



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/@cityofmebane1881/streams>.

**Members Present:**

Edward Tulauskas, Chair  
Judy Taylor, Vice Chair  
William Chapman  
Keith Hoover  
Kurt Pearson  
David Scott  
Colin Cannell

**Members Absent:**

Susan Semonite  
Gale Pettiford

**City Staff Present:**

Ashley Ownbey, Development Director  
Rachel Gaffney, City Planner  
Kirk Montgomery, IT Director

**1. Call to Order**

At 6:33 p.m. Chair Tulauskas called the meeting to order.

**2. Introduction of newly appointed Planning Board member Mr. Colin Cannell**

**3. Planning Board Member Elections**

William Chapman made a motion to re-elect the current officers Judy Taylor as vice chair and Ed Tulauskas as chair. Kurt Pearson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**4. Approval of June 12, 2023, Meeting Minutes**

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

**5. City Council Actions Update**

Ashley Ownbey informed the Board that the general rezoning of St. Lukes Church Road was unanimously approved by the Mebane City Council.

**6. Request to rezone a +/- 15,246 square foot parcel located at 600 E. Brown Street (GPIN 9825342675), from R-12 to B-3 (CD) by Terry Hedgspeth.**

Terry Hedgspeth is requesting approval to rezone a +/- 15,246 square foot lot located at 600 E. Brown Street (GPIN 9825342675) from R-12 to B-3(CD) to allow for a small retail store. The property is in the Mebane City limits in Orange County and within the General Watershed Area Overlay District. City water and sewer are already provided to the site. Currently the site is a vacant storefront, and the surrounding uses include single-family residential and a church. According to the



City of Mebane's Comprehensive Land Development Plan, *Mebane by Design*, the property is in the secondary growth area, which supports both residential and commercial uses. The property has historically been used for commercial purposes, with the last known occupancy by a bait and tackle store dating back to the 1970s. The applicant is requesting conditions that include no expansion to existing structures, no new structures, and three striped parking stalls instead of the required five stalls required by the Mebane UDO. The applicant has also proposed a restriction of uses.

The site-specific plan and staff report are provided in the meeting agenda packet available [here](#).

Ashley Ownbey provided a more detailed overview and PowerPoint presentation of the request.

Terry Hedgspeth, owner and applicant for 600 East Brown Street, presented that she was interested in operating an antique or vintage thrift store from the location.

Judy Taylor asked if the applicant would be open regular business hours or by appointment. Terry Hedgspeth replied that she would be open limited hours during the week. Judy Taylor asked Terry Hedgspeth to confirm there would be no additional outdoor lighting. Terry Hedgspeth responded that she would only add lighting over the doorway. Judy Taylor then asked if there would be anything stored outside of the building. Terry Hedgspeth replied that everything would be stored inside the building with no outside storage.

Colin Cannell questioned if the building had always had a storefront or if it was once a home. David Scott responded that as far as he knew it always had a storefront.

Chair Tulauskas opened the floor for public comment.

Valery Cohen, 603 E. Brown Street, presented that her first concern was about traffic in the area with the property being located a house down from the intersection of N. Ninth Street and E. Brown Street. She provided a police report of accidents with two in 2021, three in 2022, and most recently one on June 23, 2023. Valery Cohen shared that another concern was vehicles exiting the parking lot. She stated that there was a hill and curve that limits the visibility. Her second concern was the noise of the patrons going in and out of their vehicles and dogs from neighbors barking at the patrons. She stated that when the building was being used previously for yard sales, there were outdoor drop-offs accepted at any time, which also contributed to noise at odd hours.

Kurt Pearson asked how staff felt about putting the B-3 (CD) zoning in the middle of residential zoning. Ashley Ownbey stated that staff considered the historical use of the property for commercial purposes and that the applicant was not proposing any changes to the existing structures. Kurt Pearson asked about the intended use of the property. Ashley Ownbey replied that it would be a



small retail shop with antiques or thrift items. Kurt Pearson commented that he views the rezoning as spot zoning and did not view the request to be in harmony with the surrounding zoning.

David Scott asked the applicant to clarify that she was not intending to operate a yard sale or flea market type business where people drop off items. Terry Hedgspeth replied that when she first purchased the property, she used it for yard sales without the intention for people to drop off items outdoors. She said that as a formal business the antiques and thrift items would be inside the building.

David Scott made a motion to approve the request as follows:

*Motion to approve the B-3(CD) zoning as presented.*

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

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

William Chapman seconded the motion, which passed with a 6-1 vote. Kurt Pearson did not vote in favor of the request, over his previously expressed concerns.

7. Request to rezone six (6) properties (GPINs 9824020553, 9814921385, 9814920726, 9814824291, 9814727217, & 9814823848), totaling +/- 60.2 acres and located with frontages on Mebane Oaks Road, Broadwood Acres Road, and Longleaf Pine Place, from R-20 and B-2 to R-8 (CD) to allow for a Planned Unit Development featuring 96 single-family residences and 320 apartments by Mebane Housing, LLC and Evolve Mebane Oaks, LLC.

Mebane Housing, LLC and Evolve Mebane Oaks, LLC is requesting to rezone six (6) properties (GPINs 9824020553, 9814921385, 9814920726, 9814824291, 9814727217, & 9814823848), totaling +/- 60.2 acres and located with frontages on Mebane Oaks Road, Broadwood Acres Road, and Longleaf Pine Place, from R-20 and B-2 to R-8 (CD) to allow for a Planned Unit Development featuring 96 single-family residences and 320 apartments. The property is in Alamance County in Mebane's Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) and requires a petition for annexation before connecting to City utilities. The current use of the property is single-family residential, and the surrounding uses include large retail stores, restaurants, other commercial uses, church, fire station, and single-family residential. According to the City of Mebane's Comprehensive Land Development Plan, *Mebane by Design*, the property is in the secondary growth area, which supports both residential and commercial uses. The applicant proposes the following conditions as part of the conditional rezoning request:



#### Requested Conditions

- The UDO requires a maximum building height of multi-family dwellings in the R-8 zoning district of 50 feet, and the applicant is requesting a maximum height of 60 feet.
- The UDO requires public recreation at a rate of 1,250 square feet per dwelling unit with the multi-family private recreation of 750 square feet per dwelling unit and private open space of 1,000 per dwelling unit. The proposed development would require 11.83 acres of public recreation, 5.51 acres of private recreation, and 7.34 acres of open space. The applicant proposed providing 1.77 acres of private recreation and 7.08 acres of open space. As a condition of the zoned district, they also proposed a 7.43-acre lot be dedicated to the City for future development in lieu of the remaining required public recreation space, private recreation space, and open space.
- The applicant proposes the condition that sewer flow for multi-family buildings 1 and 2 be allocated in 2024 and sewer flow for buildings 3 and 4 be allocated in 2025. This request exceeds requirements of the City's Accumulated Paper Flow Policy, but staff agrees to the request due to the number of units in each building not fitting the policy and the timing of when the buildings would be constructed.

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

The site-specific plan and staff report are provided in the meeting agenda packet available [here](#).

Rachel Gaffney provided a more detailed overview and PowerPoint presentation of the request.

Amanda Hodierne, spoke on behalf of the applicants, stating that although there are two LLCs listed with the request, they are the same developer and builder team who purchased the properties about a year ago. The properties along Mebane Oaks Road were purchased in November of 2021 and the interior properties were purchased in April of 2022. She provided that although the project was considered by the Planning Board in 2020, the project before them now has new developers for the project. She introduced the team of Frank Forde and John McDonald from Evolve, Aden Stoltzfus as Civil Engineer, and Chase Smith as Traffic Engineer.

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

Amanda Hodierne continued to provide a more detailed overview and PowerPoint presentation of the request.



Aden Stoltzfus, with Stoltzfus Engineering, explained that the Finished Floor Elevation of the apartments would be at or sit below Mebane Oaks Road due to the slope of the property. He explained that the apartments were placed on the east side of the development to allow closer access to Mebane Oaks Road and the retail businesses along it. Aden Stoltzfus also provided that on the west side, the single-family homes would be standard R-8-zoned lot sizes overseen by a Homeowners Association (HOA) for maintaining the common areas. He said that a neighborhood meeting had been held and concerns with traffic going onto Longleaf Pine Place were addressed by providing a stop condition before entering the Arbor Creek Subdivision. He also stated that the project was phased in a way to start at Mebane Oaks Road and work back to the single-family portion that connects to Longleaf Pine Place to reduce traffic flow.

Chase Smith, from Ramey Kemp Associates, reviewed the process for initiating the traffic impact analysis. He indicated his firm collected information from the City and NCDOT regarding current and future developments including NCDOT projects in the area. Mr. Smith stated that the traffic report showed some necessary improvements such as the addition of a traffic light and turn lanes on Mebane Oaks Road.

Amanda Hodierné provided an overview of the architecture for the apartments and single-family homes. She stated that one of the concerns brought up in the neighborhood meeting was the lack of a recreation area for the single-family homes, which has since been updated to include a playground.

Judy Taylor asked if the traffic analysis had also looked at the impact to Old Hillsborough Road as well as access to the elementary school. Chase Smith responded that the City and NCDOT did not require the traffic study to go farther west on Old Hillsborough Road and determined that for the school, most of the traffic would be centered around Mebane Oaks Road with the traffic light. Judy Taylor commented that she saw more people going through the connected neighborhoods out to Old Hillsborough since Mebane Oaks was very congested during peak hours of the day. She also mentioned that another light on Mebane Oaks would almost put a signal at every quarter of a mile, and that the number of lights should be looked at in further discussions.

Amanda Hodierné commented that Chase Smith explained the traffic analysis process included the City and NCDOT, so it was not just the developers looking at the area. She said that together they determine the study area and consider current and future developments and consider the recommended improvements, including the traffic signal and signal synchronization.

Judy Taylor also voiced her concern about the lack of open space provided. She said that the development was required to provide 11.83 acres of public recreation space, 5.51 acres of private recreation space, and 7.34 acres of open space, but was only providing 1.77 acres of private



recreation and asking to use the 7.43 acres dedicated to the City to meet the remainder of the requirements.

Amanda Hodiernie replied that the plan was the best way to harmonize and meet the City's goals and objectives. She stated that the multi-family community had an amenity package that was more condensed. She provided that the amenity package included a courtyard pool area, two dog-parks, and grilling stations. She also said that with only 96 single-family homes, HOA funds would best support a smaller community gathering space. Amanda Hodiernie indicated that the dedicated lot would have been just undeveloped open space, leading to a dedication of the land to the City for a better use for the community as a whole.

Judy Taylor commented that it was her concern that there was not enough recreation space for the children in the single-family area and that a police station, if developed, would take away the open green space. She provided that the open space requirement was part of the Comprehensive Plan to provide large spaces for recreation. Amanda Hodiernie replied that she understood the concern but noted land dedication to the City is for future development including, but not limited to a police station, meaning it might be utilized for public recreation by the City.

Ashley Ownbey clarified that the applicant was providing 1.77 acres for private recreation and 7.08 acres of private open space.

Chair Tulauskas asked to talk about the variances and why the development could not adhere to the ordinance. Amana Hodiernie replied that the first variance regarding building height for the apartments was asked early on. She stated that with the final project style selected, they no longer require the variance since the buildings would fit within the fifty-foot height requirement. The variance was left in the request for a cushion. She explained that the roofs of the buildings would be flat but would require a parapet wall to screen HVAC equipment possibly exceeding fifty feet with the varying roofline.

Aden Stoltzfus provided that the initial designs were looking at A-frame roofs, which was later changed to flat roofs. He stated that the architect said the buildings with the parapet walls would be within fifty feet. Mr. Stoltzfus then asked Ashley Ownbey if the parapet would count as the roof line. Ms. Ownbey responded she would have to look at exact wording of the ordinance and requested condition.

David Scott asked if there would be elevators in the apartment buildings. Amanda Hodiernie responded that all buildings would all have elevators.

Frank Forde, with Evolve, said that the development was a great transition from busy Mebane Oaks Road back to the other residential developments. He said that although Mebane Oaks was



congested now due to construction, that eventually it looked like it would be a beautiful road that would run more smoothly. He also mentioned that he understood the traffic concerns between the developments, but that there were several points to slow down traffic, deterring people from cutting through the development to get to Old Hillsborough Road.

Judy Taylor commented that her concern on Old Hillsborough was for the intersection at NC 119, which gets very congested with school traffic. Frank Forde replied that Chase Smith may provide additional information but he did know that NCDOT was planning to adjust the signal timing of all the lights including at the intersection of Old Hillsborough Road and Mebane Oaks Road. Judy Taylor asked if the traffic study included the intersection of Old Hillsborough Road and NC 119. Frank Forde replied that they were not required to do include that intersection in the traffic study.

Chair Tulauskas opened the floor for public comment.

Louise Bryan, 1301 Yellow Wood Drive, asked the applicants what the price point of the apartments were, who would maintain the entrance from the development into the adjoining neighborhood, what recourses existed if new development was not maintained, how the traffic would be mitigated to maintain the 25-mph speed limit with the new development, information on Mebane Housing, LLC, who the developer was, would changes be allowed after construction of the development started, and if connection to water and sewer would bring more construction to Longleaf Pine Place. She also commented that there were no public parks located on the south side of Mebane.

Ashley Abashian, 975 Sugar Tree Drive, expressed concern with the density of the development and commented that a regular R-12 zoned single-family home development would alleviate some of the density concerns.

Ray Oliver, 909 Sugar Tree Drive, who is also president of the HOA in the Arbor Creek neighborhood, shared concerns that the single-family homes in phase four would be under a separate developer and the rezoning of the property would allow the new developer to add more multi-family. He also stated that the single-family area would be more likely to use Arbor Creek's amenities than walking up to the development common area near the main boulevard.

Brenda Buchannon, 1143 Dartmouth Drive, spoke of traffic concerns mostly on Old Hillsborough Road.

David Scott asked if the NCDOT funded improvements continued to Old Hillsborough Road. Ashley Ownbey replied that NCDOT did not have funded improvements on Mebane Oaks Road to Old Hillsborough Road. David Scott also asked if the improvements went down to the proposed site. Ashley Ownbey replied that they only go down to the area of Duke Medical and Modwash.





Preethi White, 965 Sweet Gum Way, shared concerns with additional traffic and City amenities with development and schools south of the interstate.

Charles Stancati, 1034 Longleaf Pine Place, described concerns with additional traffic through the neighborhoods.

Susan Huey, 3914 Longmeadow Drive, spoke of school capacity concerns, lack of open green space, more development, water resources, and traffic.

Stan Kesler, 912 Palm Court, indicated concerns about Summit Church traffic on the corner of Old Hillsborough Road, the lack of recreational space, and density.

Don Windsor, 4253 Old Hillsborough Road, spoke of concerns with traffic and more development along Old Hillsborough Road. He asked about the current population of Mebane. Ashley Ownbey replied that it was at or above 20,000 residents. She stated the North Carolina Census Bureau reported close to 18,000 residents in 2020. Considering residential permit data, the population is now expected to be closer to 20,000.

Brian Dixon, 3905 Longmeadow Drive, shared concerns with development in the proposed location and the ability of current infrastructure to support the development.

Tom Boney Jr., Alamance News, asked the origin of dedicating the 7.43-acre lot to the City, if it was voluntarily provided or if the City asked for it.

Ashley Ownbey responded on behalf of staff to items mentioned during the public comment period, beginning with the first applicant's question of who would maintain the connection between Arbor Creek and the new development. She replied both streets would be City-maintained. Judy Taylor commented that she understood that the resident was more concerned with any signs or landscaping maintenance, which was outlined in the plans as being HOA maintained.

Ashley Ownbey replied to the question of changes to the plan, reviewing that with the rezoning being site-specific, only minor changes could be approved by staff. She stated that any major changes to the street network, number of homes, open space, or more would have to go back through the Planning Board and City Council for approval. Ashley Ownbey also provided in response to comments on amenities, that the developer was providing a playground for the single-family section and other amenities for the multi-family section.

Ashley Ownbey addressed the concern with the scoping process for the traffic analysis by reviewing that the City partners with NCDOT who are the experts and help determine which intersections are too far out of the scope of a traffic study. She said that the City and the State had to be careful about





the burden of improvements placed on developments and that the developer was already making significant improvements around the immediate area of their development. Ashley Ownbey also stated that regarding the school capacity comments, the school systems are invited to participate in the Technical Review Committee and are aware of incoming developments.

Ashley Ownbey clarified the concern of people not being notified, with the fact that only those located within 300 feet of the property being rezoned receive notification letters. She then clarified again that the developer was providing 1.77 acres of private recreation and is required to provide just over 5-acres, 7.08 acres of open space and is required to provide 7.34 acres of open space and is required to provide more than 11 acres of public recreation but is proposing dedication of a 7.43-acre lot. She said that, in response to Mr. Boney's question, the original plans brought to the Planning Board in November of 2020 were recommended by the Board for the denial partially due to the proposed density. She said the City received a resubmittal after the Planning Board meeting with the plans showing decreased density and the dedicated land as an undeveloped park. Ashley Ownbey then said that when the development changed hands, that she was not part of the conversations at that time about the City potentially locating a police station on that lot. Tom Boney Jr. asked if the police station was not originally intended for Mebane Oaks Road. Ashley Ownbey replied that she could not respond to that question since she was not in those original meetings and said that the developer might be able to answer the question.

Frank Forde responded that Evolve had taken over the project from the previous developer who had already proposed to dedicate that land to the City. Evolve did not want to remove the dedication when taking over the project. He also clarified again that the land could be used as a public park, but it was up to the City. Frank Forde answered the comments about changing development after plans have gone through review by saying that the plans presented were what would be followed. He next addressed the concerns of the traffic study by again saying that the study was within the rules laid out by the City and NCDOT, with the NCDOT determining what happens on Mebane Oaks Road. He addressed the density concern by stating that they could have fit about 129 single-family homes on the property but were proposing 96 single-family homes.

Amanda Hodierne replied to comments about why the development was not all single-family homes by saying the portion where the apartments were located was currently zoned commercial not residential. Kurt Pearson commented that what was said earlier was "that B-2 allows for some density", but what the public commented on was that some density was not 500 plus units. Amanda Hodierne replied that she was just making the point of having single-family along Mebane Oaks Road was too much of a jump in harmony. Kurt Pearson responded that the applicant was making a jump to think with the current B-2 zoning the City's support of an intense use means 500 plus units.

Amanda Hodierne then addressed the comments that the R-8 zoning was taken into consideration by looking at the adjoining neighbors who were R-12 with a Special Use Permit that allowed for



7,700 square foot lots. Evolve is proposing to develop 96 lots with a standard 8,000 square foot lot without a Special Use Permit. Amanda Hodierne clarified that the development would be held to the buffers required. She clarified that they would keep as much existing vegetation as possible and would replace what was required for the buffers.

Amanda Hodierne clarified the open space again by saying that the open space requirement was 7.34 acres, and they were providing 7.08 which was less than one acre difference. She said the development is required to provide 5.01 acres of private recreation space and is proposing 1.77 acres. She clarified that the amenities for the apartments were condensed and not taking up as much acreage. Ms. Hodierne stated that the 7.43 acres proposed to be dedicated to the City was initially proposed as a City park per the previous developer. The dedication now allows the City more flexibility to decide what goes on the lot. Judy Taylor commented that even with the land dedication, there were still 8 acres missing from the required recreation space. Amanda Hodierne replied that they were applying for a waiver of those 8 acres and said she was just providing context as to why the development did not meet the 11.83-acre requirement.

Judy Taylor asked if Amanda Hodierne could speak about the price points of the apartments in response to a question presented by the public. Amanda Hodierne replied that although it was not a factor of the rezoning case, she could present that the apartments would be at market rate and not low-income. She mentioned that the rental rate in Mebane was currently around 96%, and the price rates could change within the two years before the apartments were completed.

Tom Boney, Jr. asked if the applicant could provide a more detailed price point for the apartments and single-family homes even though it was not a requirement to provide for the rezoning. Frank Forde answered that he could not provide exact rates since the development would not be done until 2024, but provided that the apartments would be at market price not low-income. He said the apartments might be anywhere between \$1,500-\$1,600 and \$2,200-\$2,400. He said for the single-family they would still be around market price possibly using \$200 per square foot for 2,200-2,400 square foot homes, which would be built in 2026 or later.

Amanda Hodierne responded to another comment about construction traffic into the adjoining property. She said that the connection was in phase four being last built with the intention that construction traffic would not be able to cut through existing neighborhoods.

Kurt Pearson commented he was concerned about the ratio of apartments to single-family homes being too high and questioned staff's response to an email he had sent for data. He said a study should be done on the ratio of apartments to single-family homes in a city of Mebane's size. Kurt Pearson commented that it was inappropriate to move forward with adding more apartments without a study being done. He said that the Board and Council needed to know that there wouldn't be too high of a ratio that would be unhealthy for the City. His first argument was the fact that the



Planning Board had the authority to decide how they wanted Mebane to grow. He made the point that he understood the hardship of the developer going through the TRC review process six times, but that the Committee was looking at the technicalities of the plan whereas the Planning Board was looking at if the development worked or fit. He said that waivers should not be necessary since the Mebane UDO had reasonable minimum requirements. Kurt Pearson expressed concern about an additional 320 apartment units being provided without the City completing a study of the share of multi-family in Mebane. He reported on his own research of current apartment units available or coming available in Mebane. He found that 119 South had 18 units available, Deerfield Crossing 3 units, Spring Forest 10 units, Alexandre Pointe 8 units, Fieldstone 7 units, Stoneybrook 35 units, Keystone 40 units, Carden Place 27 units, Arrowhead 2 units, McPherson (Mebane Downs) 1 unit, Elmwood 1 unit, and Ashbury 11 units. He also found available apartments in Graham, which added to available apartments in Mebane totaled 235 available units.

Ashley Ownbey responded that research was provided prior to the meeting with the updated census data added to the previous information shared at the October City Council meeting. She said she had gone over the information when the Kingsdown development was considered with data showing the current share of apartments at 33 percent and ten years in the future down to 30 percent with projects approved. Kurt Pearson asked if the 33 percent included Evolve. Ashley Ownbey replied that the current rate was 68 percent single-family and 32 percent multi-family. She stated that adding the approved single-family and multi-family projects, the rate was 70 percent and 30 percent including Evolve. Kurt Pearson commented that he thought 30 percent was still too many apartments. Ashley Ownbey pointed out that Staff had provided the Board with current occupancy rates prior to the meeting showing a total of 111 units available at a 96 percent occupancy rate.

Ashley Ownbey provided a response to Kurt Pearson's comment about the TRC only reviewing for technicalities. She stated that staff also review all of Mebane's long-range plans when reviewing the projects and ensure goals from the Comprehensive Plan are considered. She also stated that updates to the Comprehensive Plan would occur soon, and a housing study could be a component of those updates. Kurt Pearson replied that he did not see the development being harmonious with R-12 and R-20 zoned properties abutting it.

Colin Cannell asked the developers if the cut through to the Arbor Creek Subdivision was critical to the development. Amanda Hodierne replied that it was required by the City for connectivity. Colin Cannell also commented that as a citizen, he had observed that the City did not typically buy land due to high costs but was looking for land to support a police station for administrative services. He said that the City was looking at several properties, but most were deemed too expensive for the City. He said he was concerned that since there was land dedicated to the City on the site plan, the City Council would feel compelled to approve the rezoning based on that alone. Kurt Pearson replied that would be inappropriate, and the City Council would never consider approval just for dedicated land.



David Scott asked the developer why the front portion already zoned for commercial was proposed instead for multi-family residential. He mentioned that he had developed some of the first apartments in Mebane on Deerfield Trace and was not against apartments. He also commented that Mebane needs more retail and Mebane Oaks already had retail along it. Frank Forde responded that the initial developer had plans to leave the front portion as commercial, but his company did not deal with commercial properties which was why the apartments were considered. He also commented that the styling of the apartments created connectivity with the surrounding retail.

Frank Forde also responded to Kurt Pearson's comments, reporting that looking online at single-family homes available in Mebane, there were about 500 listings from four websites. He said the number of units currently available for apartments does not constitute whether apartments are needed in Mebane. Kurt Pearson responded that the question was not if the apartments would be filled, but whether the City wanted the apartments filled.

Amanda Hodierno addressed David Scott's question about the commercial component by saying within the last two years of planning, there was a shift for more housing over small space retail. She also stated that the developer does rely on the information provided in Mebane's long-range plans to determine the need for different types of housing. She also commented that as Ashley Ownbey said, the housing aspect could be considered in the Comprehensive Plan updates for developers to better understand what the City desires. Kurt Pearson replied that Mebane could say they had good diversity in housing but thought there was an over-diversity in apartments.

Kurt Pearson made a motion to deny the R-8(CD) zoning request for the proposed Evolve at Mebane Oaks as follows:

*Motion to deny the R-8(CD) zoning as presented due to the lack of:*

- a) Harmony with the surrounding zoning or land use; and,*
- b) Concerns expressed earlier about the number of apartments in Mebane.*

After making the motion, Mr. Pearson stated "if you go against my motion then what you're telling the Council is you are for the project."

Judy Taylor seconded the motion, with a 5-2 vote in support of recommending denial. Colin Cannell and David Scott opposed the denial.

Chairman Tulauskas noted that the request will go to City Council on August 7 at 6 p.m.

## **8. New Business**

Ashley Ownbey alerted the Planning Board that they would be receiving emails from staff to set up and activate City email accounts. She said Staff would be resetting all passwords and would be sending out new instructions and procedures.



# Planning Board

Minutes to the Meeting  
July 17, 2023, 6:30 p.m.

---

Ashley Ownbey also stated that the Board would receive an email about updating the Planning Board Rules and Procedures. She said that it was last updated in 1999. Review and discussion will occur at a future meeting.

## **9. Adjournment**

Chairman Tulauskas adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:24 p.m.