



**Planning Board
Minutes to the Meeting**

Glendel Stephenson Municipal Building
August 10, 2020
6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Kevin Brouwer, Keith Hoover, Lori Oakley, Kurt Pearson, Gale Pettiford, Vice Chairman Judy Taylor, Larry Teague, Chairman Edward Tulauskas, Thomas Vinson

Also Present: Ashley Ownbey, Planner; Cy Stober, Development Director; Chris Rollins, Assistant City Manager; Kirk Montgomery, IT Director

1. Call to Order

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

The Planning Board meeting was held virtually and livestreamed via YouTube. The video can be accessed through the following link:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCoL1RXdRDMzK98p53TMoqww>

2. Approval of May 11, 2020 Minutes

Gale Pettiford made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 11, 2020 meeting. Lori Oakley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (8-0).

3. Rezoning Request: B-2(CD) to R-6(CD) (“The Artisan at Mebane”) for +/-12.17-ac area of a +/- 50.89-ac property located at 4000 Arrowhead Boulevard (Alamance County GPIN 9824166394), by Mebane NC TH, LLC)

RZ 20-10

Staff presented an application/tax map from Mebane NC TH, LLC c/o Brett Basnight, 111 South Spring St, Spartanburg, SC 29306 requesting the conditional rezoning of +/- 12.17 acres of a +/- 50.89-acre property located at 4000 Arrowhead Boulevard from B-2(CD) (General Business, Conditional Zoning District) to R-6(CD) (Residential Conditional Zoning District) to allow “The Artisan at Mebane” an 85-unit townhome subdivision developed as a Residential Cluster Development. All units in this proposed development are to be for rent, not sale. The property is located in Alamance County within the City limits. Mebane NC TH, LLC, has the property under contract to purchase, contingent upon approval of the conditional rezoning.

The applicant proposed to provide site-specific plan onsite amenities & dedications including the following:

- The construction of all internal roads;
- The construction of 5’ sidewalks along all roads except for Roads C & D;



- The construction of an 8' gravel-surfaced privately-maintained walking trail internal to the development and connected to the City's publicly-maintained sidewalk along Arrowhead Boulevard; and
- The construction of a clubhouse and pool to exclusively serve development residents.

Requested waivers:

- A reduced municipal street right of way for Roads C & D to 35' and featuring no sidewalks, unless otherwise shown on the site plan;
- A minimum lot size of 1,900 s.f. for the proposed individual townhome lots;
- The UDO requires that this development provide 213 parking spaces total and the applicant is requesting to provide 195;
- The UDO requires a minimum lot size of 6,000 s.f. with an allowed 40% reduction to 3,600 s.f. and the applicant is requesting a minimum lot size of 1,900 s.f.;
- The UDO establishes a maximum lot coverage of 40% and the applicant is requesting to develop up to 55% of the lot area;
- The UDO requires front setbacks of 30' and the applicant is requesting that they be reduced to 25';
- The UDO requires corner side setbacks of 18' and the applicant is requesting that they be reduced to 10' minimum, with a minimum building separation of 20';
- The UDO requires rear setbacks of 25' and the applicant is requesting that they be reduced to 15'; and,
- The UDO requires a minimum lot width of 85' with a maximum reduction to 40' wide, and the applicant is requesting that they be reduced to 20'.

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) has reviewed the site plan and the applicant has revised the plan to reflect the comments.

Ashley Ownbey, Planner, provided a brief overview and PowerPoint of the request.

Paul Koonts, attorney with Oertel, Koonts & Oertel PLLC, 3493 Forestdale Dr, Suite 103, Burlington, NC, 27215, provided a brief overview of the rezoning request. He also introduced Beth Blackmon, P.E., with Timmons Group, 5410 Trinity Rd, Suite 102, Raleigh, NC 27607; Brett Basnight, with Longbranch Development, 111 South Spring St, Spartanburg, SC 29306; and, Charles Worsham, Senior Vice President of Development and Construction with Tanger Outlet Centers, 3200 Northline Avenue, Suite 360, Greensboro, NC 27408. During his presentation, Mr. Koonts showed members of the Planning Board pictures of a similar development by Longbranch Development while describing the proposed 85-unit townhome development.



Ashley Ownbey, Planner, shared additional slides reviewing the Planning staff's recommendation to approve the project. She also read aloud written comment from two Mebane residents submitted via email prior to the virtual meeting.

Deborah Greer
700 Applecross Drive
Mebane, NC 27302

To the members of the planning board, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present my comments. My name is Deborah Greer and I live at 700 Applecross Drive in the Arrowhead Greens Subdivision. We've owned this home for almost seven years. My concerns with the rezoning request have to do with the portion on the site map that appears to be the overflow parking for Tanger.

Every year during Thanksgiving holiday weekend or Black Friday, that overflow parking lot becomes necessary for the large volume of shoppers that come for holiday shopping at the outlet.

However, with the Arrowhead Greens community right across the street, we have become an overflow parking lot for shoppers as well. Depending on what Tanger establishes as their shopping hours, we begin to have people parking in our neighborhood late afternoon on Thanksgiving. Usually after the two vacant lots off Arrowhead Blvd have filled up with cars. Then it is non-stop with shoppers coming to park in Arrowhead Greens throughout the Thanksgiving holiday, Black Friday, and most of the day on Saturday. By Sunday morning it tends to taper off.

But when the people come and park in our neighborhood, they park in front of our homes, often with barely enough clearance to enter and exit our driveways safely. They park in front of our mailboxes, which delays or prevents the mail carrier from delivering mail on Friday and Saturday. We don't have sidewalks on both sides of the streets, so people are walking on our grass and in many instances are leaving their trash behind.

My neighbor at 702 Applecross Drive has repeatedly had people drive across his front lawn trying to exit from parking in the vacant lot located next to his home. He works very hard to have a nice yard, so we're all upset to see the damage left behind.

So the thing is, if the overflow parking lot goes away, I feel like the parking situation will become even worse for Arrowhead Greens. Where else will all the additional shoppers park?

I can't begin to explain our level of frustration with this. I believe, three years ago, the city, or maybe it was the police department, had placed a partial barrier at the Applecross Drive entrance and this helped considerably with the parking. But it was just the one time.



The overflow parking lot should stay and my hope is that Tanger, with the city's help, can find a solution for their customers to park outside of Arrowhead Greens.

I respectfully asked that the planning board take this request into consideration before making a final decision.

I do thank you for allowing me the opportunity to share my concerns and hope that you will share this with the Mebane City Council as well.

Sincerely,

Deborah Greer

Corey Trimpey
521 Applecross Drive
Mebane, NC 27302

My name is Corey Trimpey. I am a resident at 521 Applecross Dr in the Arrowhead Greens "AHG" neighborhood across the street from this proposed building plan.

I have been a resident of AHG since July 2015. Over the past 5 years I have seen the overflow lot full during the holiday shopping season. This is great for business at Tanger, but has caused challenges when the overflow lot has reached maximum capacity.

During Black Friday our neighborhood has seen heavy pass through traffic from Arrowhead Blvd to 8th St via Applecross Dr, minor property damage e.g. nonresidents damaging grass in homeowners yards with vehicles, and irregularly heavy parking along Applecross Dr.

If the overflow lot is removed and built upon with this job then I am requesting that Mebane PD be available to monitor Applecross Dr while within shopping season. Their purpose is to limit parking/traffic to increase safety for AHG residents including our children and reduce the possibility for property damage. This Mebane PD monitoring should be conducted each weekend starting Black Thursday/Friday through December 25. These weekends always have consumers utilizing that parking lot which is planned to be built upon.

Another proposal could be to purchase the lots across from this job on Applecross Dr to be made into parking lots



AHG streets are public, but they are not engineered for the type of heavy traffic or public parking as the Tanger parking lot is designed to accomplish.

Attached are two images of comments from the private AHG Facebook page. These images create the picture for the importance of governing our neighborhood with safety when the overflow lot is full and when there is a large volume of shoppers. These screenshots are what we experience when the lot is full and Tanger is busy.

I expect no positive outcomes for our neighborhood when the lot is no longer there and shoppers want to park. I expect your decision has already considered this challenge.

Sincerely,

Corey Trimpey

Text of attachments from Corey Trimpey's email:

November 29, 2019 Facebook post to private AHG Facebook page: *"Is our neighborhood now becoming the new Tanger Outlet parking lot? Why was the entrance not blocked the way it used too?"*

November 24, 2016 Facebook post to private AHG Facebook page: *"This evening at 6pm, the Mebane PD will be placing cones at the front entrance to our neighborhood. In an effort to protect our safety, these cones will prevent people from parking in our neighborhood for Black Friday and keep people from using our neighborhood to cut through to Tanger. Once Tanger parking lots are full, police officers will be stationed at the front of the neighborhood to monitor access to the neighborhood. Please use the back entrance until cones are removed and be sure to pass this message along to neighbors not on FB. Have a safe and Happy Thanksgiving!"*

Paul Koonts asked Charles Worsham with Tanger to help address the public comments regarding parking. He remarked that Tanger parking was one of the first things discussed with this project. Mr. Koonts stated that he believes Tanger is considering plans to help alleviate the parking situation.

Charles Worsham introduced himself and Jeff Johnson, on-site General Manager for the Tanger Outlets at 4000 Arrowhead Boulevard, Mebane, NC 27302. He recognized that one of the downsides of being a very successful retail center is the parking. Mr. Worsham clarified the use of the phrase "overflow parking" in the discussion, noting that the parking provided in the lot in



question was intended to serve a retail building that Tanger elected not to build with original construction. He stated that Tanger meets code and requirements and recognized that during the holiday season the excess parking does tend to fill up. Mr. Worsham remarked on Tanger's efforts to address parking needs during the holiday season, including the lease of parking from Cone Health, use of a shuttle, and a valet service option. He referenced cooperation between Tanger and the City of Mebane Police Department to try and prevent the parking that spills over and recognized that some customers are not cognizant of being a good neighbor and may park on residential streets. Mr. Worsham remarked that parking during the holiday season is a primary focus for Mr. Johnson, particularly the Black Friday weekend and the second Saturday in December. He stated those peaks do tend to lead to spillovers, and Tanger has gone to great efforts to try to mitigate those spillovers, as was previously described. Mr. Worsham asked Jeff Johnson to speak to the mitigation efforts.

Jeff Johnson remarked that every year Tanger looks at the parking challenge and talks with the Police Chief and Assistant Chief early on. He noted that having the police help once the overflow lot fills up has helped a tremendous amount. Mr. Johnson stated that the use of Cone Health parking has allowed for employees to park there, or be dropped off, and use the provided shuttle system. He stated he believes the biggest thing now is to push that options are available and that if the overflow parking is to go, Tanger still has plenty of space over at Cone Health. Mr. Johnson remarked that having the Mebane Police out with cones has contributed to use of parking at Cone Health and recognized that one of the residents of the nearby subdivision is the Police Chief and he keeps Tanger informed.

Paul Koonts recognized a note in an email inquiring if the Tanger site would meet all parking requirements. He stated that the site in question was always proposed as commercial, mixed-use and was never proposed for parking. Mr. Koonts remarked that this project was started pre-COVID, and he recalled conversation about a future parking deck across from Tanger or somewhere nearby. He stated if the parking deck happens, it happens, and he did not want to tie this potential project with Tanger.

Charles Worsham replied that the parking provided at Tanger is roughly four (4) per thousand (1,000), and may be a little above that, as far as parking ratio. He said this is seen across the board as Tanger develops throughout the country – a less parking-intensive construction. Mr. Worsham noted that it is difficult to mitigate the parking problems that occur four to five days out of the year and remarked that Tanger has found that at four per thousand, they operate efficiently and it is a trend within the industry, in retail environments, and typical requirements for Tanger tenants. He stated that the key thing Tanger can do is be the best neighbors they can be and manage the situation on heavy traffic days, especially during the holiday season. Mr. Worsham stated it does Tanger no good for people to not have a place to park and for Tanger not to be able



to manage turnover efficiently, as the last thing Tanger wants is a frustrated customer that does not come back a second time. He stated Tanger has thought about parking extensively, discussed it internally when first looking at this project and considering the sale of the land, and was able to get comfortable with it operationally and make it work. Mr. Worsham referenced Tanger's relationship with the City of Mebane and the Police Department for future management of the few peak days throughout the year.

Ashley Ownbey read from the approval letter for Tanger Outlets, dated October 12, 2007, confirming Mr. Worsham's previous reference to required parking of four parking spaces per every 1,000 square feet of gross leasable area.

Lori Oakley asked Ashley Ownbey if she had confirmed that by removing what has been called the "overflow" parking lot Tanger would be meeting the required four per 1,000.

Ashley Ownbey replied that she and Cy Stober, Development Director, were working on confirming the square footage of Tanger but encountered some difficulty with different records. She asked Mr. Stober to help address Ms. Oakley's question.

Cy Stober replied that the Planning Department does not have an exact figure now. He explained that Alamance County Tax Records has a low building square footage, possibly an underestimate, on the tax records available through the GIS website and he did not have the time to investigate additional records. Mr. Stober estimated the building as roughly 400,000 square feet, give or take 25,000 to 50,000 square feet, and the on-site parking – without the overflow lot – as 11.5 acres. He did not have the number of spaces in the parking lot.

Ashley Ownbey asked if Jeff Johnson might be able to speak to this question as well.

Charles Worsham responded that, if helpful, Tanger could share the survey that has the exact parking calculation. He believed an estimate of 1,100 parking spaces is correct and stated that Tanger looks at gross leasable area, so the estimate of overall building square footage of some 400,000 overstates it. Mr. Worsham stated that he did not know the gross leasable area off the top of his head and asked Jeff Johnson if it was around 350-something.

Jeff Johnson replied it was actually around 318,000.

Charles Worsham stated that Tanger may be in excess of 20-something parking stalls with the removal of the parking east of the creek. He stated the details could be provided as a follow-up to the hearing.



Jeff Johnson remarked that they had actually added a couple of spaces, so they would need to get the surveyed numbers adjusted.

Kurt Pearson asked if it was okay to ask a general question for Ashley Ownbey, to which she agreed. Mr. Pearson noted that the Planning Department recommends approval, the project has already been through TRC and the plan has been revised accordingly, but the applicant is asking for a lot of waivers. He asked if any of the waivers listed would cause any heartburn for the staff or any others. He emphasized there are a lot of waivers, with some being very substantial, and asked for a feel of how the staff went about getting comfortable with so many waivers and some very substantial waivers, such as the lot size reduction to 1,900 square feet. He noted that is a big difference and is just one example. Mr. Pearson asked for a feel of staff's approach and recognized Cy Stober may also address the question. He asked for an idea of how the waivers were discussed.

Cy Stober replied the dimensional waivers for townhomes are standard, such as what has been seen with Mebane Towne Center, Villages at Lake Michael, and Townes at Oakwood Square, in terms of the setbacks and lot size reductions. He stated the coverage is larger, certainly when compared to the Villages at Lake Michael, but is comparable to some of the townhome projects in the city, certainly the more recent projects. He explained that the road width reductions and right-of-way reductions were something staff worked very hard with the applicant on to identify a road width that would be reduced in size but also would accommodate the public services needed to serve those residents as taxpaying residents of Mebane. Mr. Stober recognized the road width reduction as a compromise from what was initially proposed, which was an alleyway approach, and the public service optimum of a wider road width. He noted the compromise allows Fire and EMS to access all of the lots from the main road as well as having smaller roads to the rear-loading units to still allow trash pickup. Mr. Stober stated that to his recollection those were the main waivers discussed with the applicant. He asked Kurt Pearson if there was anything in particular he had a question about or concerns.

Kurt Pearson replied he did not have concerns about particular waivers but noted there were quite a few, with some of the waivers being substantial. He stated he was interested in staff's perspective and in how the City Council would feel about the waivers.

Cy Stober responded that during the review process by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) there is always the optimal number of units an applicant desires and City of Mebane standards. He remarked that this is a high-density project unlike most seen in the city and staff tried to think outside of the box while also maintaining what the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) tries to accomplish. Mr. Stober noted the waivers associated with this project indicate a request from the applicant for relief from the stated intentions of the UDO.



Brett Basnight thanked the Planning Board and staff for considering the project. He noted that the plan shows a series of compromises City staff and the project's design team reached. Mr. Basnight described that each lot includes a 20-foot townhome with an attached garage, and the townhomes include kitchen and living space on the bottom floors and bedrooms on the second floor. He stated that providing value-oriented products is important to his team and drives the 20-foot townhome, with maximum square footage of 1,600. These aspects drive the waiver requests. Mr. Basnight stated that waivers also emerged because the units are rear-loading and staff wanted to see a larger public right-of-way for emergency vehicles to access units that front Arrowhead Boulevard. He noted that although there are many waiver requests, he thinks the end result will be a very attractive design aesthetic.

Kurt Pearson responded that he liked the rear-loading units and noted they appear in places nearby. He shifted the parking conversation from Tanger to the project, asking if the project would be providing two parking spaces per unit.

Brett Basnight responded that at a minimum, Mr. Pearson was correct. He stated there is one pull-in space, which is the garage, and a tandem space behind the garage. He noted the plan is also showing a tapered driveway strip so you could potentially fit two small cars or one SUV. At minimum the units will park two vehicles, and some units will accommodate enough parking for three vehicles.

Kurt Pearson stated that he had noticed the taper and remarked that one of the waivers is to provide 195 parking spaces instead of 213. He reviewed that at a minimum of two spaces per unit, there would be 170 parking spaces and inquired about available parking for guests. Mr. Pearson stated that he would not want to be in a situation where parking woes already exist at Tanger and new parking woes are created in this location, leading to parking on the street. He asked the applicant to address those concerns.

Beth Blackmon offered clarification, replying that with the parking calculation of 195 spaces only includes two spaces per unit – one in the garage and one in the driveway – plus the parking lot at the amenity center.

Kurt Pearson responded that the calculation explanation emphasizes the lack of parking available for guests within the development and asked if that was not a concern.

Brett Basnight responded that the calculation could be revised. He noted that Ms. Blackmon's description indicates the plan is actually showing more parking than what is included in the calculation because of the drive's taper.



Beth Blackmon replied that they did not account for the taper area, not knowing what type of cars residents would have. She noted the two spaces/unit plus amenity center parking is fairly standard and the taper does add extra parking. Ms. Blackmon stated that units able to be set back by 30 feet received extra driveway length, noting the waiver request for less setback is to fit the wider right-of-way worked out with City Engineering to change from a 20-foot alley to a 35-foot right-of-way.

Lori Oakley asked if Road A allows any on-street parking. She stated that since we are in the South, people do not always park in their garages and asked where the overflow and visitor parking would be located and if room existed on Road A for on-street parking.

Beth Blackmon clarified that all of the roads are the same pavement width, noting the right-of-way as the only thing that is different on Roads C and D. She stated the pavement width is 31-foot back-to-back. Ms. Blackmon noted that it comes back to whether Mebane allows on-street parking.

Cy Stober responded that the City does not regulate on-street parking unless requested by petition of the local residents.

Lori Oakley responded that it is good to know Roads C and D would be the same profile as other roads, noting a street profile was not included and one of her questions was if those roads were the same as Road A.

Beth Blackmon replied the only difference is sidewalk does not exist along all of Roads C and D and the right-of-way width is narrower.

Kurt Pearson asked if there would be a subdivision regulation to allow parking in the yard.

Brett Basnight responded that they would not allow parking in the yard. He noted that part of the program/amenity is to have staff on-site, seven days a week. Mr. Basnight stated a property manager would be on site to make sure yards are not left unsightly and yards would be managed through contract services provided by the property management team.

Kurt Pearson asked if anyone had anything else on the parking before moving on.

Charles Worsham responded that he pulled the Tanger numbers. Tanger's gross leasable area is 318,886 square feet, which at four per thousand would require 1,276 parking spaces. He stated that with the removal of the parking lot for the townhome project, Tanger will have 1,308 on-site parking spaces.



Kurt Pearson noted Tanger exceeds what is required and asked if anyone else had anything to add to the parking conversation.

Chairman Edward Tulauskas replied with concerns that individuals may straddle the curb or park vehicles over the sidewalk along Arrowhead Boulevard and asked how that would be prevented.

Beth Blackmon responded that a streetscape buffer is required there that would be landscaped. She stated there is room for someone to jump the curb and noted the sidewalk is in the right-of-way and a berm would be further back.

Chairman Edward Tulauskas replied that although parking there could not be eliminated, it could be deterred.

Kurt Pearson stated that over the last few years he has shared concerns with Planning Board and staff about the number of apartments in Mebane. He noted the project does not propose apartments, but the townhomes are rental units. He recognized that Larry Teague had asked prior to the meeting for an updated count and ratio of rentals. Mr. Pearson stated that the updated number received was 37% rental, which he has found for a long time to be really high. He stated he was not sure that was healthy. Mr. Pearson noted that Planning staff computed the numbers before and after the development, and the ratio did not change. He proposed for staff and City Council to consider what is enough rental units and at what percentage does the ratio of rental-to-own become unhealthy. Mr. Pearson reflected that as a former practicing planner he believes Mebane has stepped over the boundary. He expressed concern of the city becoming a rental haven, noting his comment has little to do with the proposed development and that he liked the townhome design. He stated he wanted to bring up the discussion again and remarked Mebane has stepped over the line with the percentage of rentals in the city.

Larry Teague seconded Mr. Pearson's comments.

Kurt Pearson suggested the Planning Board and staff sit down for a discussion. He recalled during a previous review of the UDO, the City compared itself to peers such as Knightdale and Gastonia and was off the charts with the number of apartments. Since that review, other apartments have been approved. Mr. Pearson reiterated his concern and asked for further discussion with staff to get a better idea of what is enough.

Cy Stober replied that Mr. Pearson's questions can be reviewed by the Planning Department, which will be fully staffed by the end of August. He remarked the two newest planners have background with affordable housing, which is not exactly the same topic Mr. Pearson brings up



but the rental-ownership discussion does interplay with affordability. Mr. Stober stated the Planning Department could do more research and return to the Planning Board for a more robust discussion, perhaps in a separate work session. He stated that to address staff findings an amendment to the Comprehensive Land Development Plan or a separate planning document adopted by the City may be required. Mr. Stober remarked the study should go hand-in-hand with current UDO revisions.

Kurt Pearson clarified that adding 85 rental units to the specific location with the townhome design is not something he is leaning toward voting against because it is so different. He stated his appreciation for setting up a discussion with staff.

Charles Worsham responded that Tanger has been looking to develop the property for some time and they wanted to make sure they had the right fit and product. He remarked that the uniqueness of this project was attractive to Tanger along with the amenities, partnering with a national builder, and seeing similar developments to what is being proposed.

Lori Oakley commented that seeing townhomes as rental units did strike her as odd, especially given the units exist on individual lots. She noted her appreciation of the neo-traditional planning design and having the lots front Arrowhead. She commented that the buffer appears to encroach into Lot 1A, and Lots 1A and 82A-85A do not appear to have front yards.

Beth Blackmon responded that was correct and the landscaping would have gaps for sidewalk and access in and out. She noted that in reverse, the other side comes out and there is parking.

Lori Oakley questioned why there was not a request for an additional waiver to give those lots a front yard.

Beth Blackmon noted that Lot 1A is one of the smaller lots in order to accommodate a larger right-of-way for Roads C and D. She noted no discussion of reducing the buffer.

Lori Oakley noted that the streetscape buffer also goes to the front of the townhomes for Lots 82A-85A.

Beth Blackmon responded that it may be possible to have the same number of plantings typically required but in a different arrangement, with some plantings pushed together and gaps for sidewalk.

Lori Oakley inquired about a gap in sidewalk to the north of Road A. She asked it that was missing due to topography and the floodplain.



Beth Blackmon replied it was a constructability issue with the right-of-way width crossing an existing culvert.

Lori Oakley asked if permeable pavers might be a possibility as she foresees individuals living on the western side of the property wanting to stay on the northern side of Road A to travel to the amenity center.

Cy Stober asked Ms. Oakley if she is asking for the trail to be looped on the north side of Road A.

Lori Oakley responded that she was curious if anything could fit on that side.

Brett Basnight replied that they could look into the sidewalk gap and suggested a possible crosswalk between Lots 43 and 44.

Lori Oakley advised to consider if anything will work on the northern side and if nothing works then add the suggested crosswalk.

Lori Oakley noted a typo on Sheet 2.0, with the typical lot layout still identifying an alley. She also commented that Sheet 5.0 still has Roads C and D depicted as a private right-of-way. Ms. Oakley then asked about the location of cluster mailboxes.

Brett Basnight replied those would be placed under direction from the U.S. Postal Service.

Cy Stober stated staff is silent on the placement of the mailboxes given direction from the local postmaster that the City has no jurisdictional authority as to where mailboxes are located.

Lori Oakley responded she has had different experiences with local postmasters and remarked that some mailbox clusters are poorly located.

Larry Teague commented that flooding is already occurring on the south side of the Interstate and asked the applicant how they are ensuring the new development does not contribute additional water.

Beth Blackmon replied a study and report would be completed with the construction drawings. She remarked the site was initially designed for commercial use, which would have been more impervious than what is currently proposed. Ms. Blackmon stated the existing stormwater ponds were designed to handle the more impervious, commercial site design.



Larry Teague asked Ms. Blackmon if she felt a need to make any improvements would not exist.

Beth Blackmon responded there should not be a need for improvements if the stormwater ponds are functioning as they should. She stated more studies would determine if improvements are necessary.

Larry Teague stated flooding was occurring and remarked water from the site flows into the drinking water for Chapel Hill and Pittsboro.

Cy Stober asked Ashley Ownbey to read an email from the City's engineering firm.

Ashley Ownbey read from an email that the existing detention pond will require significant work in order to be considered acceptable. The pond was built for erosion control and has not been converted to a stormwater pond. If the project moves forward, a conversion is required and the pond will need to be certified and as-builts provided to confirm compliance.

Chairman Edward Tulauskas asked for any other comments or questions.

Thomas Vinson asked for a response from staff regarding the list of waivers.

Cy Stober responded staff negotiated the waivers with the applicant and, as stated before, the result is a compromised vision. He commented this is a new type of project for Mebane and the waivers generally reflect the higher density of the development. Staff considered surrounding land uses, the proximity to the Interstate and Arrowhead Boulevard, and reviewed consistency needs in *Mebane By Design*. Mr. Stober commented staff was satisfied that even with the waivers, the applicant met the intentions of the City's adopted plans and was not proposing anything inconsistent with surrounding land uses.

Kurt Pearson made a motion to approve the R-6 conditional zoning as presented and a 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* and the request is for a property within the City's G-4 Secondary Growth Area and is "...generally residential and commercial in nature..." (Mebane CLP, p.66).

Lori Oakley seconded the motion, which passed with a split vote.

Cy Stober asked Chairman Edward Tulauskas for a roll call vote due to the virtual nature of the meeting. Chairman Edward Tulauskas called for a roll call vote. Mr. Teague and Ms. Pettiford,



nays. Vice Chairman Taylor, Mr. Pearson, Ms. Oakley, Mr. Brouwer, Mr. Vinson, and Mr. Hoover, ayes. The motion passed with a 6-2 vote.

Chairman Edward Tulauskas stated the request will go to City Council on Monday, September 14.

4. New Business

Ashley Ownbey provided a brief update on the Lowes Boulevard Corridor Plan and invited the members of the Planning Board to participate in the planning effort.

Kurt Pearson thanked Cy Stober for offering to facilitate a discussion with the Planning Board about the number of rentals in Mebane. He stated his interest in scheduling the discussion quickly so that it can occur before the Planning Board receives future requests for multifamily development.

Cy Stober thanked Ashley Ownbey for her preparation and presentation to the Planning Board and asked Ms. Ownbey to briefly introduce herself.

Larry Teague thanked the Planning Board for the questions and concerns discussed during the meeting and remarked on growth in Mebane and the continued need for careful consideration of requests by the Planning Board.

Cy Stober responded that although delayed, the widening project on Mebane Oaks Road is expected to begin soon.

5. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.