



Land Use Board

February 24, 2026

Meeting Minutes

The Union County Land Use Board met in regular session on February 24, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. in the Union County Government Center, 1st Floor Board Room, 500 N. Main Street.

Present: Chairman Darren Greene, Vice Chair Rick Davis, Derrick Austin, Doug McClew, Drew Medlin, Mark Tilley, Charles Walkup, Jr and alternates David Brooks and Rick Marshfield.

Also Present: Planning Director Lee Jenson, Senior Planner John Wear and Land Use Board Clerk Amy Griffin.

Call to Order: Chairman Darren Greene called the meeting to order.

(a) Pledge of Allegiance and Moment of Reflection: The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and Vice Chair Rick Davis gave the prayer.

Oath of Office: Regular Member Drew Medlin and alternate Rick Marshfield took the oath of office.

Establish Voting Members: Chairman Greene noted there was a quorum with all seven members in attendance.

Additions and/or Deletions to the Agenda: Doug McClew made a motion to approve the agenda and Charles Walkup Jr seconded it. Vote: Unanimously approved, 7-0.

Approval of the Minutes: Doug McClew made and Charles Walkup Jr seconded to approve the December 16, 2025 meeting minutes. Vote: Unanimously approved, 7-0.

Public Hearing:

Planning Staff Report - Rezoning Case # RZ-2026-002

Staff Contact: John Wear, Senior Planner

Summary of Request

This case is requesting to rezone one parcel totaling 0.5 acres appearing on the tax map as tax parcel 04-198-014A located on Richardson Rd from RA-40 to R-15. The rezoning request is a straight rezoning, so there are no conditions associated with this request.

Planning Department
500 North Main Street Suite 70
Monroe, NC 28112
T 704.283.3565

unioncountync.gov

Owner/Applicant

Owner: Augustine Properties, LLC
4311 Fox Brook Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211

Applicant: Augustine Properties, LLC
4311 Fox Brook Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211

Property Information

Location: On the west side of Richardson Road south of Griffith Road. Location more specifically described as tax parcel 04-198-014A.

Municipal Proximity: The site is 3.5 miles south of the City of Monroe.

Existing Land Use and Development Status: The parcel is currently zoned RA-40 and is undeveloped.

Environmental Features: There are no streams, wetlands or floodplains on the site. There is a stream that runs to the north of the property.

Utilities: Public water and sewer are not available at the site.

Zoning and Land Use History: The parcel site has been zoned RA-40 since zoning was initiated. The overall density within the R-40 zoning district is one dwelling per 40,000 square feet, compared to 15,000 square feet in R-15. The parcel was created by deed and does not meet the lot size requirements of the RA-40 district and would not be able to be utilized for single-family residential without rezoning. There are currently two parcels with R-8 zoning approximately 750 feet south of the site on Richardson Road and they are used as manufactured housing developments. The R-8 zoning was originally intended to be a floating district for the purpose of allowing manufactured home parks. A third parcel, approximately 800 feet north of the site on Richardson Road is also a manufactured housing development, with eight units on approximately 1.5 acres.

Schools: Because this rezoning request is for one lot that will create a maximum of one house, UCPS was not consulted for comments.

Transportation: This site is on Richardson Road, which is a NCDOT-maintained facility. This section of Richardson Road carries approximately 500 vehicles per day. There are no funded road improvement projects in the immediate vicinity of the rezoning. A traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was not required for this rezoning.

Planning Documents

Union County Comprehensive Plan: The Union County 2050 comprehensive plan identifies this area as Rural Residential which includes agricultural and residential uses on minimum 40,000 SF lots. The proposed

zoning district is not consistent with that, but there are existing R-8 zoned parcels within the vicinity. The lot does have existing septic and well permits approved by Union County Environmental Health, so it will accommodate a home if it can meet setbacks.

Public and Municipal Comments

Public Comments: A community meeting was not required since this is not a conditional rezoning request.

Municipal Comments: Monroe was not consulted due to the distance to their municipal limits.

Staff Comments and Recommendation

This part of Union County is identified for rural residential and agricultural land uses. Because this is a straight rezoning request, all potential uses must be considered when making a recommendation. The lack of utilities requires that septic and well be located on the lot. The lot does have existing septic and well permits approved by Union County Environmental Health, so it will accommodate a home if it can meet setbacks. Larger lot zoning requirements in rural areas partially exist to ensure lots will provide adequate spacing. Additionally, the property wasn't originally approved through the subdivision process and will require a subsequent subdivision to make it a buildable lot, which will be possible with an R-15 zoning. The rezoning does not propose new uses from what area already occurring in the immediate vicinity. The proposed use is a single-family residence on a single tract of land, which is consistent with current use of many of the adjacent properties. There are currently occasional parcels with R-8 zoning along Richardson Road, which have not caused hardship or concern with nearby residents. Rural Residential districts generally contemplate residential uses with a development density of no more than one unit per acre. Rezoning to smaller lot sizes can set a precedent for future rezoning requests. **Because of these aspects of the development, staff recommend denial of this rezoning application.**

Key Details:

- Existing development in the vicinity includes single-family homes and a manufactured home park along Richardson Road.
- Public water and sewer are not available; development would rely on private well and septic systems.
- Environmental Health confirmed the site has been tested and approved for well and septic suitability.

Applicant Presentation – Amy Augustine and business partner Ted Makuch:

- Stated their intent to construct and sell a single-family home on the property.

Public Comments:

- One resident, Thomas Perry, a neighboring property owner spoke in opposition, citing concerns regarding increased development, road infrastructure, and impacts to farmland and wells.

Board Discussion:

- Board members discussed the proposal, including concerns about precedent, infrastructure limitations, and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

Board Action:

Motion: Recommend approval of rezoning RZ-2026-002 by Charles Walkup, Jr, Second: Doug McClew.

Vote: Motion carried, 6-1 (Mark Tilley in opposition)

Outcome: Approval Recommended

Planning Staff Report – Minor Subdivision Ordinance Discussion

Staff Contact: Lee Jenson, Planning Director

Summary of Request

Planning staff provided an overview of the minor subdivision process and the difference between minor and major subdivisions under the County ordinance. Staff indicated the Board of County Commissioners requested the Land Use Board review the process and consider possible ordinance changes.

The presentation was informational, and staff recommended the Board review the information and consider stakeholder input before making formal recommendations.

Key Discussion Points:

- Review of Subdivision Definitions: Staff reviewed ordinance definitions for *subdivision, tract, and lot* to clarify how land divisions are legally classified under the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).
- Minor vs. Major Subdivision Threshold: A minor subdivision is defined as creating no more than eight lots under ten acres from a single tract, while anything exceeding that threshold is considered a major subdivision.
- 1978 Parent Parcel Date: Discussion referenced the February 14, 1978 parent parcel date, which determines how land divisions are counted and how many lots can be created from an original tract.
- Infrastructure Triggers Major Subdivision: Even if fewer than eight lots are created, the subdivision becomes major if it requires new infrastructure such as roads, water lines, or sewer lines.
- Board Direction and Next Steps: The Board of County Commissioners asked staff and the Land Use Board to review the current ordinance and develop recommendations, with the expectation that the board would gather input and continue discussion in future meetings rather than make a decision immediately.

Public Comments:

- Michelle Evans, the President of the Union County Association of Realtors, noted that some growing rural counties use an aggregation rule that evaluates multiple small land divisions from the same tract together to prevent circumventing subdivision regulations, and emphasized that subdivision rules can affect housing affordability, particularly for first-time homebuyers.
- Ryan McGee, a local home builder, commented that the cost and approval timeline for small subdivisions can be similar to large projects, which may discourage smaller developments. He encouraged the County to consider ordinance adjustments that support smaller-scale, locally built housing options.

Planning Staff Report: There were no comments from staff.

Brief Comments: There were no comments from the Board.

Close: With no further discussions, Doug McClew made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Charles Walkup, Jr. It passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.