. It is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the rezoning plan because the plan does follow the land recommendation uses of the Huntersville 2040 Community Plan.” C. Boyd seconded the motion.

L. Hallman commented that he feels it is the right land use for the site without encroaching too much on the Eastfield Area Plan. It appears that Dogwood Estates concerns and has been well mitigated.

C. Boyd commented that after hearing the presentation and seeing the overall development, location, and reasons for the modifications he is in support of it.

S. Hensley commented that he likes the plan but he doesn't think that we are at the finish line. It has been said previously that the goal of the Planning Board is to send up an application that is as complete as it can be for the Town Board to act on and it appears that the Planning Board is in support of the concept but the execution is sloppy and incomplete and in his mind should be deferred so that what is being presented is more complete.

T. Loomis and M. Pollard agreed with S. Hensley comments.

J. Sny commented that he agrees and the challenges of this site being what they are he can appreciate the challenges that the applicant is also tackling. He encourages the Town Board to consider reducing the density around Dogwood Lane and otherwise he is fine with what is proposed.

G. Baber commented that the small area plan is recommending a density for this area and it seems like it is being ignored, despite that, he likes the plan as a whole but he would like to see a better density transition to Dogwood Lane.

J. Henson commented that he likes the plan and will support it. The consensus is generally there but the pieces are not all there. With it being a large site and the conditions there will be adjustments in the future but he recommends that the applicant nail down as many of these conditions as possible before the Town Board meeting to present something more thorough.

Vote: The amended motion for approval passed (4-1-3) with J. Wright opposing, T. Loomis, S. Hensley, and M. Pollard abstaining.

Item 5A: Other Business

The Board thanked G. Baber for his service and announced that this would be his last Planning Board meeting due to a June scheduling conflict and the end of his term.

Adjourn

Motion: G. Baber made a Motion to Adjourn. J. Sny seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (9-0).

Approved this 24 day of JUNE 2025.



Chairman or Vice Chairman



Board Secretary

