



Minutes of the Town of Huntersville Planning Board

The Town of Huntersville Planning Board met at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 23, 2025.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Vice-Chairman Henson called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

Present: J. Henson, S. Hensley, C. Boyd, L. Hallman, P. Tokpah, M. Horsman, M. Pollard, and T. Loomis

Absent: J. Wright

Approval of Minutes

Item 2A: Consider approval of August 26, 2025, regular meeting minutes.

Motion: L. Hallman made a Motion to Approve August 26, 2025, minutes. C. Boyd seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (8-0).

Public Comments:

J. Webb, Huntersville, NC – Opposed R25-07

C. Paver, Huntersville, NC – Opposed R25-07

Disclosure: S. Hensley made a disclosure that his firm represents the adjoining property, and it will not affect his decision on this item. There were no objections.

Action Items

Item 4A: Consider a recommendation on petition #R25-11 Long Creek Retail, a request by TA and S Enterprises of NC Inc to rezone 4.396 acres from Highway Commercial-Conditional District to Highway Commercial-Conditional District and Rural.

B. Richards, Planning Director 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 and stated that staff does not recommend approval of the rezoning.

The Board asked staff to expound on the grading issues that have been identified, how each lot could be affected, and proposed solutions. Staff reviewed the connectivity issues and stated that an engineer would need to consider all the issues and provide a solution.

The applicant, J. Moflehi, President of TA&S Enterprises and developer of the project presented and stated that the adjacent property owner has been contacted, and they are not interested in coming to an agreement at this time to allow the grading that would be required for connectivity at this time due to the slope of the land. The applicant stated that their property is currently at street level, and it is undoable to raise their property to meet the adjacent property and retain access from Beatties Ford Road and Mt Holly-Huntersville Road. The applicant stated that they are willing to put a cross-access easement into the plan with a retaining wall and a commitment to remove the retaining wall with access to grade when the adjacent parcel is required to develop their land. The applicant stated that they will keep 3 specimen trees and remove 3 specimen trees to meet the tree save requirements at 50%.

The Board asked additional questions regarding the proposed grade, study, and resolution. Brian Upton, Civil Engineer for the developer stated that they have studied the grades and highlighted the issues and

how their proposed grade could make future connectivity work when the adjacent property is ready to be redeveloped. J. Moflehi stated that the grading and property lines are also the reason for the sidewalk stopping short and stated that they are willing to bond the portion that needs to be completed until the adjacent property is bonded.

The Board asked for confirmation on the length of the proposed storage lanes. P. Monroe, Traffic Engineer for the applicant, confirmed the lengths and that the proposed design meets NCDOT requirements.

Motion: T. Loomis made an amended motion to recommend approval of R25-11. The Planning Board recommends approval with the conditions that future modifications to the grade and the retaining wall would be guaranteed upon further development of the property to the north. An additional condition is to bond the remainder of the sidewalk. The conditions are essential for guaranteeing connectivity. It is reasonable and in public interest to approve this request because it is consistent with LU 5.1 of the 2040 Plan allowing for more density where transportation, infrastructure, and utilities already exist. This gas station will provide valuable services to the surrounding community. C. Boyd seconded the motion.

T. Loomis thanked the applicant for their adjustments to come up with a good plan.

C. Boyd thanked the applicant for their adjustments as well.

S. Hensley thanked staff for their commitment to connectivity and commented that he appreciates the investment in road improvements and stated that there is a balance between connectivity and not penalizing an existing developer that wants to invest in the community because the existing adjacent property owner does not.

M. Pollard agreed that there are ancillary benefits to the community through the road improvement, economic development, and a warmer welcome to the Town.

L. Hallman echoed that this is a good use for this location and connectivity will come in time.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (8-0).

Recusal: Jay Henson requested to be recused from Item 4B.

Motion: M. Pollard made a motion to recuse J. Henson from Item 4B. C. Boyd seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Item 4B: Consider a recommendation on Petition #R25-08 Second Street Village, a request by Jay Henson and Brian Hines to rezone +/- 4.799 acres at 204 N. Church St. from Neighborhood Residential to neighborhood Residential with a Conditional District for Townhomes and an Apartment.

N. Farber, Senior Planner 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 and modifications and stated that staff is recommending approval of the rezoning.

The Board further reviewed the woonerf design, TIA results, and affordable housing that is being proposed in the plan. Staff reviewed what is proposed and what is being requested for the woonerf design, that the TIA determined no additional improvements would be needed, and that the applicant could further expound on the affordable housing.

The applicant, B. Hines, confirmed that they had reached out to S. Trott, Town of Huntersville Engineering Director, to determine if there will be any adjustments to the TIA results with the proposed three additional units. The Woonerf design is currently set to be a combination of asphalt and permeable pavers due to where the land will perc. The open areas will be maintained by the HOA but the use will not be exclusive to the HOA.

The Board asked the applicant to expound on the attainable housing element of the project. The applicant stated that they are committing to at least 15 units within a 3-story building that will be between 80-120% AMI. The applicant will title it as such and donate the value of the improved parcel with 24 parking spaces to a non-profit organization to go and obtain grants or financing to manage, maintain, and lease the property. The building will be part of the HOA and adhere to the architectural guidelines of the overall project so it will look seamless to the balance of the project. Upon completion of the sale of the improved parcel the terms of maximum time to begin development and how long the units remain attainable will be finalized. The Town will have some say in those negotiations and the request from the applicant at this time is for the units to remain attainable in perpetuity.

The Board asked if the adjacent property had any concerns. The applicant stated that they are very amenable to the development.

The Board reviewed the buffer modification, a proposed timeline for development, the criteria for selecting a non-profit organization.

Motion: C. Boyd made an amended motion to recommend approval of R25-08, Second Street Village with all modifications outlined in the staff report. The Planning Board recommends approval based on the plan being consistent with policies LU1.1, 2.1, 5.1, 5.3, 7.1, 8.2, 9.2, D2.1.2, 2, 3.1, 6.2 of the 2040 Huntersville Community Plan. It is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the rezoning plan because the proposed rezoning is consistent with the envisioned uses and development pattern set forth in the 2040 Community Plan and Downtown Master Plan. T. Loomis seconded the motion.

C. Boyd commented that the proposal is what we are looking for in the long-term plans and he looks forward to seeing if a woonerf works, he appreciates that they are being good neighbors to the church and tying in with the existing community with the open space.

T. Loomis commented that she likes the proposed project and that the applicant is bringing additional attainable housing to the Town.

M. Pollard commented that the location for the development fits well within the context of everything else and the growth of the Town.

M. Horsman echoed the comments and stated that the purchase agreement checks all the boxes for the attainable housing element.

L. Hallman commented that he appreciates the plan being well-designed to Town standards and he looks forward to seeing it come to fruition.

S. Hensley commented that he appreciates the proposal of the 15 attainable units in perpetuity within a single development and he hopes that the Board can use this in future negotiations.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Motion: C. Boyd made a motion to reseal J. Henson. M. Horsman seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Item 4C: Consider a recommendation on Petition #R25-07 Home2Hilton, a request by PM Patel to rezone +/- 4.69 acres at 13830 Statesville Road from Corporate Business and General Residential to Highway Commercial with Conditions.

N. Farber, Senior Planner entered his staff report into the record, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by reference. Staff reviewed the proposed rezoning and stated that staff is not recommending approval of the rezoning without accommodation of the recommendations to lower the height of the building, lower or adjust retaining wall and grading so it does not compromise the buffer, provide a wider buffer, provide increased excellence in design, and stream mitigation as a condition on the plan.

The Board asked staff about the elevation of the existing Best Western, the nearest residential neighbor to the proposed project and existing Best Western, the context of the use and structure to the corridor plans along Statesville Road, and if the height of the structure were adjusted if staff would support it. Staff confirmed that they are still seeking confirmation on the elevation of the Best Western, and the concerns regarding context are with the proposed height in relation to the neighbors to rear of the proposed structure, not the use or scale as proposed in relation to Statesville Road. If the heights were reduced and the conditions met staff would likely be in support of the project.

S. Irving, Cornelius presented for the applicant.

The Board reviewed the images presented relative to the existing height of the Best Western and the proposed height of the new project, if shifting the location of the building or amenities would be more in keeping with the zoning criteria, why the applicant is insisting on 5-story. The applicant reviewed the common criteria used for measuring the building height were met, the existing NCDOT easement restrictions that limit the proposed building placement, and the criteria set by Hilton brand for approval. The applicant continued that burying the first floor is an option but not ideal.

The Board asked how the applicant went about getting the letters of support that were included. The applicant stated that the owner was a resident of the neighborhood for 14 years and is the owner of the Best Western and sought out their neighbors and associates to meet and discuss and agree to concessions already such as the masonry wall and proposed fence.

The Board asked how many neighbors are affected by the buffer modification request and if the lots have stated if they are for/against the project. The applicant confirmed lot 5 and lot 6 would be affected and

it is unclear if they have expressed a position. Both of those are currently a similar distance from Best Western to the distance being proposed for the new structure.

The Board asked if the applicant has had any discussion with Hilton regarding potential compromise on the height of the building, and with the neighbors relative to what their real objection and concerns are. The applicant stated the areas that have been discussed and that no compromise has been met with Hilton. The concerns that the presenter was aware of are additional traffic in the residential neighborhood which led to the 'no right turn sign' being added and no entrance/exit along Dallas Street, and the street address being on Statesville Road to help deter traffic from entering the residential area.

The Board asked what the tallest existing buildings are outside of Birkdale. Staff confirmed there are numerous structures around 60-65' height including the new Town Hall building.

Motion: S. Hensley made a motion to recommend approval of R25-07, Home2Hilton. The Planning Board recommends approval based on the plan being consistent with policies LU6.2, LU5.1, LU2.1, EV 2 which specifically states, "encourage existing economic assets in entrepreneurial business development." Approval is subject to and shall include the modifications listed in the staff report. Also subject to the applicant working with staff to agree on the buffer details. It is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the rezoning plan because it supports an existing small business in Huntersville, will provide needed alternative hospitality options for existing Huntersville businesses and will provide a renovated and improved existing hospitality business in Huntersville. M. Pollard seconded the motion.

S. Hensley concurred with M. Pollards statement regarding the necessity of amenities for the increased density that has been approved in Downtown, the attraction of a higher end product to the Downtown area, the upgrade of the Best Western, the shared driveway on Highway 21 are all his reasons for supporting the project.

M. Pollard commented that the economics and environment have created a demand for this type of product.

C. Boyd commented that he can see the benefits of the project with the shared drive and feels for the existing neighbors to live next to a 70' hotel. His preference would be to see it drop one-story.

T. Loomis commented that she agrees that this is a good location for a hotel and that a hotel is needed but the height is the issue for her.

L. Hallman commented that he will not support this as he feels that protecting the encroachment on the existing Greenfield Park residents is a greater priority than the business needs. It is too tall and too close to the existing residential. He also shared that letters of support as far as he can tell represent one resident of Greenfield Park and two residents came out to speak against the project. The Best Western was approved under a different set of ordinances.

M. Horsman commented that it is a close call for him and he believes more can be done to drop the height. If Hilton is really serious about wanting their product here that there is likely more flexibility to drop the height.

P. Tokpah commented that he agrees that the height is too tall and would like to see it reduced even by 1-story.

Staff stated that the applicant will agree not to exceed 64 feet for the building height.

Motion: S. Hensley made an amended motion to recommend approval of R25-07, Home2Hilton. The Planning Board recommends approval based on the plan being consistent with policies LU6.2, LU5.1, LU2.1, EV 2 which specifically states, "encourage existing economic assets in entrepreneurial business development." Approval is subject to and shall include the modifications listed in the staff report. Also subject to the applicant working with staff to agree on the buffer details and height will not exceed 64 feet. It is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the rezoning plan because it supports an existing small business in Huntersville, will provide needed alternative hospitality options for existing Huntersville businesses and will provide a renovated and improved existing hospitality business in Huntersville. M. Pollard seconded the motion.

J. Henson commented that he would support 64 feet.

Vote: The motion passed (5-3) with C. Boyd, T. Loomis and L. Hallman opposed.

Item 4D: Consider a recommendation on Petition #R25-09, a request by Greenway Waste Solutions at North Meck to rezone +/- 220.9 acres near 15300 Holbrooks Road from Special Purpose Conditional District (SP-CD) Neighborhood Residential (NR), Transitional Residential (TR), and Corporate Business (CB), to Special Purpose Conditional District SP-CD). The purpose of the rezoning is to expand the North Meck Landfill.

B. Priest, Assistant Planning Director entered his staff report into the record, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit D and incorporated herein by reference. Staff reviewed the proposed text amendment and stated that staff does not recommend approval.

The Board asked staff to confirm what permits have been issued by other governing bodies. C. Heath, Town Engineer stated that the applicant has been approved for the 404/401 permit from the state to impact the stream, additional approvals will need to be obtained such as erosion control, storm water mitigation, and assessment from the County on moving the stream.

The Board asked further questions for clarification on the effects of the stream changes and extent of possible contamination and what is not available for consideration with this item. Staff confirmed that it will be considered in the special use permit application, and the recommendation of staff is for any recommendation on the rezoning to be contingent on the approval of the special use permit.

The applicant, M. Griffin, Griffin Brothers presented.

The Board asked the applicant if there was any aspiration to go away from Construction and Demolition Debris, and to review the process that they take to ensure that they are only receiving Construction and Demolition Debris. The applicant stated that there are no plans to move into any other fields and that it would require additional approval from the Town and County.

The Board asked questions related to current known contamination issues and proposed life of the site.

Motion: L. Hallman made a motion to recommend approval of R25-09, Greenway Waste Expansion. The Planning Board recommends approval with conditions as listed in part 5 of the staff report. With the listed conditions, the application is consistent with policies LU1.1, EOS 1, and EOS 5 of the Huntersville 2040 Plan. It is reasonable and in the public interest to approve the rezoning plan because with the conditions attached the proposed application is consistent with the development pattern of the adopted and recommended plans, is conditioned to limit access to Holbrooks Road for the future compatibility with the residential neighborhood and it will mitigate the environmental challenges of the site with approved solutions. C. Boyd seconded the motion.

L. Hallman commented that he appreciated the presentation and explanation. He appreciates the necessity of it and doing the right thing for Holbrook Road.

C. Boyd agreed and appreciated their support of the neighborhood and give back to the community.

T. Loomis agreed and thanked the applicant for their consideration of Pottstown.

M. Horsman agreed and thanked the applicant for their attention to Holbrook Road and the thoughtful presentation with sensitive handling of the necessary service.

S. Hensley agreed and thanked the applicant for coming up with a way to add four decades of capacity without expanding the footprint.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (8-0).

Adjourn


Motion: C. Boyd made a Motion to Adjourn. P. Tokpah seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously (8-0).

Approved this 19 day of Nov 2025.



Chairman or Vice Chairman



Board Secretary