



Union County, NC

Land Use Board

Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, April 21, 2026

6:00 PM

Board Room, First Floor

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance and Moment of Reflection

Establish Voting Members

Additions and/or Deletions to the Agenda

Approval of the Agenda

Agenda Item(s)

[26-201](#)

Rezoning Petition CZ-2026-006 House of Pearls

DETERMINATION OF CONFLICTS

INFORMATION CONTACT:

John E. Wear, Senior Planner

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommend approval or denial of proposed rezoning to the Board of Commissioners

BACKGROUND:

This case is a request to rezone an approximately 10.92 acre portion of one parcel totaling 12.21 acres appearing on the tax map as tax parcel 02-226-017 located on Camden Road from RA-40 with Master Planned Development. The request is to develop a long-term residential drug rehabilitation facility for up to 80 residents and staff. The rezoning request is a conditional rezoning and includes the following conditions:

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

None

Attachments: [2026-CZ-006 House of Pearls - Zoning Application](#)
[2026-CZ-006 House of Pearls - Letter of Intent](#)
[2026-CZ-006 House of Pearls - Site Plan](#)
[2026-CZ-006 House of Pearls LUB Staff report](#)
[Land Use Board Advisory Consistency and Reasonableness Statements - CZ-2026-006 \(House of Pearls\)](#)

26-200**Rezoning Petition CZ-2026-001 Marcham****DETERMINATION OF CONFLICTS****INFORMATION CONTACT:**

John E. Wear, Senior Planner

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommend approval or denial or proposed rezoning to the Board of Commissioners

BACKGROUND:

This case is requesting to rezone one parcel totaling 5 acres appearing on the tax map as tax parcel 09-414-109A along NC 75 from RA-40 to Light Industrial (LI) CZ with Amended Conditions in order to develop a landscaping supply business and limited construction equipment storage. The rezoning will include the following conditions:

The rezoning will include the following conditions:

- 1) Limited to approved site plan dated March 6, 2026
- 2) Uses limited to landscaping supply business and construction equipment storage
- 3) Five-year vesting of development rights
- 4) Development will meet all requirements of the Union County Unified Development Ordinance on the date of approval
- 5) Access may be restricted to right in right out in the future, at the discretion of the NCDOT, based on safety issues that may be created by this site

A community meeting was required and was held on March 30, 2026. A total of six residents attended the meeting and asked questions about fencing, lighting, traffic and stormwater impacts. No changes were made to the site plan as a result of the meeting.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

None

Attachments: [2026-CZ-001 Marcham application redacted 1-12-26](#)
[2026-CZ-001 Marcham letter of intent 1-2-26](#)
[2026-CZ-001 Marcham community meeting minute March 2](#)
[Marcham 5 year vesting request 4-3-26](#)
[2026-04-07 Stone Pro-Sketch Plan](#)
[2026-CZ-001 Marcham Real Estate Impact Report March 2](#)
[2026-CZ-001 Marcham special permit response 3-25-26](#)
[2026-CZ-001 Marcham LUB Staff report](#)

26-237

Minor Subdivision Discussion

DETERMINATION OF CONFLICTS

INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lee Jenson, Planning Department, Director, 704-283-3564

ACTION REQUESTED:

Continue discussion of subdivision standards.

BACKGROUND:

The Board, at their February 17, 2026, meeting, following a discussion about minor subdivisions, directed staff to bring back possible changes to the minor subdivision provisions of the UDO. The Land Use Board discussed various provisions of the UDO at their February 24, 2026, meeting, and decided to have more detailed discussions about pertinent sections of the UDO over the coming months. The Land Use Board discussed the topics below at their March 17, 2026, meeting and decided to continue much of the discussion into April. This month the following topics will be discussed in more depth:

1. Discussion of the UDO definition of "Lot" in Section 105.130.
 - a. No decisions were made. The LUB wanted to continue discussions on this item.
2. Discussion of minor vs. major lot threshold/parent parcel date
 - a. The LUB decided that they were comfortable with the existing language of the parent parcel but wanted to discuss the minor subdivision lot threshold a little more and wanted information on how other counties define a minor subdivision.
3. Family subdivision exception discussion
 - a. The LUB wanted information on how other counties deal with family subdivisions

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

None.

Attachments: [Minor subdivision discussion LUB 4-21-26](#)

Planning Staff Report

Brief Comments

Adjournment