

Active Recreation – Public Input Sessions

Public Input Sessions - Active Recreation - Poster Board Dot Counts

Activity	Dot #	Dot %
Rectangular Field	22	35%
Free Play	17	27%
Pickleball	12	19%
Bocce	<u>11</u>	<u>18%</u>
	62	100%

Public Input Sessions - Active Recreation - Poster Board Comments

Comment	Mention Frequency
Keep space as open field	9
Make space draw for children	5
Connect use with renovated gym	3
Promote uses that are quiet	2
No active recreation - use for affor	2
Pickleball	1
Bocce	1
Tennis Courts	1
Horseshoe pits	1
Roller hockey	1
No playing fields	1

Conclusions

- Fields and free play are the most desired active recreation uses

Active Recreation - Survey Results (1)

Question 3 Summary

If the Town elects to use a portion of the parcel for active recreation, please rank (1=most important)

Activity	Sum % for 1s and 2s	Sum % 6s and 7s	Delta
Basketball Courts	31.7%	20.1%	11.6%
Bocce Court	20.9%	30.1%	-9.3%
Grass sport field	37.8%	17.4%	20.5%
Pickleball courts	32.8%	22.0%	10.8%
Tennis Courts	18.2%	38.2%	-20.1%
Volleyball	10.8%	43.6%	-32.8%
Workout Trail	47.9%	28.6%	19.3%

Conclusions

- Consistent with input sessions: survey respondents prefer playing field, workout or walking trails
- Playground was the most popular “other”

Question 4 Summary

If the most important active recreation option to you use was not found above, please describe your other priority use.

Response	Count	Percentage
Playground	13	22.8%
Trails / Walking / Passive	7	12.3%
Scouting Office / Yoga / Other	7	12.3%
Pool	6	10.5%
Baseball	4	7.0%
Skateboard	3	5.3%
Forest Area Kept Natural	3	5.3%
Dog Park	3	5.3%
Spash Pad	2	3.5%
Recreation Center / Pavillion	2	3.5%
Racquetball	2	3.5%
Pickleball	2	3.5%
Volleyball	1	1.8%
Bike Trails	1	1.8%
Basketball	1	1.8%
	57	100.0%

Active Recreation - Survey Results (2)

Question 5 Summary

Do you think that the entire parcel should be used for active recreation?

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	68	26.3%
No	191	73.7%
	259	100.0%

Question 6 Summary

What other uses would like in addition to active recreation?

Response	Count	Percentage
Passive or Trail	43	31.2%
Affordable Housing	40	29.0%
Green or Open Space	34	24.6%
Other/ Parking	13	9.4%
Amphatheater	4	2.9%
Other	4	2.9%
	138	100.0%

Conclusions

- Respondents prefer a mixture of uses
- As a complement to active recreation, respondents prefer passive uses (passive/trail and green/open space)

Active Recreation - Survey Results (3)

Question 7 Summary

Are there any particular portions of the parcel that you think should be the focal point for active recreation?

Response	Count	Percentage
Fields Proximate to Gym / Developed Area	27	41.5%
None	32	49.2%
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>9.2%</u>
	65	100.0%

Conclusions

- Active recreation is preferred in the area adjacent to the gym
- The distinction between passive recreation and natural areas is unclear

Active Recreation: Observations from Survey Comments

- Having playing fields near the gym to support recreation programs makes sense to many commenters
- Active recreation could provide a place for children to gather after school
- Active recreation options that garnered multiple mentions include pool, skate park, playground, basketball courts, dog park
- Pickleball and parking both had avid advocates and avid opponents
- Among those who listed preferences in addition to active recreation, passive recreation and natural areas (combined – it was hard to differentiate between them in many comments) were cited about twice as often as affordable housing, the second most popular response
- While few respondents think the whole site should be devoted to a single use, active recreation is the second most popular single use (26%), while natural uses is the most popular (36%).

An additional suggestion

Overall, the survey indicates strong support for recreational and natural uses in the portion of the site under consideration in this process ...

	Rank 1	Rank 2	Ranks 1 & 2	Rank 5	Rank 6	Ranks 5 & 6	Difference
Passive Recreation	14.67%	39.77%	54.44%	8.11%	0.39%	8.50%	45.94%
Natural Uses	30.50%	22.78%	53.28%	5.41%	2.32%	7.73%	45.55%
Active Recreation	32.05%	22.01%	54.06%	7.34%	3.47%	10.81%	43.25%
Affordable/Workforce Housing	19.31%	5.41%	24.72%	13.90%	42.08%	55.98%	-31.26%
Preserve Space for Future Public Facilities	0.77%	3.47%	4.24%	32.05%	21.24%	53.29%	-49.05%
Additional Parking	2.70%	6.56%	9.26%	33.20%	30.50%	63.70%	-54.44%

An additional suggestion

Overall, the survey indicates strong support for recreational and natural uses in the portion of the site under consideration in this process ...

	Rank 1	Rank 2	Ranks 1 & 2	Rank 5	Rank 6	Ranks 5 & 6	Difference
Passive Recreation	14.67%	39.77%	54.44%	8.11%	0.39%	8.50%	45.94%
Natural Uses	30.50%	22.78%	53.28%	5.41%	2.32%	7.73%	45.55%
Active Recreation	32.05%	22.01%	54.06%	7.34%	3.47%	10.81%	43.25%
Affordable/Workforce Housing							1.26%
Preserve Space for Future Public Facilities							9.05%
Additional Parking							4.44%

Therefore, we recommend that the town consider siting affordable housing elsewhere on the 251 South St. property, in accordance with its Affordable Housing Needs Assessment and Implementation Strategy.

Town Hall and Community Center Property

2. New Town Hall Parcel and Adjacent Parcel (251 and 235 South Street)

Parcels: 00071319, 00701320

Size: +/-3.01 ac.

Zoning: Village Infill Planning Area (VIP), Village Infill Overlay District (Green)

Current Land Use: 251–Former school building and accessory gym; Currently under construction for new town hall and community center;

Built Environment Context: Single-family homes

Topography: Relatively flat with significant drop in elevation bisecting the site; topography falls off toward water course at far eastern border of site



Source: Mecklenburg County, Polaris 3G

FINDINGS: Townhomes and mixed-income development could be appropriate here. Analysis suggests that 21 townhomes could be built on this site. Street frontage requirement could present challenges. Street or pedestrian way connecting Hillside Drive to Cathey Street would help facilitate maximizing affordable housing potential on this site. No rezoning required.

Additional Considerations:

- Village Infill Overlay District (Green): 32' maximum height permitted
- Alley access required for townhomes if garages included
- Frontage requirement on street or pedestrian way
- Open space requirements (10%, of which 5% must be park/public space)
- Potential connection between Hillside Drive and Cathey Street
- Topography and Post-Construction buffer surrounding water course

Development Process: Master Plan (DPO Section 14.6)

Consultants/Partners Required: Surveyor, Engineer, Builder/Developer, Owners of 235 South Street

