



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=LeKdqvXUgdM>

Members Present:

Edward Tulauskas, Chair
Judy Taylor, Vice Chair
Jason VanBuren
Gale Pettiford
Susan Semonite

William Chapman
Kurt Pearson
Keith Hoover
Larry Teague

City Staff Present:

Ashley Ownbey, Interim Development Director
Audrey Vogel, Planner

Kirk Montgomery, IT Director

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of July 18, 2022, Meeting Minutes

Judy Taylor made a motion to approve the meeting minutes. Susan Semonite seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

3. City Council Actions Update

Ashley Ownbey, Interim Development Director, provided an update on the City Council's recent action at the August City Council meeting

4. Request to establish LM (CD) zoning on the +/- 73.978-acre parcel (identified by Parcel Identification Number 9844452283) located on West Ten Road outside of the Mebane Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) in Orange County to allow for a light-industrial development including two warehouse buildings by Williams Development Group.

Williams Development Group is requesting to establish LM (CD) zoning on the +/- 73.978-acre parcel (identified by Parcel Identification Number 9844452283) located on West Ten Road outside of the Mebane Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) in Orange County to allow for a light-industrial development including two warehouse buildings. Proposed onsite amenities are detailed in the meeting agenda packet available [here](#). Annexation will be required before the City Council can hold a public hearing to take zoning action. The applicant has the property under contract to purchase, contingent upon approval of the conditional rezoning. 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

Audrey Vogel provided an overview and PowerPoint presentation of the request.



The following individuals attended the meeting to represent the zoning request:

- Taylor Williams – Williams Development Group, applicant
- Josh Reinke – Ramey Kemp Associates, traffic consultant
- Tim Summerville – Stewart, civil engineer
- Michael Fox – Tuggle Duggins, attorney

Michael Fox introduced the applicant team in attendance and presented the purpose of the zoning request. He noted that the proposed Mebane zoning is not different from the existing zoning in Orange County and fits in to the Buckhorn Economic Development District. Mr. Fox also discussed the neighborhood outreach for the project including a zoom call and various phone with neighbors. He cited the primary concerns as traffic, buffers, and stormwater. Mr. Fox also discussed conversations with Orange County Schools, noting that the County is going to perform a traffic study to manage existing traffic conditions and future growth for the Gravelly Hill Middle School down the street.

Taylor Williams provided information about Williams Development group and elaborated on the proposed development, site plan, and traffic impact analysis (TIA).

Susan Semonite asked if schools were remote when the TIA was completed in December 2021. It was confirmed that students returned to the classroom for the full year in 2021.

Kurt Pearson asked for more information about the buffer required between the two sites. Tim Summerville responded that by subdividing the property into two parcels the UDO requires a 20' type c buffer and the applicant has proposed to provide these plantings elsewhere on site to provide screening from the outside.

Jason VanBuren asked when Orange County Schools would complete the aforementioned traffic study. Michael Fox answered that the timeframe has yet to be determined.

Larry Teague asked if they were able to estimate the time of day for most truck traffic without having building tenants determined yet. Taylor Williams responded that it is difficult to speculate, but typically warehouses have lower peak trip generation because the shifts tend to operate on a 24-hour clock. Traffic consultant Josh Reinke added that the trip generation manual used for the TIA is based on land use type, and the warehouse use does not tend to overlap with peak traffic.

Judy Taylor asked if a service road has ever been considered to serve these properties along West Ten Rd. Josh Reinke responded that this has not been discussed or considered to the best of his knowledge. Ms. Taylor asked if any improvements would be necessary at the Mt. Willing interchange. Mr. Reinke answered that per the TIA, the development would not have a significant impact on the interchange and per NCDOT's review it would not need monitoring for signalization.

Susan Semonite questioned if the road needed to be widened to accommodate truck traffic. Josh Reinke answered that the road along the property's frontage would be widened to accommodate



the required turn lanes, however it would not be widened anywhere else.

Tom Boney of the Alamance News asked for clarification on the trip generation table presented from the TIA. Josh Reinke explained that the ITE Trip Generation manual determines generation assumptions/estimates based on studies of sites across the country. The generation is not based on number of employees, it is based on building size. He explained that the weekday AM and PM peaks on the screen is the “worst case” traffic in the morning and evening. He added that the ITE manual does not do a break down specifically for truck traffic. Truck traffic is typically spread out throughout the day as opposed to concentrated during peaks.

Mr. Boney asked if the applicant had an idea of if the company would do speculative or build-to-suit type of development. Taylor Williams answered that it was yet to be determined, however they would like to identify an occupant prior to vertical construction.

Tom Boney asked about the current and projected projects included in the traffic analysis. Per Josh Reinke the following projects were considered in the TIA:

- Project titanium - completed ABB industrial site in Mebane, northwest of the site
- Medline – the medical supply distribution facility, west of the site
- West Ten Industrial and Buckhorn Business Center, Al. Neyer light industrial developments west of the site
- Bowman Road subdivisions – single family residential development in Mebane west of the site
- Efland Industrial – 2021 TIA for industrial space north of the site

Chairman Tulauskas invited the public to speak and ask questions.

Beth Bronson, 1221 Buckhorn Rd, read aloud written comments on behalf of her neighbor Fiona Johan , 5016 Johann Ln:

Good evening to the planning board and in person attendees. I am sorry I could not attend this meeting but hope that my review of the agenda packet ahead of tonight’s meeting along with my questions provide a useful viewpoint from a rural resident.

I want to start by showing my appreciation for the 100’ buffers automatically put into this site plan from Al Neyer. I recognize that this is double the 50’ requirement in the UDO and as many of you know something I fought hard for on the 6016 West Ten Property. **I will again push that the developer and the planning board consider a slightly higher buffer of 150’, at the very least on property lines that touch rural residential housing.** I can personally attest to the disturbance that building in this area brings not only to the people, but the animals. The noise pollution alone, every day from 7am to 10pm, is enough to discourage opening your own window on a beautiful day instead of running an HVAC system.

My second concern is the traffic. I see from the traffic impact analysis that there are some added lanes that the developer plans to put in at entrances on West Ten and Buckhorn. They



seem to meet the minimum required by the TIA. **If I were a direct neighbor of this property, I would ask whose property those road expansions impact and if this is something that eminent domain automatically takes care of or if those property owners get a say about what happens to their road front property.**

Another traffic concern for those of us not directly next door to this site is the general increase of tractor trailer traffic. It is already happening to me multiple times a week that tractor trailers coming out of the truck stop are pulling in front of oncoming traffic causing the need for extreme braking. I have spoken to other neighbors and they have experienced the same thing. This is an already unsafe situation that I worry will get worse with more tractor trailers on the road.

As I stated with the 6016 West Ten rezoning I am aware that the Buckhorn Business Center does lay within the planned Buckhorn Economic Development District. Therefore, I will not object to this project outright but I truly hope that any plans that meet approval of the planning board take the local traffic into consideration. As stated above tractor trailers entering Buckhorn are already a concern and we have not even seen the effects of Medline and 6016 West Ten tractor trailer traffic. **I see the TIA recommend “monitoring” which is appreciated but I truly feel it is a bit lackluster if the city’s plans are to continue to encourage industrial development in the BEDD.** If we also factor in the new housing developments that are creeping east on Bowman Rd we are in for a significant increase in traffic at the Buckhorn interchange and I hope that we can act a bit more proactively instead of waiting for something bad to happen.

It is truly heartbreaking to see the agricultural land around me turning into an industrial area. I ask you as someone who understands the city’s need for growth to continue to consider those of us in this area that moved here specifically for the rural feel.

I will continue to tune in via YouTube and speak up when I am concerned. I appreciate all the planning board does and recognize that balancing the needs of developers and local rural residents is a tricky one, thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Fiona Johann

Beth Bronson also shared her own concerns about the impact large industrial facilities have on the existing rural residential character of the area in addition to the new higher density single family residential and townhomes popping up on Bowman Road. Ms. Bronson shared disappointment and fear that the approval of more industrial projects in the area will “set in stone” more industrial development in the primarily residential area. She added that truck traffic is already an issue and will continue to get worse, noting the development is a faster pace than the NCDOT funded improvements for the Buckhorn interchange area.

Craig Lloyd, 3103 US 70 W, explained that he is a long-time Orange County and Efland resident and is working on a park project across the street from the subject property. Mr. Lloyd shared that while



Efland will be impacted by growth in the area, it is a good corridor for economic development and employment growth. He shared his support of the project.

Kurt Pearson commented that he liked the fact the property is already zoned for light industrial in the Orange County EBD-2 district which was put together with extensive studies and cooperation with the County in the past. He added that the property is just outside the G-2 primary growth area. He also commented that the one waiver request is reasonable, and it makes sense to add to the buffers along the outside of the property. He also noted that the applicant has shown a willingness to listen to the people around them and the improvements to the roadways seem to be well-studied. He concluded that the project would be good for the area.

Kurt Pearson made a motion to approve the request as follows:

*Motion to **approve** the LM(CD) zoning as presented; and*

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

- *Is for a property within the City's G-4 Secondary Growth Area (Mebane CLP, p.66);*
- *Serves Mebane CLP Growth Management Goal 1.7 through the support [of] industrial development at existing industrial parks near I-40/85 (pp.17, 59 & 82)*

Keith Hoover seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Mr. Tulauskas confirmed that the request would be scheduled for a public hearing before the Mebane City Council on September 12th.

5. New Business

The following new business items were shared with the Board:

- Staff is working on scheduling a Planning Board basics training
- There is a community meeting on Wednesday August 17th to kick off engagement for our recreation and parks master plan and our update to the bicycle and pedestrian transportation plan

Kurt Pearson asked if the Kingsdown conditional rezoning request would need to come back to Planning Board prior to advancing to City Council public hearing. Ashley Ownbey responded that as of now it would not need to come back to Planning Board because changes made to the proposed development reduce the intensity of the project and do not significantly impact the site plan layout. She elaborated on these changes noting that they are in the August City Council agenda packet.

6. Adjournment

Chairman Tulauskas adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.