

CITY OF KANNAPOLIS, NC

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Minutes of Meeting

July 1, 2025

6:00 PM

The Kannapolis Board of Adjustment met on Tuesday, July 1, 2025, at 6:00 PM in the Laureate Center of City Hall. This meeting was held in accordance with required public notice, as well as announced on the City's website.

Board Members Present:

Emily Joshi, Chair
Holden Sides, Vice-Chair
Danielle Martini
Jeff Parker
Wilfred Bailey, Sr.
Chris Dwiggin
Ronald Flanders, Alternate

Board Members Absent:

N/A

Staff Present:

Elizabeth McCarty, Assistant Planning Director
Ben Barcroft, Senior Planner
Mia Alvarez, Planner
Zulena Anderson, Planning Technician
Pam Scaggs, City Clerk

City Attorney:

Andrew Kelly

Visitors Present:

Darlene Ramseur
Janet Martin
Gail Lewis
Richard Lewis
Carson Purvis
Jane Glover
Ronald Glover
Shanna Coles
William Coles Jr.
Jenna McClannon
Justin Lawrence
Robin Carver
Latoya Wells-Zeigler
Marcia Gay

Jonathan Bales
Anahi Carmona
Debra Perez
Lisa Call
Kelly Correll
Mary-Margaret Correll
Michael Foess
Eric Moskowitz
Lori Moskowitz
Josanna Busby
Lawrence Lee
Bernadette Waters-Lee
Jamey Collins
Cassandra Moore
Marian Goodnight
Gwendolyn Young
Patrick Sustar
Nicholas Parker
Linda Spanke
Edward Spanke
Diane Greiner
Brianna Greiner
Michael Greiner
Lyman Cross
Deborah Cross
Mary Ulrich
Thomas Ulrich
Brenda Coleman
Christopher Minnis
Susan Carver
Thomas Carver

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Joshi called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

OATH OF OFFICE

Newly appointed Board member Robert Flanders was administered the Oath of Office by City Clerk Pam Scaggs.

ROLL CALL AND RECOGNITION OF QUORUM

Recording Secretary Zulena Anderson called the roll. The presence of a quorum was recognized.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Joshi asked for a motion to approve the agenda, which was made by Mr. Sides, second by Mr. Parker, and the motion was unanimously approved.

1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2 Chair Joshi asked for a motion for the approval of May 6, 2025, and June 3, 2025, minutes, which
3 was made by Mr. Sides, second by Mrs. Martini, and the motion was unanimously approved.

4 **SWORN IN FOR TESTIMONY**

5 Mia Alvarez, Ben Barcroft, Patrick Sustar, Michael Foess, Nicholas Parker, Kelly Correll, Jeanna
6 McClannon, Jamey Collins

7 **PUBLIC HEARING**

8 **BOA-2025-08- Request for a Special Use Permit (SUP) submitted by Sustar/Little LLC to**
9 **allow for a self-service storage facility on property located at 9170 Davidson Highway. Note:**
10 **was continued from the June 3, 2025, meeting at the request of the Applicant for additional**
11 **time to gather requested information by the Board regarding off-site building visibility and**
12 **lighting for the property.**

13 Ms. Alvarez reminded the Board members that the permit being requested is to allow for the use
14 of a self-service storage facility. She noted that the case has been continued from the last two BOA
15 meetings due to the Board requesting additional evidence from the applicant regarding off-site
16 building visibility and lighting. Ms. Alvarez then made herself available for questions.

17 Chair Joshi stated that the Board had previously voted for continuance, and the applicant
18 subsequently requested to postpone the case hearing until the July meeting. Chair Joshi explained
19 that City staff has recommended approval with three conditions, and since the previous meeting,
20 the applicant has agreed to two additional conditions, including one to increase the required buffer
21 zone. While the minimum requirement is a Type B buffer zone, the applicant agreed to a Type C
22 buffer zone, which provides greater coverage.

23 Ms. Joshi also noted that the applicant agreed not to install pole lighting, committing instead to
24 pedestrian-level lighting, thereby avoiding industrial-style fixtures. She reminded the Board that
25 they had previously requested specific evidence regarding lighting and topography. With the
26 additional conditions offered by the applicant, the Board may choose to move forward and vote on
27 the final motion.

28 Ms. Joshi informed the Board that they may reopen the evidentiary portion of the case if they
29 believe additional information is needed, particularly regarding lighting and topography.
30 Alternatively, they may choose to accept the proposed conditions in good faith as sufficient to
31 address the concerns raised at the previous meeting. She then asked if any Board members had
32 questions for staff and clarified that questioning the applicant would require formally reopening
33 the evidentiary portion.

34 Mr. Dwiggin said that from his perspective, the additional width of the tree line is satisfactory.

35 Mr. Sides asked for clarification on where the Board currently stands in the voting process. He
36 stated that, to his understanding, the Board had previously voted on the Findings of Fact and now
37 needs to vote on whether to approve or deny the permit. Ms. Joshi confirmed that he was correct—
38 they had approved the Findings of Fact based on the evidence presented by the City. She explained
39 that it is now up to the Board to decide whether to approve the case, approve it with conditions, or
40 deny it.

1 City Attorney Kelly stated that he would like to add context to Ms. Joshi's comments. He stated it
2 was the Board's determination whether the Board had, in fact, approved the Findings of Fact by
3 conducting an evidentiary hearing, closing the hearing, reviewing the certified Findings of Fact,
4 and completing the deliberation phase, as he was not present at the last two meetings.

5 City Attorney Kelly reminded the Board that they have the option to adopt conditions to address
6 any remaining concerns or to request additional information if needed. He noted that the Board
7 has now been presented with two additional conditions for the SUP, including the applicant's
8 agreement to install a Type C buffer instead of the required Type B buffer, and encouraged
9 members to consider whether they fully understand the implications of that change. He also
10 pointed out that the Board may wish to review whether the lighting conditions proposed by the
11 applicant are more restrictive than what is typically required by the Kannapolis Development
12 Ordinance.

13 Mr. Kelly emphasized that many of the proposed conditions may address the Board's previous
14 concerns related to the approval criteria. He explained that if the Board believes that more
15 information is needed, particularly concerning topography or lighting, they may make a motion to
16 reopen the evidentiary hearing to hear from both the applicant and any opposition. However, he
17 advised against reopening the hearing unless the Board is not satisfied with the conditions currently
18 proposed.

19 City Attorney Kelly also clarified that Board members may still ask staff questions during
20 deliberation without reopening the evidentiary portion, for example, questions about existing uses
21 permitted in the General Commercial (GC) zoning district. He concluded by noting that, during
22 the deliberation phase, the Board may freely discuss the case among themselves.

23 Ms. Joshi asked for clarification on the differences between a Type B and Type C Buffer zone.

24 An audience member asked if the microphone volume could be increased. Ms. McCarty asked all
25 of those who will be speaking during the meeting to please speak directly through the microphone
26 as some audience members who are sitting at the back of the room cannot hear what is being said.

27 Ms. Alvarez used a chart on her PowerPoint to explain the different types of buffer zones. She
28 mentioned that Type B is a more aesthetic buffer zone while Type C is a semi-opaque buffer by
29 containing more foliage trees compared to Type B. She also mentioned that Type B buffer has a
30 minimum width of six feet while the minimum for Type C is eight feet.

31 Chair Joshi asked if there were any other conditions proposed by the applicant that stated the
32 lighting would be at pedestrian level. She asked Ms. Alvarez to clarify the lighting condition. Ms.
33 Alvarez said that the applicant proposed that the lighting fixtures would be at pedestrian level. Mr.
34 Parker asked if Ms. Alvarez could show a picture of the proposed building.

35 Mr. Parker said that by looking at the picture of the proposed building, one could see the lights.
36 He asked Ms. Alvarez if these are the lights they are referring to. Ms. Alvarez asked Mr. Parker
37 to clarify his comment. Mr. Parker said that if one were to look at the lights on the first floor,
38 between the windows, the lights are much lower than usual traditional office lighting.

39 Ms. Joshi asked the Board members if they had any further questions or concerns regarding the
40 conditions proposed by the applicant to address issues related to topography and lighting. She also
41 inquired whether the Board was satisfied or would prefer to request additional evidence, and, if

1 so, encouraged them to consider what specific information should be requested. She added that if
2 the Board was ready to proceed, approving the case with the discussed conditions was also an
3 option.

4 An audience member asked if she could pose a question regarding the process. Another audience
5 member stated that residents had concerns and would like the opportunity to speak, claiming they
6 were never given that chance. The audience member then asked whether the public hearing takes
7 place after all the evidence has been presented.

8 Mr. Kelly responded by explaining that the meeting was a quasi-judicial hearing. When audience
9 members twice said they could not hear him, he repeated his explanation. The City Attorney
10 clarified that the meeting was not a public meeting in the general sense. The audience member
11 reiterated her question, asking whether a public hearing occurs after all evidence has been
12 presented, and referenced a public hearing that had taken place in May.

13 The City Attorney explained that what occurred was an evidentiary hearing, during which
14 individuals concerned had the opportunity to speak and present evidence in opposition to the
15 application. He emphasized that in quasi-judicial proceedings, the Board must evaluate whether
16 specific legal standards are met, and unlike legislative public hearings, this process is more
17 structured, like a court proceeding. He added that his intention was to educate the audience on the
18 process and the rights of both the applicant and those in opposition.

19 The audience member then asked if the public hearing could be reopened, stating her
20 understanding that the Board has the authority to do so. She asked whether, as a member of the
21 public, it would be possible to reopen the hearing now that the applicant had submitted additional
22 evidence related to the special use permit.

23 Chair Joshi responded that it is up to the Board to decide whether to reopen the evidentiary hearing.
24 She reminded the audience that the public hearing had previously been opened and that the Board
25 was now reviewing new conditions proposed by the applicant. She noted that the City staff
26 recommended approval of the special use permit with three conditions and that the applicant had
27 voluntarily proposed additional conditions in response to Board feedback from earlier meetings.

28 Chair Joshi reiterated that the Board must now determine whether the additional evidence—
29 particularly relating to topography and lighting—satisfies the concerns previously raised. She
30 concluded by stating that it is the Board's responsibility to decide whether to continue the case or
31 move forward with a decision. Ms. Joshi asked the Board members if they were satisfied with the
32 additional conditions to move forward to approve the permit with conditions or if they would like
33 to reopen the evidentiary hearing again to ask the applicant to provide more evidence related
34 specifically to topography and lighting.

35 An audience member asked what about if they had information they would like to discuss about
36 topography. Chair Joshi replied that now the board can discuss amongst themselves what decision
37 they would like to take based on the evidence provided.

38 Another audience member stated that residents were not informed about what was proposed to be
39 built on the site during the evidentiary hearing. A second audience member added that, on May 6,
40 they had no idea the project involved a public storage facility, claiming they were only told it was
41 a rezoning request.

1 Chair Joshi responded that if the Board chooses to reopen the evidentiary hearing, it will be limited
2 to receiving evidence related to topography and lighting—whether presented by the applicant or
3 by those opposed to the permit. She emphasized that an evidentiary hearing must be based on
4 factual evidence, not personal opinions or feelings. Chair Joshi also noted that any evidence
5 provided must be evaluated in relation to the standards set forth in the City’s ordinances.

6 Mr. Parker said that he believes the Board has extended the case enough, has talked about the
7 issues, and are now provided with answers to questions they have posed to the applicant.

8 There being no additional questions or comments for staff, Chair Joshi closed the deliberation
9 phase.

10 Chair Joshi asked for a motion to approve with conditions the Special Use Permit. Mr. Parker made
11 the motion to approve, second by Mr. Dwiggin, and the motion was approved. Mr. Sides stated
12 that he is not in favor.

13 Chair Joshi asked for a motion to issue the Order of Approval. Mr. Parker made the motion to
14 approve the Order, second by Ms. Martini, and the motion was approved. Mr. Sides stated he is
15 not in favor.

16 **BOA-2025-10- Request for a Special Use Permit (SUP) submitted by Green Street Peak GP**
17 **LLC to allow for a pocket neighborhood development at 403 Alpine St.**

18 Senior Planner Ben Barcroft detailed that the property consists of approximately 4.67 acres and
19 that the applicant is requesting a special use permit to allow for a 27-unit pocket neighborhood.
20 He also detailed that the property is in the Residential 8 (R8) zoning district with surrounding
21 properties consisting of single-family residential dwellings and that the proposed development is
22 compatible with both future and existing land uses. Mr. Barcroft displayed the future land use map
23 and stated the whole parcel is in the Urban Residential Character Area in which its uses include
24 single family attached and detached residences aligning to the proposed project. Mr. Barcroft
25 showed pictures of the site taken from Alpine Street, including where the street ends and where a
26 private street starts with a few existing houses. He also showed pictures taken from Snipe Street
27 and noted it is another access point to the parcel. Mr. Barcroft detailed while showing the drone
28 footage that the parcel is located where the wooden area is shown around the existing houses.
29 Subsequently, he showed the preliminary site plan of the 27 proposed lots in which he said staff
30 has briefly reviewed and commented. Mr. Barcroft pointed out on the site plan that Alpine Street
31 is on the left side of the parcel and the right-of-way ends where the gravel road starts. He noted
32 that the street is required to be paved to the City’s standards as well as the proposed roads going
33 through the parcel that connect to Snipe Street.

34 Mr. Barcroft reviewed staff Findings of Fact as follows:

- 35 **1. The proposed special use will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be**
36 **located and in general conformance with the City’s Land Use Plan.**
37 The Move Kannapolis Forward 2030 Comprehensive Plan designates the subject
38 parcels as being located in the “Urban Residential” Character Area. The property is
39 currently zoned Residential 8 (R8). Within this district, pocket neighborhood
40 developments are permitted by right for up to 12 units. Proposals requesting
41 between 13 and 30 units require the issuance of a Special Use Permit.

1 The proposed pocket neighborhood development consists of 27 single-family
2 detached units, resulting in a density of approximately 5.78 units per acre. This
3 proposal aligns with both the recommended land use for the character area and the
4 desired density range of 4 to 10 units per acre, as outlined in the Comprehensive
5 Plan. Additionally, it remains within the R8 zoning district's maximum allowable
6 density of 8 units per acre.

7 **2. Adequate measures shall be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to**
8 **minimize traffic hazards and to minimize traffic congestion on the public roads.**

9 The proposed pocket neighborhood development includes access from Alpine Street
10 and a new connection to Snipe Street, which will help distribute traffic flow and
11 reduce potential congestion. The site design incorporates appropriate ingress and
12 egress to ensure safe and efficient access, minimizing traffic hazards on adjacent
13 public streets. Further, the extension of Snipe Street to intersect with Alpine Street
14 will increase connectivity for this area of the city. Increased connectivity allows
15 greater accessibility for thru travel and overall public safety.

16 **3. The proposed use shall not be noxious or offensive by reason of vibration, noise, odor,**
17 **dust, smoke or gas.**

18 The proposed pocket neighborhood development will not generate any noxious or
19 offensive vibration, noise, odor, dust, smoke, or gas.

20 **4. The establishment of the proposed use shall not impede the orderly development and**
21 **improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted within the zoning district.**

22 The proposed development will not impede the orderly development of surrounding
23 properties, as it is compatible with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood.

24 **5. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the proposed use shall not be**
25 **detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare.**

26 As indicated by the applicant, the proposed development will not be detrimental to or
27 endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare.

28 **6. The proposed use complies with all applicable provisions of the KDO.**

29 The applicant has indicated, and staff has verified that the project will comply with all
30 applicable provisions of the Kannapolis Development Ordinance, including the use-
31 specific standards in Section 4.2.D(3)a.4.

32 **7. The applicant consents in writing to all conditions of approval included in the**
33 **approved special use permit.**

34 N/A unless the Board of Adjustment determines to add conditions.

35 Mr. Barcroft stated that staff recommends approval of the Special Use Permit based on the staff
36 Findings of Fact, the conceptual site plan, and compliance with all local, state and federal
37 requirements. He then made himself available for questions.

38 Mr. Parker asked if any renderings of how the proposed houses would look can be provided. Mr.
39 Barcroft replied that to his knowledge, there are not any renderings of the proposed dwellings. Mr.
40 Parker commented that he sees parking being a potential issue as he believes the site plan shows
41 an insufficient number of parking spaces. Mr. Parker asked if the parking spaces are allocated. Mr.
42 Barcroft answered yes, and that there will be on-street parking as well. Mr. Parker asked for more
43 details on the proposed street parking and commented that he sees insufficient space for public
44 safety vehicles if the parking spaces are in various alleys. Mr. Barcroft replied that the provided

1 plot plan is a preliminary one and that the plot plan will have to go through the Fire and Engineering
2 departments for review to ensure the City's requirements are met.

3 Mr. Bailey commented that he agrees with Mr. Parker on wanting a visual view of the proposed
4 dwellings and questioning the parking spaces. Mr. Bailey said he believes he is not seeing enough
5 of the proposed neighborhood.

6 There being no questions or comments for staff, Chair Joshi called for the applicant to answer
7 questions.

8 The applicant, Nicholas Parker of 11330 Preston Drive, Charlotte, introduced himself. Mr. Parker
9 asked how many bedrooms the proposed dwellings would include. The applicant responded that
10 the homes will be three-bedroom, single-family detached residences intended for sale rather than
11 rental. The applicant explained that the homes will feature modern farmhouse architecture, each
12 with a minimum front porch depth of five feet and a width of ten feet.

13 The applicant also noted that each unit will include two parking spaces, and that alley lengths will
14 not exceed 150 feet to meet state fire code requirements. The applicant stated that what makes the
15 project unique is their specialization in developing sustainable communities with zero energy
16 homes, noting experience with similar developments.

17 The homes will be "expandable," with conditioned attics that will allow homeowners to increase
18 their living space and potentially build equity. The applicant described the use of masonry
19 materials, high-efficiency windows, and included appliances, along with two-by-six exterior walls
20 for improved insulation.

21 Additionally, the applicant shared that his company embraces the concept of pocket neighborhoods
22 as an alternative to traditional townhouse developments. He noted ongoing collaboration with the
23 Kannapolis Planning Department and expressed that this would likely be the first pocket
24 neighborhood built in the city.

25 Ms. Joshi thanked the applicant for his explanation and asked, based on the site plan, what do the
26 little extra squares indicate. She wondered if they indicated parking. The applicant responded that
27 the squares are representation for if in the future, the homeowner would like to add additional
28 storage space or shed to their property; he discussed that the City requires for pocket
29 neighborhoods to have a certain amount of attached or detached storage space available.

30 Mr. Bailey asked if the project consists of 27 detached units, to which the applicant confirmed he
31 was correct. Mr. Bailey noted that, based on the preliminary plat, the street runs through the parcel,
32 and he only observed about four parking spots in front of lots 20 and 23. Mr. Parker, the applicant,
33 explained that the plat may be difficult to interpret, but there will be concrete hatching behind each
34 unit indicating space for two vehicles per lot.

35 Mr. Bailey then asked how future homeowners would access their units. Mr. Parker replied that
36 residents would use the alley and turn into their parking spots. Mr. Bailey inquired about how
37 garbage collection would work in a pocket neighborhood. Mr. Parker said one option is for the
38 garbage truck to travel through the alley to collect trash and exit the same way; the other option is
39 for residents to bring their containers to the main road. He added that this is why pocket
40 neighborhoods typically have six to eight units per cluster.

1 Mr. Bailey expressed concern about whether visitor parking would be provided. The applicant, Mr.
2 Parker, responded that on-street parking will be available. However, Mr. Bailey stated he does not
3 believe there is sufficient space for additional parking. Mr. Parker asked for clarification,
4 confirming if Mr. Bailey meant it appeared there would not be enough parking. Another Board
5 member, Mr. Parker, agreed with Mr. Bailey's observation.

6 Mr. Parker asked how many three-bedroom units are proposed. The applicant said he plans to build
7 27 three-bedroom units. Mr. Bailey commented that future residents may have high school or
8 college-aged kids who may need additional parking. Mr. Parker said that he agrees with Mr. Bailey
9 and that he does not believe there is enough parking for a neighborhood of solely three-bedroom
10 units. He mentioned that the proposed parking could possibly work if the units consisted of two
11 bedrooms. The applicant replied that they can potentially add additional off-street parking, and it
12 is a topic his company has talked about. Mr. Parker commented that he would like to see renderings
13 on how the dwellings will look and not just be provided with a plot plan as he believes it will help
14 the Board better understand the development.

15 Mr. Sides asked the applicant that since he has mentioned developing similar projects in the past,
16 has he seen those neighborhoods struggle with parking or has it been comparable to the plot plan
17 provided. The applicant answered that it is comparable to the plot plan the Board has been provided
18 with; he mentioned that there has been one community he developed six to seven years ago that
19 has not had any issues. He also mentioned that there will be dedicated on-site parking and that he
20 will add additional dedicated on-street parking as well as additional off-street parking.

21 Mr. Parker asked if there would be any fencing between the dwellings. The applicant replied that
22 fencing has not been proposed for the project but that does not mean they will not install fences
23 on site.

24 Mr. Dwiggins asked if the neighborhood will have a Homeowner Association (HOA). The
25 applicant answered, "yes" and stated that since the project is a pocket neighborhood made with
26 linear green space, it is treated as a townhouse community in sense of all yards and common areas
27 will be maintained by a third party.

28 There being no questions or comments for staff or the applicant, Chair Joshi opened the Public
29 Hearing.

30 Kelly Correll, 1407 Price Avenue, stated that he has lived on his property for 37 years and has
31 observed the population increase with new houses being built on Kimball Street and the nearby
32 mobile home park, which has several hundred units. Mr. Correll described Kimball Street as
33 resembling a highway despite being only about 18 feet wide with rough shoulders, where cars
34 often travel at speeds of 65 to 70 miles per hour, resulting in many accidents. He expressed concern
35 that the proposed new neighborhood could worsen these issues by increasing population density.

36 Mr. Correll acknowledged the Board's concerns about parking and garbage collection, which he
37 had not previously considered but now agrees are valid. He noted that garbage trucks may be
38 reluctant to back in and out to collect trash. He also observed that some lots, such as lots 18 and
39 19, appear larger than others on the plot plan, but overall, the lots seem small, and he questioned
40 how each unit could accommodate three bedrooms. He asked if the plot plan is drawn to scale.

1 Mr. Correll pointed out that the right of way leading into Snipe Street borders his property; he
2 believes it is approximately 22.5 feet wide, which he feels is insufficient. This raised concerns for
3 him about how the street could be constructed without encroaching on his or his neighbors'
4 properties. He concluded by stating his main concern is that the proposed density is too high and
5 that he believes building around 14 units would be more reasonable.

6 Ms. Joshi thanked Mr. Correll and asked if anyone else would like to speak.

7 Jeanna McClannon, who lives at 210 Snipe Street, referred to the plot plan provided by the
8 applicant and noted that her property is on the right-hand side of the right-of-way, while Mr.
9 Correll's property is on the left. She expressed the same concern as Mr. Correll regarding traffic,
10 emphasizing that Snipe Street is very narrow for entering and exiting. Ms. McClannon explained
11 that the beginning of Snipe Street is wider than its extension. She mentioned that there are
12 apartments beside her property, and if the road is extended, it could eliminate their parking and
13 cause vehicles to drive close to her front porch. She stated that extending the road to allow passage,
14 which is currently very tight, would negatively affect her.

15 Ms. McClannon also voiced concern about trash pickup. She mentioned ongoing issues with drug
16 activity on Kimball Street and near 22nd Street, including squatters and a meth house over the past
17 four years. She noted that people frequently walk through the nearby woods from the mobile home
18 park. Ms. McClannon expressed worry that the proposed development will bring more people and,
19 consequently, more problems to the area, including increased traffic. She added that she regularly
20 sees people walking through her property.

21 Ms. Joshi thanked Ms. McClannon.

22 Jamey Collins stated that he was representing his mother, who lives at 1409 Price Avenue. He
23 explained that he visits his mother's house at least once a week and often has to pull over to let
24 cars pass on the narrow road. Mr. Collins questioned the width required for a two-lane road and
25 asserted that Snipe Street does not meet that standard as claimed. He also noted that people
26 frequently park on the sides of the street. Mr. Collins expressed concern about drug activity in the
27 area, mentioning that individuals living in the nearby woods contribute to the problem, and when
28 the police have been contacted, they reportedly say there is nothing that can be done. He asked if
29 there are any possible actions to address these issues. Additionally, Mr. Collins voiced concerns
30 about traffic and road boundaries, emphasizing the need to consider whether larger vehicles like
31 school buses and fire trucks would be able to safely navigate the roads connected to the proposed
32 development.

33 Ms. Joshi thanked Mr. Collins.

34 There being no additional questions or comments for staff or the applicant, Chair Joshi closed the
35 Public Hearing.

36 Mr. Dwiggin asked if he could direct a question to staff, and City Attorney Kelly confirmed that
37 he could. Referring to the testimony regarding the width of Snipe Street and traffic congestion near
38 the proposed neighborhood, Mr. Dwiggin noted that he was aware of certain thresholds that
39 trigger a traffic study. He asked staff whether the proposed development would require a traffic
40 impact analysis and what criteria must be met for one to be conducted. Mr. Parker then asked
41 whether there were any plans either by the developer or the city to upgrade the public right-of-way

1 on streets connected to the proposed development. Ms. McCarty responded that under the
2 Kannapolis Development Ordinance (KDO), a traffic impact analysis is required if a development
3 is projected to generate 100 or more trips per hour or 1,000 trips per day. Since the proposed
4 development includes only 27 units, it does not meet the threshold and therefore does not require
5 a traffic study. Mr. Dwiggins remarked that he had not remembered the specific threshold for when
6 a traffic study would be required.

7 Chair Joshi noted that any concerns regarding density, traffic, or emergency vehicle access must
8 be raised prior to the Board's motion on the Findings of Fact. She reminded Board members that
9 they have the option to vote to revise the Findings of Fact. Chair Joshi then asked Mr. Kelly
10 whether a vote to revise the Findings of Fact would require a continuance to obtain additional
11 evidence related to concerns such as potential traffic hazards and density. Mr. Kelly responded that
12 if the Board wishes to gather more evidence, the evidentiary portion of the hearing should remain
13 open. When Chair Joshi asked if a continuance would be necessary, Mr. Kelly confirmed that it
14 would. He advised her to state that the evidentiary portion will remain open until a future meeting
15 and noted that the Board can determine how much time is needed for staff and the applicant to
16 provide the additional information. Mr. Kelly added that if the Board believes more than one
17 meeting may be required, they have the discretion to allow for that. Chair Joshi then asked whether
18 the Board needs to specify what type of evidence they are requesting, and Mr. Kelly recommended
19 doing so, as it would be helpful. Chair Joshi concluded by telling the Board that if they choose to
20 request additional evidence from staff or the applicant, they must clearly identify the concerns that
21 need to be addressed.

22 Mr. Parker asked whether the Board could request renderings of the proposed dwellings. Mr.
23 Bailey inquired if additional information about parking could also be requested. Mr. Parker then
24 asked whether the public safety department had reviewed and approved the plot plan. Mr. Barcroft
25 responded that the plot plan is still in a preliminary stage, has not been approved, and has not yet
26 been reviewed by any other department.

27 Chair Joshi asked whether the proposed alleys would be constructed, noting that one of the Board's
28 concerns is the functionality of the alleys. She explained that the Board wants to ensure future
29 residents can have their trash collected without issue and that emergency vehicles, such as
30 ambulances, can enter and exit the neighborhood without needing to reverse. Chair Joshi stated
31 that the Board will request the applicant to provide site renderings to help visualize the overall
32 layout of the development. She then asked staff to clarify the City's requirements for rights-of-way
33 and whether those requirements have been met in this proposal. Specifically, she asked what the
34 minimum width of an alley would need to be in a pocket neighborhood to comply with City
35 standards.

36 Ms. McCarty responded that the City's ordinances include alley requirements as well as applicable
37 fire codes. She noted that alleys typically require a minimum of approximately 20 feet of paved
38 width. She also explained that roads are subject to a maximum length of 150 feet before a
39 turnaround is required. Therefore, if any alley exceeds that distance, it must include a turnaround,
40 hammerhead, or cul-de-sac to accommodate emergency vehicles.

41 Mr. Bailey noted that upon reviewing the renderings again, it appears the alley is intended for
42 vehicles and that a separate walking path is also included. He asked staff to confirm whether his
43 observation was correct. Ms. McCarty confirmed that he was correct. Mr. Bailey then asked why

1 both an alley and a walking path are included in the design. Ms. McCarty explained that a core
2 principle of pocket neighborhoods is to cluster homes together in a way that fosters a sense of
3 community. In this particular case, the dwelling units are oriented toward the pedestrian walkway,
4 while parking is accessed via the alley at the rear of the homes.

5 Mr. Bailey commented that he would have liked to see renderings of the proposed dwellings
6 themselves. In response, Ms. McCarty reminded the Board that the proposed development is
7 located in the R8 zoning district, which allows up to eight units per acre. However, the applicant
8 is proposing to build at a density of 5.78 units per acre. She added that the right-of-way within the
9 site will need to comply with the requirements of the Land Development Standards Manual
10 (LDSM), and if necessary, the road will be widened to meet city standards. Sidewalks are also
11 proposed as part of the development.

12 Mr. Bailey asked whether the proposed development would have only one way in and one way
13 out. Ms. McCarty responded that the main road through the site is two-way and that there will be
14 an extension off Alpine Street. Mr. Bailey clarified his question, asking if the same road would
15 serve as both the entrance and exit. Ms. McCarty confirmed that vehicles will be able to travel in
16 either direction on the main road.

17 Chair Joshi added that the alley is intended for use by future residents only. Mr. Bailey then asked
18 whether Snipe Street would continue or dead-end. Chair Joshi replied that she believed one of the
19 proposed conditions is to open Snipe Street, allowing the alley to connect through to Alpine Street.
20 She explained that staff indicated opening Snipe Street would help reduce traffic by providing an
21 alternative route, so vehicles would not have to travel solely through Alpine Street.

22 Mr. Barcroft clarified that part of Alpine Street is currently a private gravel road, and some of the
23 streets shown on the plot plan do not yet exist. These streets will need to be improved to meet City
24 standards. Mr. Bailey reiterated his concern, asking whether the development will still rely on a
25 single point for entrance and exit. Mr. Barcroft responded that vehicles would be able to enter and
26 exit the development from either Snipe Street or Alpine Street.

27 Chair Joshi suggested the Board request evidence of the proposed alley widths to determine
28 whether a turnaround will be needed. Ms. McCarty said that this issue will be addressed during
29 the site plan review process, which includes review by the fire marshal to ensure compliance with
30 state fire codes related to road width and emergency access. Mr. Bailey clarified that his concern
31 was not with the alleys but specifically with Snipe Street. Chair Joshi confirmed that Snipe Street
32 is planned to be opened as part of the development.

33 Ms. Martini asked whether Snipe Street is a two-lane road. Mr. Barcroft responded that Snipe
34 Street is not officially designated as a one-lane road, but it is considered a narrow existing street.
35 He noted that the right-of-way is 40 feet. Ms. Martini asked him to confirm whether the right-of-
36 way is indeed 40 feet. Mr. Barcroft affirmed that the right of way is 40 feet but estimated the paved
37 portion of the street to be around 20 feet, although he did not know the exact measurements. Ms.
38 Martini then asked whether the street would remain the same width or become narrower. Mr.
39 Barcroft replied that he had inquired about that but had not received a definitive answer. He added
40 that the street would need to meet the City's standards within the boundaries of the development,
41 but he was unsure whether any improvements would be required outside of the property.

1 Mr. Dwiggins expressed concern about the existing portion of Snipe Street, noting that if the parcel
2 creates a bottleneck, it could lead to traffic issues. He explained that he is trying to understand the
3 City's plans for the current segment of Snipe Street because approving additional residences
4 without expanding the street could create problems. Mr. Dwiggins said that both he and other
5 Board members want to determine the potential impact of the proposed development and identify
6 what further information is needed to make an informed decision. He stated his support for a
7 continuance to allow time for the applicant to provide renderings of the proposed dwellings and
8 more detailed information about the alley dimensions. He added that, given the information
9 available so far, he cannot make a fully informed decision due to several uncertainties that may
10 affect the community.

11 Chair Joshi asked the Board members what specific information they would like to request from
12 staff and the applicant. She encouraged them to be precise about what they want to see in the
13 requested renderings and whether those details would address their concerns, such as road widths.
14 Chair Joshi noted that the road width is likely outside the applicant's control, and therefore, more
15 appropriate to address with staff. Mr. Bailey agreed, stating that staff would be best suited to
16 provide information on the road and assess whether its condition could cause issues. Chair Joshi
17 added that the Board should determine if the problem can be measured or if it is simply an
18 inconvenience. She explained that if measurements are possible, the Board can request specific
19 data for clarification—provided it falls within areas under their control. She emphasized that the
20 Board must provide clear and explicit reasons to the applicant and staff so they understand exactly
21 what evidence is needed to address the concerns.

22 Mr. Parker expressed concern about stormwater management, specifically regarding the amount
23 of impervious surface in the proposed development. He noted that while he understands there is a
24 water detention pond, he questioned whether the City's stormwater system can adequately handle
25 runoff from the property. Mr. Barcroft responded that the Engineering Department will review the
26 site's stormwater plan. Mr. Parker also asked if all the alleys would be paved. Mr. Barcroft added
27 that pocket neighborhoods are required to include 30 percent open space. Mr. Parker reiterated his
28 concerns about potential stormwater issues within the development, citing his knowledge that the
29 City's stormwater system may not have sufficient capacity to handle runoff based on the
30 impervious surface ratio typical for this type of development. Ms. McCarty assured the Board that
31 the development must comply with the Land Development Standards Manual (LDSM)
32 requirements for stormwater, and that the Engineering Department will review and begin
33 inspections at the start of construction.

34 Mr. Kelly noted that the Board's questions are a normal part of progressing from the preliminary
35 plat stage to the preliminary graphic stage, which will eventually lead to the building phase and
36 require multiple reviews. He asked whether departments such as Fire and Engineering could
37 review and provide information about the proposed development, since not all evidence can come
38 from the applicant. Ms. McCarty responded that the Planning Department can request reviews
39 from other departments. She explained that a weekly technical review committee meeting includes
40 representatives from transportation, environmental services, fire, planning, parks and recreation,
41 and NCDOT. During these meetings, participants discuss concerns and requirements related to the
42 new development, including stormwater and road width.

1 Chair Joshi stated that the Board will consider voting for a continuance and determining what
2 additional information to request from the City and applicant, such as renderings, to help make a
3 more informed decision.

4 Mr. Kelly suggested asking the applicant if he would agree to a continuance of the case, given that
5 the Board will base its decision on the information provided. The applicant, Mr. Parker, said he
6 does not mind if the Board votes to continue the case. He added that he is not only a developer but
7 also a licensed civil engineer with over 25 years of experience, including numerous projects in
8 Kannapolis. Mr. Parker stated that the alleys meet fire code requirements and that the stormwater
9 detention system has already been implemented to comply with the Land Development Standards
10 Manual (LDSM).

11 Chair Joshi called for a motion to continue the SUP case. Mr. Parker made the motion to continue
12 the case. Chair Joshi then asked all those in favor to say “aye,” and all Board members responded
13 affirmatively. She asked those opposed to say “no,” and hearing none, the motion was unanimously
14 approved.

15 Chair Joshi stated that the case has been continued to the August meeting. She noted that the Board
16 has requested the applicant to provide architectural renderings and asked staff to coordinate with
17 other departments to review concerns related to stormwater management, garbage collection
18 locations, alley widths for emergency vehicle access, and roadway width.

19 **Planning Director Updates**

20 Ms. McCarty stated that the next Board meeting will be held on August 5th at 6:00 p.m. in the
21 same room. She informed the Board members that the new fiscal year has begun and provided
22 updates on the department’s statistics, covering the period from July 1, 2024, to June 30, 2025.

23 Ms. McCarty shared that during the last fiscal year, the Planning Department issued 772 residential
24 permits, slightly higher than the previous year’s total of 762. About half of these permits were for
25 multi-family residential dwellings, 13 percent were for single-family attached dwellings, 35
26 percent were for single-family detached dwellings, and 2% were for duplexes. Additionally, 158
27 non-residential permits were issued.

28 She noted that the Planning and Zoning Commission considered eight rezoning applications and
29 one Special Intensity Allocation during the last fiscal year, a decrease from eighteen rezoning
30 applications the previous year. Similarly, there were eleven Board of Adjustment cases, down from
31 fifteen the prior year. Ms. McCarty mentioned that there were no Board of Adjustment cases from
32 September 2024 through January 2025, but several cases are scheduled for upcoming meetings.

33 Ms. McCarty reported that the Planning Department employs three code enforcement officers who
34 handled over 1,800 code cases in the past fiscal year, including 1,304 public nuisance violations
35 such as junk vehicles and overgrown grass. She also highlighted that over 1,700 maps were created,
36 and more than 1,200 new addresses were assigned.

37 Regarding annexations, she stated there were eight annexations of fourteen parcels totaling over
38 250 acres, including areas off Camp Julia and Jim Johnson Roads. This represents significant
39 growth compared to the previous fiscal year, which had only four annexations.

1 Exempt plats increased from thirty-one to eighty-five last year, primarily due to challenges with
2 sewer allocation. The Planning Department also reviewed sixty-six site plans, twenty-five minor
3 subdivisions, and sixteen major subdivisions, and granted three sewer allocation permits during
4 the fiscal year.

5 Chair Joshi thanked Ms. McCarty for the update.


6 **Other Business**

7 N/A

8 **Adjourn**

9 There being no further business, Chair Joshi asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Sides made the
10 motion, which was seconded by Mr. Dwiggin, and it was unanimously approved.

11 The meeting was adjourned at 7:31 PM on Tuesday, July 1, 2025.


Holden Sides, Vice-Chair
Board of Adjustments
Zulena Anderson, Planning Technician
Board of Adjustments