



**Planning Board
Minutes to the Meeting**

Glendel Stephenson Municipal Building
November 9, 2020
6:30 p.m.

The Planning Board meeting was held virtually, with a small number of staff and members of the public attending in person and livestreamed via YouTube. The video can be accessed through the following link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ci2UakUtAD8>

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

Members Present at City Hall: Thomas Vinson

Also Present at City Hall: Ashley Ownbey, Planner; Audrey Vogel, Planner; Cy Stober, Development Director; Kirk Montgomery, IT Director

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of August 10, 2020 Minutes

Lori Oakley made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 10, 2020 meeting. Judy Taylor seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Introduction of Audrey Vogel, City Planner

Cy Stober introduced Audrey Vogel to the Board.

4. City Council Actions Update

Cy Stober Provided an update on recent City Council actions which was requested by the Board during the August Planning Board Meeting. The update consisted of Tupelo Junction, the Artisan, and Bradford Academy.

5. Mebane Housing Supply Report

Planners Audrey Vogel and Ashely Ownbey provided an overview of the Mebane Housing Supply Report completed by planning staff at the request of the Planning Board and presented key findings from the report.



Cy Stober indicated that the report would be uploaded to the Planning page on the City’s website after revisions are complete. He shared with the Board that Staff will be adding data from the year 2000.

Kurt Pearson suggested further discussion of the report at the next meeting, giving the Board more time to digest the information presented in the report.

A member of the public, Aimee Tattersall, commented on road capacity in relation to new homes being built near the Tanger Outlets and on Lebanon Road.

Kurt Pearson commented on the multifamily housing data in the report, indicating that in his opinion over 30% multifamily is too high in comparison to nearby peers, Graham and Hillsborough. This is something he wants to keep an eye on, understanding that the share is expected to decrease.

Larry Teague echo Mr. Pearson’s comments, adding that it is a concern for traffic and schools and the Board will appreciate more time to review the information to provided recommendations to city council.

6. Request to Adopt Buckhorn Area Plan and Amend Mebane Comprehensive Land Development Plan by Mebane Planning Department

Cy Stober provided a brief introduction to the Buckhorn Area Plan, noting that a dedicated public meeting will be held Tuesday, November 10, at 6 p.m. on Zoom to discuss it in detail– including an open Question and Answer session.

Anna Hawryluk, Environmental Programs Coordinator at the Piedmont Triad Regional Council, PowerPoint of the proposed Buckhorn Small Area Plan. Craig Benedict, Orange County Planning and Inspections Director, also participated in the presentation of the plan, detailing the partnership of Orange County with Mebane for this area.

The Buckhorn Economic Development District (BEDD) was dedicated as a development district by the City of Mebane and Orange County in 2011 to include a variety of manufacturing, wholesale, distribution, retail and service uses. The existing BEDD is located in the western portion of Orange County just off Interstate 85/40 Exit 157, and includes approximately 900 acres of developable land. It is featured in the City’s Comprehensive Land Development Plan (CLP) Mebane By Design as G-2 Industrial (V) Primary Growth Area and recommended to “Maximize non-residential use and discourage further single family developments. Multi-family or workforce housing in close proximity to the current and future industrial land uses will be encouraged to minimize commuting concerns, especially traffic congestion. Encourage low water user and incentivize the employment of local residents at any new industries developed in this area.”



In December 2019, the Mebane City Council, at the recommendation of the Planning Board, annexed and zoned two properties to M-2 (“Light Manufacturing”) that lay outside but adjacent to the CLP’s geographic scope, with the rationale that the action was consistent with the goals and objections of the CLP. Per North Carolina General Statutes, the City has an obligation to revise its adopted plans to reflect Council actions. This study expands the boundaries of the original BEDD in order to utilize the land most suitable for economic development, especially reasonable or potential access to infrastructure, including these two newly-annexed properties. If acted upon by the City, the study area and the plan’s recommendations will be integrated into an amended CLP to revise its Future Growth Area and G-2 Industrial (V) Primary Growth Area, “Part of BEDD and North of US-70.”

This item is subject to public comment and feedback, including by the Planning Board.

No direct impacts financial impacts are identified. The municipal utilities have already been extended to the area through a Utility Service Agreement between the City and Orange County. Use of these services will generate revenue to serve properties annexed into the City, including the maintenance of utility lines.

Following the presentation, Anna Hawryluk, Craig Benedict and Cy Stober took questions and comments from the Planning Board and members of the public.

Kurt Pearson asked of there has been any public input that has been directed to Orange County. Craig Benedict indicated that it will be occurring at the meeting scheduled for the following night (11/10/2020) and Anna Hawryluk added that a letter was sent to all properties owners within the study area, noting that there is an online comment box that was shared in the letter.

Kurt Pearson asked about the potential to increase residential density in the rural residential areas should water and sewer be extended. Craig Benedict clarified that the water and sewer infrastructure has been intended for economic development, and the County is not interested in single-family development, as indicated in the Orange County Land Use Plan. Orange County is behind on their non-residential tax base, and the county does not want to create any conflicts between residential and non-residential uses with the plan. Cy Stober added that staff is not proposing to change the land use in Primary Growth Area 5, and the intention is for economic development and perhaps higher density residential to support the economic development.

Craig Woodland, 850 Long Leaf Pine Pl, asked about internet and telecom access. Anna Hawryluk responded that is was not part of the parcel analysis. Cy Stober noted that this a valid matter and while the study only investigated public utilities, he recognized the importance of private utilities as well. Craig Benedict added that Orange County is the early phases of implementing a broadband expansion plan, and the County has a fiber conduit between Hillsborough and Efland.



Kurt Pearson noted in response to a comment from Patricia O'Connor in the Zoom chat box about Preston Loop, that this is a plan to guide development, although any future development would still need to go through the public input and approval process. Cy Stober added any project to receive municipal services within Mebane's statutory limits for annexation would be required by City policy to be annexed into Mebane, which requires two public hearings – a public hearing for annexation, and a public hearing for zoning. Cy shared some details about public notification and reiterated that the Buckhorn Area Plan is a planning document to provide guidance for findings for future requests.

Craig Benedict commented on Preston Loop, indicating that the area has been targeted for economic development since the 90's and the single family residential that exists there was the product of a timing issue. Mr. Benedict noted that the plan will help avoid future conflicts between residential and non-residential uses. Kurt Pearson responded that those people that live there now cannot be overlooked. Cy Stober reiterated that no action by the City will be taken until projects come to the City.

Several members of the public shared comments and asked questions.

Aimee Tattersall, 1133 Squires Road, commented that Squires Road is also under stress from development, which is a residential area that's existed since the 1950's, in addition to homes along West Ten Road that have been there for a long time. She also expressed concerns that work force housing will need to be available for the types of jobs expected in the economic development area.

Beth Bronson, 1221 Buckhorn Rd, asked for clarification on telecommunication expansion and requested more information be shared on the timeline.

Janine Zanin, 4601 Timberwood Trl, commented that Orange County is doing work without giving its residents an opportunity to share input before passing the responsibility to Mebane to make a decision on something at Orange County residents do not agree with. She noted that the plan is more than just providing utilities and it will pave the way for rezoning for industrial uses. She described that assets in the area such as family farms, historic places, wetlands, wildlife. She noted that the county invested in a middle school and soccer complex in the Study Area, and many of the students that go to school there are experiencing poverty. She expressed disappointment in Orange County leadership.

Debra Elmore, 1015 Buckhorn Rd, expressed concern over the development surrounding herself and rural residential neighbors, specifically about traffic and how it is burdensome to residents of the area and will only continue to get worse. She noted that her family has lived in this rural area since the 1930's.



Jimmy Riley, 6508 E Washington St, asked for confirmation that the Plan will not impact the business that already exist in the study area. Cy Stober confirmed that the Plan will not directly impact any property owners or their ability to use their land as they have been.

Carolyn Wilson, 1727 Cedar Creek Dr, asked how the adoption of the Plan would impact the land that her family owns on Ben Wilson Road. Cy Stober indicated that the property is already in the jurisdiction of the Mebane CLP, in addition the property would likely be identified as a top-tier parcel for economic development in the Buckhorn Area Plan.

Audrey Vogel read aloud the following written comment received via email:

Alan, Robin, Jay, Joannie and Sammy Wilson, 101 Sam Snead Dr

08/03/2020

To Whom it may concern,

Recently we have been made aware of pressure from Orange county insisting the city of Mebane to reject the proposed project on our land in favor of Orange county's desired industrial plan. We are asking for Mebane leadership to support and protect our interest as citizens and taxpayers against the unrealistic expectations of orange county. The proposed use for our property is much more in line with current zoning and is contiguous with adjoining properties as opposed to the much more invasive and environmentally damaging use proposed by orange county for industrial purposes. We are at a loss of understanding regarding this threat that has come against us as Mebane recently approved another residential subdivision further into Orange county in close vicinity to our land.

Our feelings are that the City of Mebane is being strong armed by Orange county to conform to their future wishes, therefore effecting our family and potentially putting us at the mercy of adjoining property owners as well. Our land encompasses a creek, numerous setbacks and easements and does not appear highly suitable for mass industrial usage unless tied to adjoining properties. Should adjoining property owners refuse to sell or have un-realistic pricing opinions, our financial well being and income from our property then becomes totally reliant on those adjoining property owners willingness to conform or to come to the terms of a potential end user. Some of us have already procured other properties based on the positive hopes and outlooks of this sale, deposits have been made and will be lost to us if the deal is denied on this basis. Our sincere hopes are that we can rely on the leadership of the City of Mebane to uphold our best interest as citizens and protect us from these implications.

Kurt Pearson made a motion to approve the Buckhorn Area Plan and amend the CLP accordingly. Kevin Brouwer seconded the motion. Per a roll call vote, the motion carried (5-3).



7. Request to Establish M-2 (CD) Zoning on a +/-47.5-Acre Parcel (PIN 9834436528) at 6016 West Ten Road Located Outside of the Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) in Orange County by Al Neyer

Staff presented an application from Al Neyer, 4509 Creedmoor Rd., Suite 201, Raleigh, Nc 27612 requesting to establish M-2 (Light Manufacturing) zoning on +/-46.38 Acres (1 Parcels) located outside of the Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) in Orange County at 6016 West Ten Road, with a master plan that shows the highest potential intensity of use on the property, with a condition allowing for layout and design flexibility. The proposed property is actively being subdivided into a +/-24.77-ac and a +/-21.56-ac parcel through a process exempt from local standards, per NC General Statutes. The property is currently zoned Orange County's R-1 (Rural Residential). The property lies outside the geographic scope of the City's adopted Comprehensive Land Development Plan (CLP) Mebane By Design. The property lies outside the City of Mebane's ETJ and will require annexation for action to be taken by the City Council.

Cy Stober, Development Director, provided a brief overview and PowerPoint of the request.

Tim Summerville, Engineer with STEWART, 101 West Main St, Durham, NC 27701, provided an overview of the request, displaying a colorful visual of the master plan, and then asked the Board if there were any questions.

Larry Teague asked where would your proposed Buckhorn Road entrance be? And is that northwest corner where the used car lot is now? Tim Summerville answered, that is correct, that is where the used car lot is, and the entrance would be to the south of that off of Buckhorn.

Audrey Vogel invited the members of the public attending on the Zoom Webinar to ask questions and share comments concerning this request.

Patricia O'Connor, 1011 Squires Rd, asked about the use of the proposed warehouse buildings and commented that the process of having the Board vote on the project prior to public meeting is backwards. Tim Summerville answered her questions. Cy Stober responded that the public meeting on Tuesday, Nov 10th is for the Buckhorn Area Plan.

Aimee Tattersall, 1133 Squires Road, commented on a request for the buffer on the east side be increased from to 100 ft remarking that it would make a big in terms of noise for the adjacent neighbors.

Aimee Tattersall asked if any of the Planning Board members lived in this area, or in orange county, and have all the members of the board walked the property. Keith Hoover responded that he does live and Orange County, and to the best of his knowledge none of the Planning Board members have walked the property. Lori Oakley indicated that she also lives in Orange County and is very familiar with the Buckhorn Road Area. Larry Teague replied that he is familiar with the area as well.



Aimee Tattersall asked questions about potential traffic concerns, as well as the ponds and stream buffer on the property. Tim Summerville responded to her questions about the buffering and stream. Cy Stober responded that the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is currently being conducted and the results have not yet been provided to staff. He stated that the City requires the developer to provide turn lanes for projects that are expected to create more than 50 trips per day.

Kurt Pearson clarified that the Planning Board serves as a recommendation body, and do not have the power or role of approving these projects. There will be more opportunities for public input before City Council, which has the authority to approve or deny. He also asked when the TIA would be available, which Tim Summerville answered that the results of the TIA are a week or two away. Kurt remarked that it would behoove the Board to continue without knowing the findings of the TIA, and asked Cy Stober about tabling the issue until all the information is received. Cy Stober indicated that if the Board would like a full recommendation from staff, they would need the results of the TIA to complete their findings of fact.

Judy Taylor commented that she would like to see the TIA as well as the comments from the public and City Council on the Buckhorn Area Plan because the property is located within that study area. Keith Hoover agreed.

Justin Parker, representing the applicant, indicated that they understood and were agreeable to the Board's intent to table the discussion of the project until the TIA is complete. He also offered to meet with the public and Planning Board members at the site.

Lori Oakley raised questions about the trailer storage shown on the plans, discussing impervious surface coverage and steep slopes, in addition to access to both parcels and buffer encroachments.

Fiona Johan, 5016 Johan Lane, asked several questions about the creek runs through neighbors' properties, expressing concern about overflow during heavy rain. These concerns were echoed by her neighbors in the zoom chat box. Ms. Johan also asked about the 150 ft max building height, and noise and light pollution. Tim Summerville responded to her questions. Justin Parker offered to discuss further at a site visit.

Audrey Vogel read aloud the following email received from both Mike Resetar, 5009 Johann Lane, and Mark Fredericks, 5001 Johann Lane:

We are not against the planned change or the proposed usage of the land, but we currently have a water problem with drainage from the property in question already. We would ask that any building and parking required would be sure to address this rainwater runoff in their plans. We would like some type of collection or at least proper drainage to insure we do not get all the runoff water ending up in our backyard.



We would also like you to consider putting a sound and/or privacy fence along the entire property.

Audrey Vogel read aloud the following email received from David "Tony" Squires, 1100 Winchester Way:

My name is Tony Squires and I own the property to the East of the proposed West Ten Road Rezoning Request. In reading the recommendations from Tom Teneyck, Orange County Land Use Planner, in memorandum to Craig Benedict dated October 9, 2020, I agree that the buffers should be 100 ft and not the proposed 70ft as shown on the site plan.

It is my understanding that the final use/user of the property has not been identified. Larger buffers zones would help mitigate damages to neighboring landowners. Please have this comment added to the readings for tonight's meeting.

Best Regards,

David "Tony" Squires

Craig Woodland, 850 Long Leaf Pine Pl, commented on the low impact nature of the proposed use other than trucks coming and going and that it supports economic development.

Kurt Pearson made a motion, seconded by Gale Pettiford, to table their recommendation until the December 14th Planning Board Meeting. Per a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

8. Request to rezone six parcels (PIN 9814920726, 9814823848, 9814727217, 9814824291, 9814921385, 9824020553) from R-20 and B-2 to R-6 (CD) for a Planned Unit Development on +/- 59.845-Acres Located at 1413 Mebane Oaks Rd and at the ends of Longleaf Pines Pl and Broadwood Acres Rd by Diamondback Investment Group, LLC

Diamondback Investment Group, LLC, is requesting approval to conditionally rezone six (6) properties totaling +/- 59.85 acres located at 1413 Mebane Oaks Road and the ends of Longleaf Pine Place and Broadwood Acres Road from R-20 (Residential District) and B-2 (General Business District) to R-6(CD) (Residential Conditional Zoning District) to allow for a Planned Unit Development of 194 townhomes, 62 single-family homes, and +/- 2.1 acres of retail uses. The property is located in Alamance County outside of the City limits. Diamondback Investment Group, LLC, has the property under contract to purchase, contingent upon approval of the conditional rezoning.

Requested Waivers

- The UDO requires front setbacks of 30', and the applicant is requesting they be reduced to 20' for the townhome lots.



- The UDO requires side setbacks of 10' for the single-family lots, and the applicant is requesting a minimum side setback of 5'.
- The UDO requires a minimum lot width of 85', and the applicant is requesting a minimum lot width of 26' for the townhome lots and 45' for the single-family lots.
- The UDO allows for a minimum lot size reduction in R-6 PUDs from 6,000 s.f. to 3,600 s.f., and the applicant is requesting a minimum lot size of 2,600 s.f. for the townhome lots.
- The UDO requires a maximum lot coverage of 40%, and the applicant is requesting a maximum lot coverage of 60% for the townhome lots.
- The UDO requires no more than 30% of front yards be improved for off-street parking and drives in small lot residential subdivisions, and the applicant is requesting a driveway width of 16' that will exceed that requirement.
- The UDO requires sidewalks on both sides of the street in small lot residential subdivisions, and the applicant is requesting sidewalks be required on only one side of the streets.
- The UDO requires a 25'-wide Type B landscaped buffer be installed to provide separation between lower density residential areas and small lot residential subdivisions, and the applicant is requesting a 25' rear setback on lots abutting single-family lots larger than 8,000 s.f.
- The UDO requires overflow on-street parking in small lot residential subdivisions, and the applicant is requesting to provide additional on-site parking.
- The UDO calculates that the applicant should provide 7.31 acres in public recreation area, and the applicant is requesting to provide 0.74 acres in a greenway and a payment *in lieu* of \$303,678.

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.

Beth Blackmon, project manager with Timmons Group, 5410 Trinity Rd, Suite 102, Raleigh, NC 27607, provided a presentation on the rezoning request. During her presentation, she indicated that the applicant has added two additional excluded uses, hotel/motel and commercial parking lot, per the outcome of the neighborhood meeting, in addition to several architectural commitments.

After Ms. Blackmon's presentation, two members of the public attending on the zoom webinar asked her questions.

Charles Stancati, 1034 Long Leaf Pine Place, asked when they neighborhood meeting was held.

Barbara Morris, 1045 Sweet Gum Way, raised a question about buffer extending along the perimeter of the development with the exception of the portion that is adjacent to her backyard. She



requested plantings or some sort of measure to reduce her sight line into the backyards of the new homes

Audrey Vogel and Ashley Ownbey read aloud the following written comments received via email:

Ronald and Barbara Morris, 1045 Sweet Gum Way:

Dear City of Mebane:

RE: Request to rezone 6 parcels agenda item

Due to COVID concerns we will be unable to attend in person, and therefore send our concerns to be read by the City clerk during the meeting per instructions in the letter received.

Our names are Ronald and Barbara Morris and we live in Arbor Creek Subdivision C, Mebane, NC 27302. We have been made aware of a proposed new development adjacent to our property. Diamondback Investment Group has submitted plans which raise several concerns.

Key Concerns:

Rezoning request: Based on information received, the developer would like approval for a rezoning request for R-6 (high density). However, all the adjacent neighborhoods and those that will be connected to the new development are currently zoned R20 (low to moderate density) or B2 (Commercial). Since neighborhoods will be connected, We would request that the city stay in line with connected neighborhoods' current zoning and DENY the request to rezone to a R-6 development. We have a significant investment in our home/property and feel that re-zoning the adjacent property will impact the value of our home. Additionally, changing to an R6 have the potential to change the environment due to potential for high turnover of property. R6 construction tends to degrade quicker overtime due to the ownership is not for the long term and therefore the upkeep of the property/housing degrades due to lack of ownership.

Saturated Market: We request that the City hold off on continuing to approve new large developments until other neighborhoods currently under development are at least 90% complete. Mebane is rapidly growing and the fact that several neighborhoods are being built, means there is a risk of too many starting up at one time and then the inability to complete all of them due to a drop in demand. Also, development could take longer due to the market being saturated and therefore those of us adjacent to those developments have to tolerate the mess for extended periods. Case in point, Arbor Creek experienced an issue where development ceased for an extended period due to economic downturn. The existing neighbors had to tolerate a partially developed neighborhood for years.



Respect to current homeowners: Request that developers leave at least an ½ Acre of natural tree buffer between the new development and current property line. Many of the current owners including us, paid a premium (Additional \$5000) for their lots because of the view, privacy and increased natural area that they offered. Also, the increased natural area will assist with water drainage that is already a major issue in the area which frequently floods after a heavy rain.

Increased road traffic. With all the expansion around our area, the traffic continues to increase. Today, it is already difficult to turn onto Old Hillsborough road from our subdivision due to the increase in traffic and adding more neighborhoods is only going to make this issue worse. Additionally, we are concerned that making the road go all the way through will result in increased traffic in the neighborhood. We already have people that speed through the neighborhood and if you connect the new neighborhood to our existing one, it will cause more traffic to fly down our road.

Storm drainage: The developer is proposing to put an undesirable element of the development (storm drainage pond) directly behind current homeowners. This will increase insects and snakes and also present a potential danger to the many small children that live in those homes. In addition, there are already flooding and drainage issues in the proposed pond that backs up to Sweet Gum Way. I request that you require any new development to grade the property to direct water flow away from existing neighborhoods and locate the storm drainage ponds in the middle of their own development. It should not be placed on the edge which would require existing homes to have to tolerate the downside. The existing homes were purchased in their specific area because they chose not to select a cheaper lot which was located near one of Arbor Creeks storm drainage ponds. They should not be forced to now have to live next to one.

Flooding issues: City engineers need to carefully assess all development and consider current flooding issues to ensure it is not exacerbated by new development. A city-sponsored drainage plan needs to be developed to ensure no additional drainage issues for existing neighborhoods. Today there is a drainage ditch 20 feet behind our house and it already gets very full with a downpour. Anytime we have major rain we are concerned and keep a close watch on the water level. I am concerned that changing the landscape behind our home could result in flooding that could reach our house. This is a HUGE concern.

Family Friendliness of neighborhood: Based on current plans, the new development has minimal year-round family friendly features like a playground. Considering the new development and current community will be connected, there is a high probability of increased use of the current neighborhood playground which is maintained and funded by the neighborhood HOA. We request the developer be required to add more family friendly features to the new development.



Sustainable growth & Infrastructure: There are currently multiple neighborhoods underdevelopment within a 5 miles radius of the proposed development but there has not been any new infrastructure to support all this growth. There has been no expansion of roadways, turning lanes, traffic lights or schools. The city keeps growing at an accelerated pace but has not invested as quickly to support all of the current or 1000s of new citizens. We respectfully request that the city be measured in what they approve and when they approve it. The infrastructure needs to catch up with the development.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns.

Ronald and Barbara Morris

Ashley and Michael Abashian, 975 Sweet Gum Way

Members of the Planning Board,

Thank you for your time, in advance, for the upcoming Planning Board meeting to be held on November 9th at 6:30pm. As members of the Mebane community we look forward to discussions with you. We are residents at 975 Sweet Gum Way which is one of the lots directly adjacent to the western border of the newly proposed development. We would like to share our concerns about the development of this property as it is currently proposed.

- *Request for a 25+ foot natural buffer: The current proposal indicates that a retention pond is to be built directly behind our property. This area is currently wooded and looking out at these trees is one of the things that we love about the back of our home. Unfortunately, you did not require the developer of our neighborhood to build in a natural buffer along the edge of our neighborhood to protect us against future development. We're requesting that a natural buffer of at least 25 feet be left between our property line and any development on the proposed property. As it's currently proposed, when we stand on our back porch we'll go from looking at a beautiful wooded lot (see attached photo) to looking across hundreds of feet of open space which will include a retention pond, a road, and a bunch of townhouses. Representatives from the group bringing this rezoning proposal indicated that it was likely that all of the trees behind our home would be removed. In addition, we are concerned that if/when we decide to sell our home this change from a beautiful wooded lot to a retention pond and townhouses will make our home significantly less desirable. This request of a 25+ foot natural buffer would be mutually beneficial to both neighborhoods. The houses along Sweet Gum Way would maintain some privacy on the back of their homes and folks in the new neighborhood wouldn't have to look at the back of several homes all across their western border. We feel that this request sets a positive precedent by respecting the privacy of existing homes in addition to providing the new neighborhood with a natural area at its border.*



- *Townhomes: We are concerned about the fact that this proposal includes townhomes in addition to traditional single family homes. With the extension of Longleaf Pine Rd, our two neighborhoods will be connected, effectively creating one big neighborhood. We appreciate that the folks bringing this proposal forward attempted to transition the neighborhood from commercial out by the road to townhouses to single family homes. That being said, we feel like townhomes are a poor choice for this neighborhood for a number of reasons including the impact it will have on the resale value of existing single family homes, the impact that a higher density of people will have on the charm of the existing Arbor Creek and Manorfield neighborhoods as well as concerns about how diligent the HOA will be with respect to maintenance of and around the townhomes. We would like to request that this land not be rezoned to R-6 (high density) but instead to R-12, to match the zoning of the Arbor Creek neighborhood. If this parcel must be zoned R-6 then we'd ask that the neighborhood comprise of only single family homes to match the Manorfield neighborhood.*

To conclude, we're not vehemently opposed to a new neighborhood being built on these parcels, we always knew that that was a possibility in the future. Mebane is growing and we understand that people want to move here and they need a place to live. We just ask that you not only consider the newcomers that would benefit from this type of development but also consider the folks that already live in these neighborhoods, the folks who have been investing in Mebane for years already. Again, thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to working with you moving forward.

Sincerely,

Ashley and Michael Abashian

Charles Stancati, 1034 Long Leaf Pine Place

Hello City of Mebane Planning Board,

I would like to address a few concerns about the proposed development by the Timmons Group on Mebane Oaks Road by Walmart.

The first concern is safety.

The traffic on Mebane Oaks Road in that particular area is dangerous now, especially during the hours of 7AM to 9AM and 3:30PM to 5:30PM. Also, I am very concerned about the Longleaf Pine Place Connection. As a resident of this street, I see many issues:

1. Speeding - There are no stop signs on Longleaf Pine Place or Sweet Gum Way. The proposed



development will have access to these streets.

2. *Truck Traffic* - Construction vehicles during construction and delivery vehicles such as UPS, Fedex, and Amazon. They will use these local streets as a "cut through".

3. *Extra Car Traffic* - They will use this new roadway connection as a quick way to avoid traffic on the Mebane Oaks Road, either way, getting to route 119 or to Chick-fil-A. There are many toddlers in this neighborhood and, as it been said, behind a bouncing ball comes a running child.

The second concern is property value.

Since townhouses are being proposed connected to this single family home development, I see the value of my home dropping to less than what I paid for it! I know the Manorfield side of this development was originally slated to be townhouses and that was scrubbed, and all the new developments in this immediate area are all single home sites.

In closing, I understand progress and development but let us, as a community, do it correct the first time so we can avoid problems. A problem is hard to correct once it is implemented.

Thank you for listening,

Charles Stancati

A proud member of the Mebane community!

Jeff and Rebecca Steinbach, 3909 Long Meadow Drive

Dear Planning Committee,

My wife and I are brand new to Mebane - moved just under 3 months ago to the Long Meadow community which borders the new Mebane Oaks Residential planned development. We are disappointed to lose the peaceful open fields (and horses) behind our property - something that drew us to the home we purchased. Our #1 concern for our house and our neighbors is the lack of a natural buffer currently between our property and the future development. Our hope is we can try to keep a serene feel in our backyard despite houses coming directly behind us.

In the recent meeting just between homeowners and the developer a request was made for a 25' natural buffer between the new development and our property line, as initially the plans appeared to have no buffer on the south side of the new development proposal. The developers have come back with a plan for a 10' buffer and try to keep original vegetation in place. I do appreciate the developer trying to look out for existing homeowners and I would ask your committee to keep us in mind as you review the plans. Please consider:

1) We request as much buffer zone as possible.



2) We don't have many trees directly on the property lines (within 10-25') so could planting of some privacy type trees be included in this buffer zone?

Thank you so much for keeping Mebane beautiful!

*Jeff and Rebecca Steinbach
3909 Long Meadow Dr.*

Jill Howard, 800 Hickory Lane

Written comments to be read at meeting:

Thank you very much for your service to our great community. I would like to share concerns related to the rezoning request from R-20 to R-6 at 1413 Mebane Oaks. I will start by saying that I am excited about and welcome development in our town - I very much appreciate access to greater resources, opportunities, school expansion, etc. At the same time, for us to all continue to enjoy the things that brought us to Mebane in the first place, it is clearly important to evaluate rezoning requests with a careful eye.

This one in particular is concerning in part due to the fact that it connects to the Arbor Creek/Manorfield community. There appear to be a number of factors that would negatively impact the existing community such as traffic, increased safety risk to young children, storm drainage, environmental sustainability, and the fact that the quiet residential streets would likely become used as a cut-through by commuters to avoid the busy Mebane Oaks/Old Hillsborough intersection.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I would urge you to reject this rezoning proposal and instead retain this property as it is currently zoned.

*Jill Howard
800 Hickory Ln, Mebane, NC 27302*

Craig Woodland, 850 Long Leaf Pine Pl, provided comments and recommendations, echoing similar concerns to those in the comments read aloud such as density and harmony with the surrounding area, traffic concerns, and connection to Arbor Creek neighborhood or the Hawfields area.

Jason Scott, 3910 Long Meadow Drive, provided comments, expressing concerns over traffic on Mebane Oaks Road and the City's ability to accommodate the level of density proposed.

Lori Oakley shared several comments. She applauded the quality of drawings and connectivity efforts. She asked about the density, specifically if there was any consideration to slightly lower the



density. She also asked about the waiver for relief from the single family home buffers. Beth Blackmon responded to her comments, noting that a higher density residential is a common transition from commercial. Lori raised additional questions and comments about landscaping and buffering. She also reiterated that R-6 is very high density, considering the surrounding R-20.

Beth Blackmon noted that the phasing of construction is intended to reduce constriction traffic and disruption in the adjacent Arbor Creek neighborhood. Craig Woodland asked if the developer would be open to restrict any construction traffic from accessing the neighborhood, with a sign. Cy Stober indicated that it would need to be a City Council Action.

Charlies Stancati asked about the traffic study, specifically why the intersection of Old Hillsborough and Long Pine included in the study? Cliff Lawson, traffic engineer, responded that the study is scoped by the City and NCDOT.

Kurt Pearson commented on the number of waivers being requested and may reflect an apparent attempt to maximize or “cram” the number of lots in the development. He also echoed concerns about density and harmony with the surroundings, traffic, and buffers. He noted that the area is ripe for development, but not necessarily for that level of intensity.

Kevin Brouwer shared concerns about the density and the waivers. He noted that the outdoor space was not sufficient for the number of new residents.

Lori asked about the project to the south of the site area zoned CD R-8. Cy Stober offered to follow up on the matter.

Larry Teague echoed concerns about traffic on Mebane Oaks Road, and the number of waivers requested.

Kurt Pearson asked Cy Stober about the process should the applicant make revisions prior to presenting to City Council. Cy Stober clarified the recommendation process in Section 9-3 of the Mebane UDO. He also noted that any significant changes would require further review by staff.

Ashley Abashian commented that there has not been mention of a buffer on the west side of the property, near her home and several others. She also noted how close the proposed homes and retention ponds will be to the existing homes, where trees currently exist.

Cy Stober clarified that a buffer is not required by the UDO in that area. Lori Oakley suggested that this request be asked of city council.

Gale Pettiford made a motion to recommend that the request be denied due to a lack of harmony with the surrounding neighborhood and lack of consistency with the CLP. Kevin Brouwer seconded the motion. Per a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.



Chairman Tulauskas noted that the request will go to City Council on December 7th at 6pm. Cy Stober added the public hearing notices will be sent out.

9. New Business

Cy Stober provided a brief update on the Main Street Program and the upcoming Downtown Associate Community Meeting to be held on Thursday, November 12th.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.