



The Planning Board meeting was held at the Glendel Stephenson Municipal Building located at 106 E. Washington Street, Mebane, NC 27302 and livestreamed via YouTube. The video can be accessed through the following link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BW7si2QIIdU>.

**Members Present:**

Edward Tulauskas, Chair  
David Scott  
Gale Pettiford  
Kurt Pearson  
Susan Semonite  
William Chapman

**Members Absent:**

Colin Cannell  
Judy Taylor, Vice Chair  
Keith Hoover

**City Staff Present:**

Ashley Ownbey, Development Director  
Briana Perkins, City Planner  
Chad Cross, IT Specialist

**1. Call to Order**

At 6:30 p.m. Chair Tulauskas called the meeting to order.

**2. Approval of March 11, 2024, Meeting Minutes**

David Scott made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Kurt Pearson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**3. Request to rezone the +/- 2.16-acre property located at 1233 S. Third Street (GPIN 9814474216), from R-20 to R-12 by Jenny W. Whitt of Whitt Real Estate, LLC.**

Jenny W. Whitt of Whitt Real Estate, LLC is requesting approval to rezone one parcel, totaling +/- 2.16 acres and located at 1233 S. Third Street (GPIN: 9814474216), from R-20 to R-12. The property is located in the Mebane City Limits in Alamance County and includes frontages on S. Third Street and Skyview Drive. The surrounding zoning in the area includes R-12, Residential District, and R-20, Residential District. Properties across S. Third Street are zoned R-6 (CD), Residential Conditional District, and B-2, General Business District. Surrounding land uses are largely single-family residential. A multi-family development and post office are located on the other side of S. Third Street.

The staff report is provided in the meeting agenda packet available [here](#).

Briana Perkins provided a more detailed overview and PowerPoint presentation of the request.

Jenny W. Whitt of Whitt Real Estate, LLC, owner of 1233 S. Third Street, provided some additional information about plans to subdivide the property.



David Scott asked Ms. Whitt what the subdivision would look like with the R-12 zoning as opposed to the current R-20 zoning. Ms. Whitt showed a sketch of a subdivision of six lots with three lots having frontage on S. Third Street, and three lots having frontage on Skyview Drive.

William Chapman asked if Ms. Whitt had an idea of what size homes would be on the lots. Ms. Whitt answered that she did not have that information now and was going through the rezoning process first. She stated the property was not part of the Indian Head Subdivision, which has certain standards, so the homes would only have to adhere to the standards set by the City.

Susan Semonite asked if there was only driveway access from S. Third Street. Ms. Whitt replied that there would be driveway access for lots 1, 2, and 3 from S. Third Street and lots 4, 5, and 6 would have driveways on Skyview Drive. Susan Semonite asked to confirm it would be regular driveways for each property. Ms. Whitt replied that they would be standard driveways. She also provided that each lot would be about 0.36 acres each after subdividing.

Susan Semonite commented that she had seen the property listed for sale. Ms. Whitt replied that the property is listed for sale and that if she could sell it as is, then she would. If not, she would move forward with subdividing the property.

Chairman Tulauskas asked how many lots could be subdivided with the current R-20 zoning. Ms. Whitt replied that four lots are possible with the R-20 zoning and the R-12 zoning would create two additional lots.

Kurt Pearson asked if the applicant was the one purchasing the property. Ms. Whitt replied that she currently owns the lot. Kurt Pearson also asked if there was a proposal provided to the City of what the lots would look like developed. Ashley Ownbey replied that staff had confirmed a subdivision with six lots would meet lot area and lot width requirements of the R-12 zoning district. She also said that the City does not review single-family driveways outside of the connection to the right-of-way. Kurt Pearson asked if the lots in the back would be like flag lots. Ashley Ownbey replied there would be no flag lots since there was direct access to both S. Third Street and Skyview Drive.

Mary Russo, 110 Dawn Court, asked why the zoning was R-20 and was also concerned with clear cutting the land, density, traffic, and noise.

Faye Saunders, 1233 Skyview Drive, was concerned with water runoff after the land was cleared since there was already an issue. Kurt Pearson replied that a concern of water runoff would be considered during the building process and would not be a factor in rezoning the property.

Kim Graham, 1228 Skyview Drive, commented that when she had moved to the neighborhood about 20 years ago the realtors informed her that the lot was not buildable due to the water. She



expressed concerns about the water runoff. Ashley Ownbey replied that Ms. Whitt had brought a similar concern to the attention of the City regarding a drainpipe that appears to not be working properly. Ashley Ownbey also stated that correcting the drainage issues would be required to develop the property. Kim Graham also asked if the City would consider speed bumps if the property was developed to improve safety on Skyview Drive. Kurt Pearson replied that speed bumps would not be considered as part of the rezoning request, and that the neighbors could always approach the City about traffic concerns. Chairman Tulauskas commented that if the property was developed, the required improvements may help the situation with the water runoff.

James Strickland, 1229 S. Third Street, was under the impression that the property did not have full access on S. Third Street and asked if additional land was acquired. Ms. Whitt replied that she had recently purchased more land along S. Third Street to have full frontage on S. Third Street. James Strickland asked if all of the houses would be facing S. Third Street. Ms. Whitt replied that three houses would be facing S. Third Street, and the other three houses would face Skyview Drive.

Jose Santibanez, 5914 Lebanon Road, commented that he did think development would help the property. Jose Santibanez commented that he was also working on rezoning his property.

Jenny Whitt said she would be willing to meet with the neighbors after the meeting to discuss the drainage issues. She indicated she had been in conversation with the City Engineer, Franz Holt, about how to remedy the drainage issue before any new development.

Mary Russo, 110 Dawn Court, asked again why the property was zoned R-20 to begin with. Kurt Pearson replied that the whole area may have started as R-20 and had since changed to R-12 with the subdivision. Mary Russo asked what the R-20 zoning could provide for the property currently. Kurt Pearson replied that it was about the same requirements as R-12 with mainly a difference in the minimum lot size. Susan Semonite commented that both zoning districts are residential, and it was not likely a change to commercial zoning.

James Strickland, 1229 S. Third Street, commented that when the Indian Head Subdivision was originally proposed that the parcel in question could not be purchased by the developer and was left with the R-20 zoning. He also provided that in his research, he had found R-12 very similar to R-20.

Susan Semonite made a motion to approve the request as follows:

*Motion to approve the R-12 zoning as presented.*

*Motion to find that the application is consistent with the objectives and goals in the City's 2017 Comprehensive Land Development Plan Mebane By Design. Specifically, the request:*

- *Is for a property within the City's G-4 Secondary Growth Area and is generally residential in nature (Mebane CLP, p. 66).*



David Scott seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chairman Tulauskas noted that the request will go to the City Council on May 6, 2024, at 6:00 p.m.

#### **4. Review of Amended Rules of Procedure**

Ashley Ownbey provided an overview of the amended Rules of Procedure provided in the meeting agenda packet available [here](#).

Kurt Pearson asked to clarify that a quorum is the majority of the Board's actual membership as described in the section "Meetings." Ashley Ownbey replied that a quorum is currently five, which is a majority of the board's current membership. Five members must be present for the Planning Board to take action on an item. A motion passes with a majority of those present at the meeting. If five members are present, three votes are needed to pass a motion.

Ashley Ownbey asked the Board since the agenda format had changed if the Board would still like to have City Council Actions Update as an agenda item. She said that the City's Public Information Officer summarizes the City Council meetings and that could be emailed to the Board instead of an update during the meeting. Alternatively, she could continue with the update during the meetings. Kurt Pearson replied that he would like to keep the City Council Actions Update at the top of the agenda for meetings. Other board members agreed.

Ashley Ownbey asked the Board about including information for the general public on the Order of Business. Susan Semonite suggested information could be placed at the bottom of the agenda for the public to reference. Chairman Tulauskas agreed that it should be somewhere on the agenda even if it is printed on the back.

Kurt Pearson asked if any member of the Board could put forward a motion to table an item. Ashley Ownbey replied that yes, any member can move to table an item. She said that the State has some restrictions on how long the Planning Board can table an item, which is 30 days, unless the applicant agrees to a different timeline.

Ashley Ownbey provided the Board with an update on recent action by the City Council. She said that the Bowman Road Townhomes was approved with a split vote of 4-1 and included an additional condition of partitions being added between the units in the rear yards. She indicated that there were some questions from the City Council about the setback requirements for townhomes and Planning staff would be researching the item and possibly bringing forward revisions with the third phase of comprehensive updates to the Mebane Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Lastly, Ashley Ownbey said that the Tractor Supply rezoning was tabled until the City Council's June meeting. She said that City Council questioned the developer's progress on securing land for the



road extension and had asked the developer to continue to discuss the matter with the adjoining property owner.

Kurt Pearson asked if the applicant made it seem like he had tried to purchase the land. Susan Semonite said she had previously asked the question if the land was buildable, and the applicant had said the land was buildable. She said that her understanding was that the applicant and landowner had just not come to an agreement.

David Scott commented that he had also asked in the previous meeting if the applicant was given a price. He said that the applicant did not say during the Planning Board meeting, and after speaking with him outside of the meeting, the applicant had said a price was never given. Kurt Pearson asked if the applicant had even asked for a price. David Scott replied that according to the applicant, he had asked for a price.

Ashley Ownbey said that there was not a particular number given for the price of the land, and there had been some calculations done to estimate the land's value by acre. David Scott commented that knowing the landowner from past development deals, a price was probably not provided.

#### **5. Announcements**

Ashley Ownbey reported that there was one seat on the Board up for appointment, Gale Pettiford's seat representing one of the Alamance County ETJ positions. Applications for the position are due to Alamance County by Friday, May 24, 2024.

David Scott asked if it was just the one seat up for appointment. Ashley Ownbey replied that it was only one seat this year and then four seats next year.

Kurt Pearson said for the record that he would be in support of Gale Pettiford being reappointed to the Planning Board. Susan Semonite commented that she agreed, saying that she thought Gale Pettiford was an outstanding member.

Kurt Pearson asked if the appointment recommendation would be at the next City Council meeting. Ashley Ownbey replied that the applications are due May 24, and the City Council would make their recommendation at their regular meeting on June 3. The Alamance County Board of Commissioners will make the final appointment.

#### **6. Adjournment**

Chair Tulauskas adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:17 p.m.