



Mebane Planning Board  
In Person Regular Meeting  
September 20, 2021- 6:30 PM

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the Mebane Planning Board's Regular Meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 9, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Glendel Stephenson Municipal Building located at 106 E. Washington Street, Mebane, NC 27302.

For people who plan to view the meeting, but not participate, the City provides a YouTube live stream by searching *City of Mebane* on YouTube or at the following link:

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

Access to the meeting is also available by the following three (3) options:

**Option #1- Attend in Person**

- All City Staff are required to wear masks per City Policy.

For people that do not plan to attend in person but would like to address the Planning Board during the presentation and discussion of an agenda item, see options below.

**Option #2- Email Comments to be read aloud by Planning Staff**

- Email comment to [avogel@cityofmebane.com](mailto:avogel@cityofmebane.com). Written comments must be received by **4pm September 20<sup>th</sup>**.
- Messages must contain commenter's name and address.
- Written comments will be read aloud by the Planning Staff.

**Option #3- Conference Telephone**

- Email [avogel@cityofmebane.com](mailto:avogel@cityofmebane.com) by **2:00pm on Monday, September 20<sup>th</sup>** to comment during the meeting.
- Emails must contain commenter's name, address, and **telephone number that you are using to call into the conference line for identification, in addition to the agenda item you would like to comment on.**
- Upon the City's receipt of email, participants will be emailed a confirmation which will include the phone number and access code to use the night of the meeting.
- Callers will be held in queue and asked to mute their phones or speakers until they are called on to speak.
- Speakers will be called in the order in which their email was received.
- Per authority of NCGS 143-318.17, if a person participating remotely willfully disrupts the meeting, then upon direction by the Chair, such person may be removed from electronic participation, or his or her e-mail may not be read.



Planning Board  
Regular Meeting Agenda  
September 20, 2021, 6:30 p.m.

---

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of August 9, 2021, Meeting Minutes
3. City Council Actions Update *(includes one attachment)*
4. Proposed Text Amendment to the City of Mebane Unified Development Ordinance Article 4 (“Use Regulations, Density, and Dimensional Standards”), Table 4-1-1 (Table of Permitted Uses) and Table 4-2-1 (Table of Density and Dimensional Requirements) to allow multi-family, townhouse, and condo residential uses and eliminate the minimum setback requirements in the B-1 Central Business District by Frank Ascott of TRG Capital, LLC.
5. New Business
  - a. Introduction to new website, [CityofMebaneNC.gov](http://CityofMebaneNC.gov)
6. Adjournment



---

**Planning Board  
Minutes to the Meeting**

August 9, 2021  
6:30 p.m.

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=9qOPlue29PI>

**Members Present:** Chairman Edward Tulauskas, Lori Oakley, Gale Pettiford, Kurt Pearson, Keith Hoover, Kevin Brouwer, Larry Teague

**Also Present:** 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. Swearing-in of reappointed members Kurt Pearson and Larry Teague**

Stephanie Shaw, City Clerk, swore in Kurt Pearson and Larry Teague to take their oaths for their new terms as members of the Planning Board.

**3. Election of Officers**

Cy Stober explained that the Planning Board elects two members of the board to serve as chair and vice chair on an annual basis. Staff did not receive any nominations prior to the meeting.

Kurt Pearson made a motion to nominate current officers, Edward Tulauskas as Chair and Judy Taylor as Vice Chair. Larry Teague seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**4. Approval of July 19, 2021 Minutes**

Lori Oakley made a motion to approve the July 19 meeting minutes. Kevin Brouwer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**5. City Council Actions Update**

Cy Stober, Development Director, provided an update on the City Council's recent action at the August City Council meeting,

**6. Proposed amendment to the Flood Hazard Overlay District (FHO) in accordance with the Federal Emergency Management Agency Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) Case Number 21-04-0010P that revises the extent of the floodplain along the northern bank of the Lake Michael Tributary (FIRM #370390, Panel #9825, Suffix #L), effective July 15, 2021.**



Cy Stober presented the proposed amendment, summarizing the FEMA FIRM amendment process. Cy Stober explained that will bring the proposed amendment is necessary to bring the City's official Zoning Map into consistency with the revised FIRM. Josh Johnson, P.E. of Alley, Williams, Carmen, & King was in attendance and available to answer any technical questions.

Kevin Brouwer made a motion to the amendments to the City of Mebane Unified Development Ordinance and Zoning Map as presented and that the amendments are consistent with the objectives and policies for growth and development in the Comprehensive Land Development Plan Mebane By Design and are required by State and Federal law. Kurt Pearson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Cy Stober commented that the request will go before the City Council at the public hearing scheduled for September 13.

**7. Request to establish R-8(CD) zoning on three (3) properties totaling +/- 25.58 acres located at 900, 1002 & 1010 Ben Wilson Road (PINs 9824434841, 9824435349 & 9824435147) outside of the Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) in Orange County for a residential cluster development of 147 townhomes by Ben Wilson Rd, LLC**

Staff presented the above application from Ben Wilson Rd, LLC. The Planning staff has reviewed the request for harmony with the zoning of the surrounding area and consistency with the City's adopted plans and recommends approval. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) has reviewed the site plan and the applicant has revised the plan to reflect the comments. The initial request was presented to the Planning Board on June 14, 2021, and received a recommendation for denial due to concerns about density and insufficient parking. The request has since been revised to increase the amount of parking so that a waiver is no longer required, and the number of townhome units has decreased from 161 to 147.

Audrey Vogel provided a brief overview and PowerPoint of the request.

The applicant, James Parker of Ben Wilson Rd, LLC, 320 Executive Court, Hillsborough, NC 27278, provided a presentation of the request and site plan. Mr. Parker primarily discussed the site plan revisions since its initial presentation in June: additional parking and landscaping of parking areas.

Larry Teague expressed concern that there aren't enough turn lanes to accommodate traffic volumes coming to and from Mebane Oaks Road. Mr. Parker responded that the TIA warranted one turn lane, which is provided at the northern entrance to the site.

Larry Teague asked if Orange County had any farmland protection requirements that would need to be considered in converting farmland into townhomes. Cy Stober responded that the City of Mebane does not have any type of farmland protection agreements with Orange County nor Alamance County.

Lori Oakley thanked the applicant for the consideration of her concerns raised at the June 2021 Planning Board meeting, noting that the plan surpasses minimum parking requirements. Ms. Oakley also noted that while she would have liked to see lower density, perhaps R-12, but was pleased to see



that they reduced the density from the previous request. Larry Teague echoed Lori Oakley's remarks. Mr. Parker responded that the parking waiver request for the previous site plan was not intentional and concurred that sufficient parking is important.

Lori Oakley made a motion to approve the request to establish R-8 CD zoning as presented. Larry Teague seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Chairman Tulauskas confirmed that the request will go before the Mebane City Council at the September 13th public hearing.

**8. Request to rezone the +/- 0.343-acre property addressed 702 Vance Street (PIN 9815730196), from B-3 to R-12 to allow for a single-family detached home by VGG Holdings LLC, c/o Peter Gitto**

Staff presented the above general rezoning request. The Planning staff has reviewed the general rezoning request for harmony with the zoning of the surrounding area and consistency with the City's adopted plans and recommends approval.

Audrey Vogel provided a brief overview and PowerPoint of the request. The applicant Peter Gitto of VGG Holdings LLC, 7720 Basset Hall Court, Raleigh, NC 27616 approached the podium to answer questions from the Planning Board.

Two members from the public began to ask Pete what he intended to build on the property and why a rezoning was necessary. Chairman Tulauskas asked the members of the public to share their names and addresses for the record and to hold their questions until after the Planning Board addressed Mr. Gitto.

Lori Oakley asked if staff or the applicant knew why the property was zoned for business use in the first place. Mr. Gitto explained his process to get an exclusion determination, as the property was previously recognized by Alamance County and the City as a single property with split-zoning (R-20 and B-3 zoning) but had historically existed as two lots. Cy Stober clarified that the original recorded plats and historic deeds demonstrated that the properties were recorded as individual lots and never legally recombined, and the applicant provided the evidence of this property history and was issued a Certificate of Exclusion, per Article 7, Section 2 of the Unified Development Ordinance. As such, Cy Stober approved an exempt subdivision plat for the subject B-3 property and adjacent R-20 property in March 2021 per the exclusion determination. Cy Stober also added that he did not know why the subject had B-3 zoning, as there are not records for some of the older parcels of land in the city. Mr. Stober also clarified that residential uses are not a permitted use in the B-3 Neighborhood Business zoning district.

Kurt Pearson asked about the second lot referenced. Cy Stober clarified that the subject property and the adjacent property to the west of the site, 704 Vance Street, had originally been recognized as a single lot and had been recently subdivided per the exclusion determination process discussed above. This adjacent property is zoned R-20 and the applicant has already submitted a permit application to build a single family home.



Larry Teague clarified that the applicant intends to build two homes, one on the 704 Vance St property with residential zoning and one on the subject 702 Vance Street property pending rezoning approval.

Lori Oakley commented that she initially wondered why R-12 was being requested over R-20 zoning but understood that the subject property did not conform to the minimum lot area of the R-20 zoning district. Cy Stober confirmed that she was correct.

Kurt Pearson commented that there appeared to be quite a few non-conforming lots in this area of Mebane. Cy Stober responded that there are numerous non-conforming lots in the older parts of Mebane. Planning staff has not brought forth an initiative to propose rezoning to bring all lots into conformance at this time as it would be an enormous undertaking.

At this time Chairman Tulauskas invited members of the public to provide comments and ask questions.

Mitchell Graves, 706 Vance Street, expressed concern that two-story dwellings are too large for the size of the lots and would not align with the character of the neighborhood.

Kurt Pearson responded that the lot is nearly 15,000 square feet which really isn't very small and is larger than a typical R-12 lot size. He also noted that as a general rezoning request, the Board is only evaluating the setbacks and other density and dimensional requirements of the proposed use, but the design of the proposed use is a separate issue. Cy Stober added that North Carolina General Statute does not permit cities to regulate the architectural character of single-family residents, such as number of stories, square footage, and appearance, unless there is a historic district or overlay in place.

Kurt Pearson asked Mr. Graves if that helped clarify that the Planning Board does not have purview to dictate what the applicant builds on the lot. Mr. Graves responded that he understood but wanted the Board to hear his concern about neighborhood change and the impact of the proposed rezoning on the character of the neighborhood.

Phillip McAdoo, 408 Giles Street, raised concerns about drainage issues referring to another home that Mr. Gitto is building on Roosevelt Street. Mr. Gitto responded that he would go check out the site if drainage issues were persisting, but that he added a drainage pipe to fix the issues Mr. McAdoo was referring to. Mr. Gitto explained that the drainage issues in that area are because the public right-of-way does not have an adequate drainage system, but he would continue working on improve the drainage at the site.

Mr. McAdoo asked what was the reason for him and his neighbors attending the meeting other than changing the zoning of the property? Cy Stober responded that North Carolina general statutes and the local ordinance require a public hearing which will be held September 13th at 6 pm before the Mebane City Council. Mr. Stober added that any decisions made at the planning board meeting



tonight are recommendations to the City Council, which holds the authority to make decisions on rezonings. The hearing will be advertised per state and local requirements including the posting of the property, an advertisement in the local paper and the notification of all neighboring property owners within 300 feet the subject property. Mr. Stober added that the Planning Board meeting gives the public an opportunity to speak in favor or in opposition or ask questions regarding the rezoning request.

Carmen Bradsher commented that she did not live in the area but owned property there (she did not specify her address). Ms. Bradsher asked if the proposed rezoning from neighborhood business to residential would apply to the surrounding properties in the area, and if a resident that ran a daycare in the area would still be able to continue that use? Chairman Tulauskas clarified that the rezoning request only applied to the one subject property 702 Vance Street, and it would not impact the daycare business. Ms. Bradsher expressed concerns about the impact of the new home on the taxes in the area and the potential for gentrification.

Omega Wilson, Co-founder of the West End Revitalization (WERA), explained that he represents an environmental justice organization that owns two properties on the east side of Vance and Giles Street. Mr. Wilson explained that the properties in the neighborhood are historically owned by African Americans and the lots are irregular in part because the streets were not built by the City until after zoning was established. Mr. Wilson commented that the City's planning and zoning processes that impact environmental justice communities, such as West End, should formally take into the consideration the population of African American, indigenous people, and/or latinos that live in those communities. Mr. Wilson also informed the Planning Board about an environmental justice mapping project that WERA and the City are working on under the guidance of the Federal Government.

Tom Boney of Alamance News asked for some clarification about the location of the WERA owned properties relative to subject property and the Mebane City limits. Mr. Wilson clarified that the subject property and the properties on Giles that he referenced are located within City Limits since they were annexed some 30 years ago.

Rodney Graves commented that he used to live on Vance Street and owns vacant property on Giles Street. Mr. Graves shared the history of the subject property, which was paid for by a soldier killed in action during World War II and family that worked for years at the Kingsdown factory. Mr. Graves expressed disagreement with the development of the property by someone without any ties to the community or deep history of the neighborhood.

Kurt Pearson asked if the majority of those in attendance that disagree with the rezoning request are homeowners of residential properties. The audience replied with a unanimous "yes." Kurt Pearson indicated that the plot plan for the proposed home on the subject property clearly meets all of the setback requirements for the request R-12 zoning district, with side setback distances in excess. Mr. Pearson asked what could be built on the property under its current B-3 Neighborhood Business



Zoning? Lori Oakley responded that she looked at the Table of Permitted Uses in Article 4 of the UDO which includes laundromat, library, bank, barbershop, and carwash. Ms. Oakley added that as its currently zoned the property owner could build a laundromat on the property as a by-right use without any public notification or public hearing. Ms. Oakley and Mr. Pearson concurred that single-family residential zoning would allow for a more compatible use of the property due to the residential nature of the neighborhood.

Mitchell Graves, 706 Vance St, commented that he did not have an issue with the proposed residential use, but did have concerns about density. Chairman Tulauskas responded that R-12 is a relatively low-density zoning district compared to some of the properties zoned R-8 in the area. A woman in the audience added that they are asking for the developer to respect the neighbors in the area, and that they don't have an issue with the property being developed but they do have an issue with what is going to be built. Kurt Pearson responded that the Board does not have the power to regulate that, and if the residential rezoning is approved it will be up to the applicant to choose what to build provided that it meets the development requirements. Mr. Pearson suggested that the applicant and the residents of the area sit down and talk as neighbors about Mr. Gitto's plans for the property.

Kurt Pearson made a motion to approve the R-12 rezoning request as presented. Keith Hoover seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Kurt Pearson and Cy Stober clarified that there will be an opportunity to attend the City Council public hearing which will held on September 13<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm. Cy Stober added that the property will continue to be posted, the hearing will be advertised in the local papers and the surrounding property owners will received a letter.

#### **9. New Business**

Audrey Vogel notified the Board that the September Planning Board meeting will be held on September 20th which is pushed back one week due to the Labor Day holiday.

#### **10. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.





---

## AGENDA ITEM #3

### City Council Actions Update

---

#### Presenter

Cy Stober, Development Director

---

#### Public Hearing

Yes  No

---

#### Attachments

1. Policy Document: Policy for Implementing Strategies to address Paper Flow related to Residential Growth

# CITY of MEBANE

<p><b>POLICY STATEMENT</b></p> <p><b>SUBJECT: Policy on implementing strategies to limit residential permitted wastewater at State mandated amounts creating accumulation of Paper Flow impacting permitting capacity at wastewater facilities</b></p>	PAGE 1 OF 2
	EFFECTIVE: August 2, 2021
	SUPERSEDES: N/A
	PREPARED BY: Franz Holt, City Engineer
	ADOPTED BY COUNCIL: DATE: August 2, 2021

**PURPOSE**

To establish a policy to implement strategies as presented to Council that limits the accumulation of Paper Flow (wastewater permitted at State mandated flows per bedroom which is typically 2 times higher than when on line/tributary) which impacts available wastewater treatment and pump station capacity. Strategies will include the following items.

- A. Wastewater Permitting Implementation.
- B. Plan review and Approval Process.
- C. Service Prioritization and Wastewater Reservation.

**GENERAL**

1. Applicability

This policy applies to all development prior to and after adoption of this policy.

2. The following are made effective for residential development approved prior to the adoption of this policy.

A. Permitting wastewater for multiple phases of a multi-phased residential project at one time will not be allowed.

B. Permitting wastewater for additional phases of residential development may be done once a final plat has been approved for the current phase provided that the City Engineer approves the number of lots being platted.

- C. Sub-phasing of larger phases of residential development once the wastewater is permitted will not be allowed (permit only what the developer intends to plat as a phase).
3. The following strategies are made effective for newly approved residential development after the adoption of this policy.
    - A. Permitting wastewater for multiple phases of a multi-phased project at one time will not be allowed.
    - B. Permitting wastewater for additional phases of development may be done once a final plat has been recorded and construction starts for 50% of the residential units has occurred.
    - C. Sub-phasing of larger phases once the wastewater is permitted will not be allowed (permit only what the developer intends to plat as a phase).
    - D. For multi-family projects the maximum number of units permitted in any calendar year are 72 (typically 3 buildings at 24 units each).
  4. The following strategies are made effective for plan review and approval process.
    - A. TRC meetings for residential project will occur once a month.
    - B. Non-residential projects will be reviewed at either of the two currently scheduled meetings.
    - C. Prior to moving forward through the plan review and approval process, proposed major multi-phased developments of 300 residential units or more will require review as to the City's ability to provide needed services beyond and including wastewater.
  5. The following strategies are made effective to encourage future development that maintains a balance of residential, institutional, commercial, and industrial growth through wastewater capacity reservation and development prioritization.
    - A. Upon completion of the planned reroutes of wastewater to the Graham WWTP and WRRF expansion the following wastewater reservations will be implemented:
      - i. Orange County Buckhorn Economic Development District - 130,000 gallons per day
      - ii. NCIC and CCIC - 70,000 gallons per day
      - iii. Commercial/Office/Institutional – 100,000 gallons per day
      - iv. Infill development not requiring a permit – 100,000 gallons per day
    - B. Additional prioritization implementation as to the type of development served will be as follows:
      - i. Areas that have a general health need.
      - ii. Industrial, Office & Institutional, Commercial and Unique Residential Projects in and nearby Historic Downtown Mebane.
      - iii. Residential development not requiring new pump stations and oversized facilities.
      - iv. Residential development requiring oversized facilities where oversizing reimbursement requirements are waived by the developer.
  6. Other Items
    - A. Policy will be explained and distributed to developers.
    - B. Success of new strategies will be reviewed on an annual basis.
    - C. Policy is subject to change with Council approval.
    - D. Complete a flow reduction study for State review and approval for flow to the Graham WWTP.



---

## AGENDA ITEM #4

### Proposed Amendment to Article 4 of the Unified Development Ordinance

---

#### Presenter

Audrey Vogel, City Planner

---

#### Public Hearing

Yes  No

---

#### Summary

The Planning Board shall advise and comment on the Proposed Text Amendments to the City of Mebane Unified Development Ordinance Article 4 (“Use Regulations, Density, and Dimensional Standards”). The applicant Frank Ascott of TRG Capital, LLC, proposes to amend Table 4-1-1 (Table of Permitted Uses) to allow Condominium, Multifamily, and Townhouse residential uses in the B-1 Central Business District. Related amendments to require development standards for Condominium, Multifamily, and Townhouse uses in B-1 Districts are also proposed for Subsections C, E, and F, respectively, of Article 4, Section 7.3.

The applicant is seeking these text amendments in order to re-develop a property zoned B-1 (Central Business District) at 206 E Washington Street for multifamily residential and commercial purposes. The Mebane UDO currently allows for two primary uses on a single zoning district but not for the new development of condominiums, multifamily, or townhomes in B-1 zoning districts. While existing Downtown structures have higher-density residential units, the Mebane UDO does not allow for new development to support higher-density residential sites.

The applicant also proposes to amend Table 4-2-1 (Table of Density and Dimensional Requirements) to eliminate the minimum setback requirements for the B-1 Central Business District. The current standards require a 15’ front setback and a 20’ rear setback for B-1 zoning districts, which is inconsistent with the goals and objectives for Downtown in the City’s Comprehensive Land Development Plan *Mebane By Design* and the *Mebane Downtown Vision Plan*. Much of the existing development in the historic core of the Central Business District does not conform with these front and rear setbacks, and this amendment will bring new development into conformance with that established historic appearance and orientation.

Staff finds that the proposed amendments are consistent with the following objectives and policies for growth and development in the Comprehensive Land Development Plan *Mebane By Design*:

- Growth Management Goal 1.1 *Encourage a variety of uses in growth strategy areas and in the downtown, promote/encourage a village concept that supports compact and walkable environments.*
- Growth Management Goal 1.2 *Continue to support historic Downtown Mebane’s culture: aesthetics, walkability, bikeability, and shopping, dining, and housing options.*

The proposed amendments will enable the realization of several recommendations in the Mebane Downtown Vision Plan for a variety of residential uses. The elimination of minimum setbacks and allowance for diverse residential uses downtown will enable new development to conform to the historic character of development that exists in the historic Downtown today. The Vision Plan explicitly calls for residential development and mixed-use development with ground floor commercial and upper story residential in various areas the Downtown study area. For example, the Plan identifies the partially vacant shopping center at the corner of Washington and Fifth Streets as an appropriate site for redevelopment with mixed use and or multifamily residential, none of which is currently permitted by the Mebane UDO (Section 4, Page 48).

---

### **Financial Impact**

N/A

---

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff advises an in-favor recommendation of the proposed amendments, as presented, to be reviewed by the Mebane City Council at the October 4, 2021, Public Hearing.

---

### **Suggested Motion**

Motion to approve the amendments to the City of Mebane Unified Development Ordinance as presented. The amendments are consistent with the objectives and policies for growth and development in the Comprehensive Land Development Plan *Mebane By Design* and aligns with the recommendations of the Mebane Downtown Vision Plan.

---

### **Attachments**

1. **Pages from Article 4 of the Unified Development Ordinance with proposed text amendments in red**
2. **Text Amendment Application**

Table 4-1-1

<b>4-1-1 Table of Permitted Uses</b>																
02/04/08;amended 04/07/08,05/03/10,07/11/11,08/05/13 04/07/14, 10/06/14; 07/09/18; 11/05/18; 03/04/19; 10/17/19	Ref. SIC	Development Standards	Zoning Districts													
			RA20	R20	R15	R12	R10	R8	R6	OI	B1	B2	B3	M1	M2	
<b>RESIDENTIAL USES</b>																
<b>Single Unit Residential</b>																
Single-Family Detached Dwelling	0000		Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z							
Modular Home	0000		Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z							
Manufactured Home, on individual lot (within MH Overlay District Only)	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 A					CC									
Patio Home Dwelling	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 B						D	D							
<b>Multiple Unit Residential</b>																
Condominium, less than 2 acres in area	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 C						D	D		D					
Condominium, 2 or more acres in area	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 C						D	D		D					
Manufactured Home Park (within MH Overlay District Only)	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 D					CC									
Multifamily Dwelling, less than 2 acres in area	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 E						D	D		D					
Multifamily Dwelling, 2 or more acres in area	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 E						D	D		D					
Townhouse Dwelling, less than 2 acres in area	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 F						D	D		D					
Townhouse Dwelling, 2 or more acres in area	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 F						D	D		D					
Two-Family Dwelling (duplex)	0000							Z	Z							
<b>Group Residential</b>																
Boarding and Rooming House	7021	Sec. 4-7.3 G									D	D				
Family Care Home	8361	Sec. 4-7.3 H	D	D	D	D	D	D	D							
Group Care Facility	8361	Sec. 4-7.3 I								D		D				
Temporary Emergency Shelter	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 L	D	D	D	D	D	D	D		D	D	D	D	D	
<b>Nontraditional Residential Developments</b>																
Live/Work Combination Dwelling & Nonresidential Use	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 M						D	D	D	D	D	D			
Planned Unit Development	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 N		D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D					
Residential Cluster Development	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 O		D	D	D	D	D	D							
Traditional Neighborhood Development	0000	Sec. 4-7.3 P		D	D	D	D	D	D							
<b>ACCESSORY USES AND STRUCTURES</b>																
Accessory Dwelling Unit (on single-family lots)	0000	Sec. 4-7.4 A	D	D	D	D	D	D	D							
Accessory Dwelling Unit to an Office Use	0000	Sec. 4-7.4 B								BA	Z					
Accessory Uses and Structures (customary)	0000	Sec. 4-1 G	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	
Automatic Teller Machine	6099									Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	
Caretaker Dwelling	0000	Sec. 4-7.4 C	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	
Communication Tower Under 50' in Height	0000	Sec. 4-7.4 D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D		Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	
Fence, Wall	0000	Sec. 4-2 C	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	
Home Occupation	0000	Sec. 4-7.4 E	D	D	D	D	D	D	D							

Z=Allowed by right  
D=Allowed if development standards are met  
E= Exempt

BA=Special use permit required from Board of Adjustment  
CC=Special use permit required from City Council

Table 4-2-1

Zoning District	Minimum Lot Area (Sq Ft.)	Minimum Lot Width (Ft)**	Front Yard Setback (Ft.)	Side Yard Setback (Ft.)	Rear Yard Setback (Ft.)	Maximum Building Height (Ft)	Maximum Lot Coverage***	Development Standards
<b>O&amp;I Office &amp; Institutional</b>								
	8,000	70	30	10	20	40		
<b>Commercial Zoning Districts</b>								
B-1 Central Business	N/A	N/A	<del>15</del> <i>b</i>	<i>c, d</i>	<del>20</del> <i>c</i>	50 <i>h</i>		
B-2 General Business	6,000	50	40 <i>b</i>	<i>c, d</i>	30 <i>c</i>	70 (amended 04/07/08)		
B-3 Neighborhood Business	5,000	N/A	20	20 <i>i</i>	20	35		
<b>Industrial Zoning Districts</b>								
M-1 Heavy Manufacturing	N/A	50	30	25	20	150 (amended 01/12/15)		
M-2 Light Manufacturing	N/A	50	50 <i>e</i>	20 <i>a</i>	20	150 (amended 01/12/15)		

- (d) The total minimum side setback shall be 20 feet. Only one side setback is required. Patio home developments utilizing zero side setbacks shall comply with the zero side back requirements of Section 4-2, D.
- (e) The minimum lot width shall be 40 feet.
- (f) Minimum recreational space shall be provided as required in Section 6-7.1.
- (g) The minimum amount of useable common open space that shall be reserved for passive and/or active open space purposes shall be in accordance with the standards and requirements of Section 6-7.3, G. The minimum amount of private common open space required by this subsection is in addition to the minimum recreational space required in subsection (f) above.

**C. Condominium**

1. **Where Development Standards are Required:** R-8, ~~and~~ R-6 and B-1 districts.
2. **General Requirements:**
  - (a) Condominiums are a type of housing in which the ownership of the occupancy rights to the dwelling unit is individually owned or for sale to any individual and such ownership is not inclusive of any land.
  - (b) Plans for all condominium developments built on two or more acres require conditional zoning.  
(Amended November 5, 2018)
  - (c) Density: The number of units per acre shall be the same as that permitted for multifamily housing in the zoning district where the condominium development is located.
  - (d) Timing: The proposed schedule of development likely to be followed shall be submitted
  - (e) Minimum recreational shall be provided as required in Section 6-7.1.
3. **Common Areas:** Areas not shown as lots on the site development plan shall be designated as common areas and on any subdivision plat as an area to be held in separate ownership for the use and benefit of residents of the development.
  - (a) Easements over the common areas for access, ingress from and to public streets and walkways and easements



## **E. Multifamily Dwelling**

**1. Where Development Standards are Required:** R-8, ~~and~~ R-6 and B-1 districts.

### **2. General Requirements:**

(a) Multi-family dwelling units are intended for renter occupancy and include no land or common ownership as an incidence of occupancy.

(b) Plans for all multifamily units built on two or more acres require conditional zoning.

*Amended November 5, 2018*

(c) Density: The number of units per acre shall be the same as that permitted for multi-family housing in the zoning district in which located.

(d) Recreational space: Minimum private recreational space shall be provided as required in Section 6-7.2.

(e) Open Space: The minimum amount of useable common open space that shall be reserved for passive and/or active open space purposes shall be in accordance with the standards and requirements of Section 6-7.3, C. The minimum amount of private common open space required by this subsection is in addition to the minimum private recreational space required in subsection (d) above.

### **3. Site Development Requirements:**

(a) Parking: Off-street parking shall be provided as required in Table 6-4-1. Guest and overflow parking shall be provided so as to be readily accessible to all dwelling units. Parking spaces shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of Section 6-4.

(b) Screening: Screening shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of Section 6-3. However, if a berm is determined to be an adequate alternative screening method as provided for in Section 6-3, B, 3, the minimum height of the berm shall be six feet.

(c) Signs: Signs shall comply with the requirements of Section 6-6.

(d) Private Drives: Private drives are allowed to connect parking areas and groups of multifamily units to public streets. These drives shall be constructed to the same standards as public streets except that the minimum pavement width shall be sixteen feet. Parking shall not be

- (j) Location and amount of recreation and open area.
- (k) Landscaping and buffering plan prepared in accordance with the standards of Section 6-3.

All plans and construction details must meet current specifications of the City of Mebane.

**5. Placement of Buildings:**

- (a) There shall be maintained at least 20 linear feet of open space between individual and unattached buildings of one story and 30 linear feet between two story buildings in a multifamily development.
- (b) Setbacks from public street right-of-ways shall be the same as required by the zoning district where the multifamily development is located.
- (c) Any group of buildings forming a courtyard shall have at least 25 percent of the perimeter of the courtyard open for access by emergency vehicles.

**F. Townhouse Dwelling**

**1. Where Development Standards are Required:** R-8, ~~and~~ R-6 and B-1 districts.

**2. General Requirements:**

- (a) A townhouse is a type of housing with one or more structures containing a total of two or more units intended for owner occupancy, where ownership of the land beneath each unit runs with that unit, where units and the individually owned lands on which they rest do not meet conventional lot requirements for street frontage and yard sizes, and where walls between units are constructed in accordance with North Carolina State Building Code.
- (b) Plans for all townhouse developments built on two or more acres require conditional zoning.  
(Amended November 5, 2018)
- (c) Density: The number of units per acre shall be the same as that permitted for multi-family housing in the zoning district where the townhouse development is located.

**3. Common Areas:** Areas not shown as lots on the site development plan shall be designated as common areas and on any subdivision plat as an area to be held in separate ownership for the use and benefit of residents of the development.



## APPLICATION FOR A ZONING AMENDMENT

Application is hereby made for an amendment to the Mebane Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Name of Applicant: Frank Ascott for TRG Capital, LLC

Address of Applicant: 304 East Washington Street, Mebane NC 27302

Address and brief description of property to be rezoned: Application for text amendment to

UDO table 4-1-1 & 4-2-1 to remove setbacks in B-1 zone and allow multi-family & Condo Uses

Applicant's interest in property: (Owned, leased or otherwise) Applicant proposes to re-develop

a parcel located at 206 East Washington St located in the B-1 Central Business Zoning District.

\*Do you have any conflicts of interest with: Elected/Appointed Officials, Staff, etc.?

Yes \_\_\_ Explain: \_\_\_\_\_ No X

Type of re-zoning requested: Text amendment to UDO table 4-1-1 & table 4-2-1

Sketch attached: Yes X (drafts of text changes attached) No \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for the requested re-zoning: Removal of setbacks for the B-1 zoning district and allowance

If development standards are met of Condo (less than 2 acres) & Multifamily (less than 2 acres)

Signed: 

Date: 8/4/2021

Action by Planning Board: \_\_\_\_\_

Public Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Action: \_\_\_\_\_

Zoning Map Corrected: \_\_\_\_\_

The following items should be included with the application for rezoning when it is returned:

1. Tax Map showing the area that is to be considered for rezoning.
2. Names and addresses of all adjoining property owners within a 300' radius (Include those that are across the street).
3. \$300.00 Fee to cover administrative costs.
4. The information is due 15 working days prior to the Planning Board meeting. The Planning Board meets the 2<sup>nd</sup> Monday of each month at 6:30 p.m. Then the request goes to the City Council for a Public Hearing the following month. The City Council meets the 1<sup>st</sup> Monday of each month at 6:00 p.m.