

Harrisburg Stakeholder Meeting

July 16, 2020

Attendees

1. Pastor Franklin Watkins, 15+ years at Baptist Church
2. Jaleah Taylor, Chair of Harrisburg Youth Council
3. Doug Cremer, Speedway Property Manager, operations, pieces in Harrisburg
4. Mark Kime, Landscape Arch for Land Design in Charlotte
5. Laurens Willard, Galvan Industries, Hwy 49 on south end of Town
6. Robert Carney, Executive Dir of Cabarrus County EDC
7. Carly Bedgood
8. Alan Kerley, Taylor Morrison Homes, building in Town, part of Farmington
9. Laura Reid, Transportation Engineer with Kimley Horn, On-Call TIAs
10. Jim Merrifield, MPD properties, commercial real estate developer (Charlotte), Farmington project 485 and _ River Road
11. Rob Reddick, McAdams Co, design firm, Farmington project
12. Mark Swartz, Real Estate Development, Harrisburg Town Center

Meeting Notes

- Once rezoned, preliminary plat process before Construction Documents – tacks on 60-90 days, already entitled; several other communities don't have a preliminary plat process
- Many communities skip preliminary plat process; go straight to final plat
- Conditional zoning; so many conditions already included; preliminary plat process is an extra step
- Conditional zoning
 - Like process; like community involvement to help dictate what the Town wants
 - Like being able to limit land uses
- Neighborhood meetings
 - Rezoning requires a neighborhood meeting
 - Business built by-right are not required to hold a neighborhood meeting
- Biggest issues - schools and traffic
- Harrisburg Area Land Use Plan (HALUP) is a good roadmap; helps to reduce the conflict
- Common issues
 - Townhome – limit rentals
 - Alley load on townhomes
 - Issue of affordability; frontload more affordable; some areas in Town could accommodate for workforce employment
 - Can build more affordably if alleys are not required in all cases and locations
- Affordability needs to be better accommodated
- Need more flexibility – not so overly restrictive with the finest grain details
- Commend Town's technical review committee – staff gives good feedback, helps process and getting through it

- Apartments basically prohibited in Harrisburg – reflects community collective will
 - How might they be included in the updated UDO?
 - Apartments need to be addressed; demand exists
 - Politically unpopular
 - Current UDO allows for apartments but will not be approved with current sentiment
- Signs
 - No big problems
 - Relatively restrictive; higher end
 - Grandfathered signs on Hwy 49; many would prefer to change
 - Sign ordinance does not require much work
 - Builders perspective
 - No off-site marketing signs for new neighborhoods
 - Allow one off-site of specified standard if permitted for finite period of time
 - Some sites are difficult to advertise because of railroad and dead-end streets
- Incompatibilities – not much problem
 - Town Center – uses are mixed; no issues; people know what’s there and expected
- Design standards
 - Active open space with proximity to lots – how its interpreted – unreasonable to have within 50 ft. of every lot
 - Planting mitigation – more coordinated plantings on another part of the site would be an improvement
 - Nice improvements and understand their purpose, but they add costs
 - Fountains in stormwater ponds
 - Internal landscape easement between new lots
 - Allow buyers to choose when and how they screen their properties rather than requiring
- Variances – Town is very good
 - 35’ height; three-story Townhomes need to be 45’
- Rezoning in Mecklenburg County – 90 acres, 450 homes – will impact traffic in Harrisburg yet no consideration of required improvements in Town
 - Traffic analysis ends at County limits
 - UDO – specifies one mile for TIA improvements
 - NCDOT should be involved
 - Hard to enforce
- Harrisburg process is positive relative to other area communities