



Land Use Board

June 9, 2026

Meeting Minutes

The Union County Land Use Board met in regular session on June 9, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. in the Union County Government Center, 1st Floor Board Room, 500 N. Main Street.

Present: Vice Chairman Rick Davis, Mark Tilley, Charles Walkup, Jr., and alternate Rick Marshfield.

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

Call to Order: Vice Chairman Rick Davis called the meeting to order.

(a) Pledge of Allegiance and Moment of Reflection: The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and Mark Tilley gave the prayer.

Establish Voting Members: Vice Chairman Rick Davis noted there would be a quorum with four members including alternate Rick Marshfield.

Additions and/or Deletions to the Agenda: Charles Walkup, Jr. made a motion to approve the agenda and Vice Chairman Rick Davis seconded it. Vote: Unanimously approved, 4-0.

Approval of the Minutes: Charles Walkup, Jr. made a motion to approve the May 19, 2026 minutes and Mark Tilley seconded it. Vote: Unanimously approved, 4-0.

Public Hearing:

Planning Staff Report – Text Amendment to Sections 25.010 Table of Allowed Uses, Section 25.020-I Other Use Category, 30.210 Data Centers, and 32.220 Crypto Mining Operations of the Union County Development Ordinance

Staff Contact: Lee Jenson, Planning Director

Summary of Request

Proposed regulations for data centers and cryptocurrency mining operations within the Heavy Industrial zoning district.

Staff Comments and Recommendation

Lee Jenson explained to the Board that currently the County's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) did not contain regulations addressing data centers or crypto mining. He then went into an explanation of both.

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

unioncountync.gov

Board Discussion:

- Groundwater well usage
- Wastewater
- Board members reviewed proposed buffering, including the berm and sound-absorbing wall.
- Questions were asked regarding tenant types, parking lot activity, veterinary operations, and potential future uses.
- Additional discussion centered on limiting dumpster collection hours to reduce impacts on nearby residents.

Board Action:

Motion: Mark Tilley recommended approval of TXT-2026-002 with the following additional conditions:

- Additional research regarding groundwater well restrictions.
- Wastewater disposal requirements.

Second: Rick Marshfield

Vote: Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

Planning Staff Report – Minor Subdivision Discussion

Staff Contact: Lee Jenson, Planning Director

Summary of Request

Planning staff continued the discussion regarding minor subdivision standards as requested by the Board of County Commissioners. The purpose of this meeting was to further evaluate the definition of a lot, the impact of parent parcels divided by public roads, the minor versus major subdivision threshold, and family subdivision provisions. Staff also presented research from peer counties regarding subdivision thresholds and related regulations.

The Board discussed the potential implications of modifying the current ordinance, including balancing property rights with development review standards and determining whether additional review requirements should apply when parent parcels are divided by public roads. Due to limited Board attendance, members expressed a preference to continue the discussion at a future meeting when a larger Board was present.

Key Discussion Points:

- **Definition of a Lot and Road-Split Parcels:** Staff reviewed the current UDO definition that treats a parent parcel divided by a public road as separate lots for subdivision purposes. Discussion focused on whether this creates a loophole allowing up to sixteen lots through the minor subdivision process rather than requiring major subdivision review.
- **Property Rights and Road Impacts:** Board members discussed situations where public projects, such as the Monroe Expressway or future railroad extensions, divide existing property. Some

members expressed concern that changing the ordinance could unfairly impact property owners whose land was split through no action of their own.

- **Minor vs. Major Subdivision Threshold:** Staff presented examples from peer counties showing thresholds ranging from three to twenty lots, with many counties using a five-lot standard. Board members generally expressed support for maintaining the current eight-lot threshold but discussed alternative approaches, including increasing the threshold while limiting road-split parcels to a single overall allotment.
- **1978 Parent Parcel Reset Concept:** Staff revisited the previously discussed concept of replacing the February 14, 1978 parent parcel date with a lot-of-record approach and implementing a ten-year reset period. Staff noted that previous Board discussions had generally supported this concept.
- **Need for Full Board Participation:** Several members stated they were uncomfortable making recommendations on significant ordinance changes with only four voting members present. The Board agreed that future discussion should occur when more members were available to participate.

Board Discussion & Concerns

- **Balancing Development and Property Rights:** Members discussed the need to balance development oversight with the rights of property owners, particularly those affected by public infrastructure projects.
- **Subdivision Review Requirements:** Discussion focused on whether larger developments created through road-split parcels should be subject to the additional review standards required of major subdivisions, including open space and agency review requirements.
- **Future Consideration:** Members requested that the item return at a future meeting when a fuller Board could participate in the discussion and provide broader input.

Board Action: No formal recommendation was made.

Planning Staff Report: Planning Director Lee Jenson let the Board know that both the House of Pearls rezoning and Marcham rezoning were passed by the Board of County Commissioners at their last meeting.

Brief Comments: There were none.

Close: With no further discussions, Mark Tilley made a motion to adjourn, and Rick Marshfield seconded. It passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.