Board Chair:
Rodney Cheek

Planning Director:
Matthew Hoagland

Alamance County Development Center
Conference Room
1946 Martin Street
Burlington, NC 27215
November 12, 2026 at 6:30 PM

ALAMANCE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
AGENDA

Livestream: https://www.youtube.com/@alamancecoplanning9852

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

A. October 8, 2026 Regular Meeting

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS*

V. BOARD/COMMISSIONER RESPONSES

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Full U.D.O. Revision Draft (November 2026)

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Planning Board applications review and recommendation

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS/DISCUSSION

A. Annual Holiday Social

IX. ADJOURNMENT

(Public Comments Procedures)

1. *Those wishing to make public comments should sign-in prior to the meeting.*
2. *In order to be fair and ensure that all citizens wishing to speak may be heard, the Chair may place time limits on public comments.*
3. *Any further discussion by the public on a given agenda item is subject to the discretion of the Chair of the Planning Board..*

Board Chair:
Rodney Cheek

Planning Director:
Matthew Hoagland

Alamance County Development Center
Conference Room
1946 Martin Street
Burlington, NC 27215
October 8, 2026 at 6:30 PM

ALAMANCE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
Meeting Minutes

Livestream: https://www.youtube.com/@alamancecoplanning9852

Members' Present: Amie Perkins, Stephen Dodson, Lee Kimrey, Rodney Cheek, Lee Isley, Richard Tom King, Henry Chandler
Members' Absent: Mac Jordan, Ernest Bare

Staff Present: *Planning Director*: Matthew Hoagland, *Assistant County Manager:* Brian Baker, *County Attorney:* Rik Stevens, *Assistant County Attorney*: Michelle Horn, *Planner 1:* Keyshawn Haith

I. CALL TO ORDER
The Meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM.

II. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
A. September 10, 2026 Regular Meeting

A correction was noted on page 5 of the PDF, the term "middle village" should be corrected to "Mill Village." A motion to approve the minutes was made by Tom King and seconded by Stephen Dodson. The board voted in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS*
Mr. Max Morgan introduced himself and shared concerns as a developer of working-class housing. He stated that the proposed zoning changes would make it harder for working-class residents to afford homes in Alamance County, forcing many to live outside the county despite working here. He expressed that the changes would prevent farmers from benefitting from selling their land and would instead favor higher-income newcomers such as doctors and lawyers. Morgan emphasized that growth is already coming from all directions and noted the potential impact of developments such as the Danville Casino. He argued that the proposal amounts to down-zoning and believes all landowners should be formally notified. Morgan criticized the lack of public awareness, saying very few residents know about the proposal and that information should be more accessible. He added that the county is no longer agriculturally dominant and that surrounding counties are reducing lot sizes while Alamance is doing the opposite. He urged the board to prepare for inevitable growth by pursuing investments in water and other infrastructure through available grants. He concluded by thanks

Mr. Philip Morgan spoke about his experience operating mobile home parks and began by expressing appreciation for the board's recent work on regulations that have benefited operators like himself. However, he shared concerns about the limited area designated under the proposed transitional "Blue Zone," noting that mobile home parks are increasingly valuable real estate and that the small zoning area restricts opportunities for responsible park owners. Morgan emphasized that the primary issue with many parks in

the county is neglect by their owners, not residents, and stated that he maintains high standards by conducting background, criminal, and credit checks. He explained that he supports enforcement actions against poorly maintained parks because they give responsible operators a bad reputation. Morgan also described how he actively cooperates with county staff on issues such as septic system problems. He urged the board to allow more space and flexibility for mobile home parks so that families, including elderly residents, can afford homes, noting that modern manufactured homes cost significantly more than in the past. Morgan explained that mobile home parks are an important and valuable real estate asset class and limiting opportunities for new parks or expansions would restrict landowners who could otherwise create well-maintained communities offering good housing options. He concluded by asking the board not to eliminate these opportunities and thanking them for their time.

Mr. Peter Childers addressed the board with two main topics of concern. His first topic focused on data centers. He noted that a previous data center in Hamlet was approved without residents being notified, claiming commissioners had entered into nondisclosure agreements. Childers expressed strong distrust of data center development, citing noise, pollution, minimal long-term employment, and the strain such projects place on local contractors during construction. He questioned whether a "no data center" option was being considered, what timeline the board was following during the current one-year moratorium, and how the board intended to define or regulate different sizes of data centers. He emphasized that small data centers have existed unnoticed for years, but large industrial-scale ones pose significant adverse effects, and he asked whether the board had identified and planned for those impacts. He stated he does not yet trust the board or the county commissioners on this issue. Childers then moved to his second topic: zoning. He said he watched the previous meeting and disagreed with comments from builders urging the board to "slow down," noting that his community has lived 30 years with no zoning or land-use protections. He argued that residents value their quality of life and deserve a stake in shaping development. While he acknowledges that development is inevitable, he said extremely dense projects undermine existing neighborhoods. He referenced a proposed development by Sasser that could generate thousands of daily vehicle trips, major water usage, and significant light pollution, all while being marketed as "quiet country living." Childers noted that residents could accept reasonable development, but large-scale high-density projects are unfair and damaging. He challenged statements made by a builder's representative who suggested that flushed wastewater returns directly to the aquifer, requesting the science behind such a claim. Childers emphasized ongoing tension between developers and residents, saying that the community is not advocating for no development, but for thoughtful, gradual growth that aligns with infrastructure capacity. He cited Highway 54 as already overburdened, asserting that new large developments would worsen traffic and strain infrastructure. He closed by urging the board to plan growth responsibly and thanked them for listening.

Mr. Matt Kirkpatrick spoke on two primary issues. He began by addressing the ongoing UDO revision process, noting that he and others have been attending meetings for about a year with the same purpose: to ensure that county ordinances protect residents from improperly placed industrial uses, which he described as destructive to surrounding communities through noise, ash, dust, and overall environmental harm. Kirkpatrick urged the board to evaluate all proposed changes with public health and welfare as the guiding principle, emphasizing that everyone has a stake in preserving quality of life. He warned that when industrial uses are permitted too close to residential areas, citizens are forced into conflicts that can escalate to legal battles, diminish community well-being, and deter investment, as few people wish to live where air, water, and road conditions feel unsafe or unhealthy. Kirkpatrick then read a letter submitted by Calandra

Salo of 4244 Jack's Creek Trail, who could not attend the meeting. In her letter, Salo asked that her comments be included in the official record for the board's discussion of the October UDO revision draft. She raised concerns about gaps in the draft definitions of landfills, noting that the current language addresses disposal but not processing activities such as grinding, mulching, composting, burning, or storage of materials before processing. She explained that state permitting distinguishes between disposal and processing and asked whether the omission was intentional. Salo recommended adding language to Section 6.4.2 requiring that any site conducting multiple regulated uses be classified at the highest applicable level, ensuring that processing activities cannot be overlooked simply because they occur on a landfill site. She also recommended updating the definition of "solid waste management facility" to automatically incorporate any future changes made by the State of North Carolina or the Department of Environmental Quality so that county regulations remain enforceable if terminology or permit types change. Salo asked that her letter and her questions about the omissions be officially entered into the meeting minutes. Kirkpatrick concluded by thanking the board for their work.

Mr. Alan Figus spoke in reference to the UDO guidelines, echoing earlier concerns about whether the proposed changes will truly enhance the protection, well-being, and safety of Alamance County residents. He explained that his comments are tied directly to impacts from the Phillippie landfill on Clapp Mill Road. Figus stated that although the landfill operates under an approved permit, it has already exceeded its permitted hours and shown disregard for existing rules, creating what he described as a nuisance operation. He warned that the proposed UDO language could allow the landfill to expand, increasing negative effects on neighboring properties. He provided examples of current issues, noting the dangerous conditions created by truck traffic on the narrow, winding road. According to Figus, trucks are so wide they span nearly the entire lane, and their frequent use has already caused damage such as downed utility lines. He also described finding ash and black and white residue on his car, his first introduction to the landfill's operations, and stated that residents living even closer have reported similar experiences that affect farms, families, and children. Figus emphasized that loosening or weakening regulatory language would not benefit the community, especially considering the high concentration of landfills already present in Alamance County. He expressed frustration that the county appears to be becoming a dumping ground for central North Carolina. Figus also echoed others' lack of confidence in county commissioners, stating that they failed to protect citizens when they approved the landfill initially. He concluded by returning to his central question: whether any of the proposed UDO changes will meaningfully improve the safety, well-being, and protection of Alamance County residents, urging the board to keep that priority at the forefront of their decisions.

Ms. Pam Gaude stated that she originally came to read Calandra Salo's proxy letter, but since Matthew had already read it aloud, she did not need to repeat it. She confirmed that she had a copy available for the board in case they had not yet received it, as Salo wished for it to be included in the record. Gaude then shared her personal concerns as a resident living near a curve on Clapp Mill Road, explaining that she sees every truck traveling to and from the landfill and experiences the constant smoke, dust, and heavy traffic firsthand. She expressed disappointment in what she described as ongoing deception surrounding the operations in the area and noted how disruptive the traffic and emissions have been to daily life. To cope with the noise, she said she often turns up her earbuds while doing gardening or farm chores. Gaude closed by asking for more consideration and better outcomes for residents in southern Alamance, thanking the board for their time.

Ms. Landreth Freeman shared his support for the current draft of the UDO, particularly the two-acre minimum lot size in the agricultural district. As a resident of that area, she acknowledged his own bias but noted that he would have preferred an even larger minimum acreage, though he recognizes the need for balance. Freeman explained that he appreciates how the draft uses different minimum lot sizes across districts, which helps guide residential development toward areas with available services rather than placing additional strain on rural agricultural zones. She also pointed out that the agricultural district, while large, is only one part of the overall zoning system and does not include municipalities, which already have their own zoning rules. Freeman thanked the board for actively seeking community input and for listening to both residents and subject-matter experts throughout the drafting process. She also highlighted that the current UDO draft contains thoughtful guardrails on data centers, noting specifically that large data centers would only be allowed in designated employment centers under the draft, ensuring they remain farther from residential and agricultural areas. She closed by expressing appreciation for the board's careful and considered approach.

Mr. Mike Owens began by expressing disappointment in most of the board, noting that he appreciated Mr. Dodson's service but felt that the board was repeating mistakes from four years ago. He referenced the idea, often attributed to Einstein, that doing the same thing and expecting different results is unreasonable, arguing that the board is once again advancing policies he views as overreaching. Owens criticized the avoidance of the word "zoning," stating that despite the change in terminology, the effects are the same. As a farmer with roughly 700 acres and a family operation producing about 2,000 steers a year, he said he does not want or need government protection of his land and strongly opposes restrictions on how property owners can use or sell their land. Owens described his background and work ethic to emphasize that he and other landowners have invested deeply in their property and should retain full control over it. He argued that attempts to regulate land use equate to government overreach or "communism," especially when they prevent landowners from selling land at its highest value. He cited examples such as a landowner denied permission to sell a single acre for a high price, which he felt demonstrated unfair interference. Owens asserted that land values and property rights should be determined by landowners, not by government decisions influenced by concerns like quarries, noise, or development impacts. He also argued that claims about protecting farms or rural heritage are unrealistic, noting that the average age of farmers is around 65 and that farming as an industry is declining nationwide. Because of this, he believes the market, not regulations, should determine how agricultural land transitions. Owens said people cannot be forced to continue farming or to maintain unprofitable businesses, referencing the repeated ownership changes of Quarry Hills Golf Course as an example. Throughout his comments, he stressed that the majority of county residents do not want zoning or heavy land-use regulation, referencing past public meetings that drew large crowds opposing such measures. He argued that people living in subdivisions may desire zoning, but rural residents do not want restrictions placed on their property. Owens concluded by urging the board to rethink the draft UDO, stating that it is too aggressive and will not succeed if brought to the commissioners. He advised the board to regroup and take a more reasonable approach.

Mr. Tom Schopler spoke briefly to respond to comments made by the previous speaker, stating that he agreed with the point that landowners should retain the right to sell their land. He clarified, however, that his concern centers on the effects of large-scale residential development on neighboring wells. Schopler

explained that if a farmer sells land to a developer who then installs hundreds or even a thousand homes with deep, high-capacity wells, the surrounding properties with existing wells could be negatively affected. He emphasized that his focus was on the importance of lot size and development intensity, not on restricting someone's right to sell land. When the previous speaker pushed back, Schopler clarified that he was speaking specifically about the scale of development and the impact on shared resources like groundwater. He closed by reiterating that lot size matters when considering appropriate development patterns and thanked the board.

IV. BOARD/COMMISSIONER RESPONSES

Following several public comments about data centers, board members and staff briefly addressed the topic. They explained that the county will take up data center regulations more fully after the UDO revision process is complete. At this stage, the board is only looking at draft, hypothetical placement options. The current working draft categorizes small-scale data centers as a Class 2 use in the HIDO district and hyperscale data centers as a Class 3 use, with draft definitions included for discussion. Staff noted that there has already been community concern about regulating noise at the property line, and that this may be explored further as the draft develops.

County legal staff reminded the board that the commissioners adopted a one-year moratorium on data centers, which carries legally mandated deadlines and an outline for work progress. At this point, the county is not close to any of those deadlines. The commissioners must receive an actionable proposal before month 11 of the moratorium, but they may ultimately choose to let the moratorium expire, extend it, or adopt a regulatory framework, none of which has been predetermined. When asked about the next steps in the process, staff explained that preliminary internal discussions have begun with the county manager, but there is currently no formal plan or mandate defining whether a committee of experts will be appointed or what form the regulatory development will take. Regardless of what the commissioners decide, any eventual changes to land-use regulations, whether related to data centers or other uses, must come through the Planning Board for review and recommendation. A question was raised about a central information source for citizens. Staff advised that the moratorium details, including deadlines and the county's work program, are available in the meeting materials from the August 17 session. Section 5 of the moratorium document outlines the required steps the county must take during the moratorium period. Staff also noted that the county has already begun early research meetings to evaluate what types of regulations might be needed. Regarding noise concerns from large data centers, staff confirmed that there have been conversations about addressing noise on a broader scale, possibly through updates to the county's noise ordinance, so that any future rules apply consistently across similar facilities. This may be considered as data center guidelines are developed, but no formal decision has been made.

The conversation then shifted to questions about landfill definitions raised by public commenters. Mr. Hoagland explained that the draft UDO intentionally mirrors definitions found in state statutes and administrative code, including those governing land clearing and inert debris landfills. He cited specific North Carolina General Statutes and Administrative Code sections to show where the definitions originate and confirmed that the county uses state terminology purposefully for consistency. County legal staff clarified that the UDO does not currently contain language stating that undefined terms default to state

definitions. In situations where the UDO defines a term differently than the state, the county's definition controls. Staff acknowledged that they have discussed the need for greater consistency moving forward. A board member raised concerns about repeated accusations of deception or misleading language in the landfill section of the draft, asking whether these concerns stem from misunderstandings or legitimate issues. County legal counsel responded that since the county is currently involved in litigation with individuals who spoke during public comment, including Mrs. Salo and Mr. Kirkpatrick, it is not surprising that they disagree with the county's interpretation of regulations. Because of the ongoing litigation, he refrained from further comment on the substance of those disputes.

A board member referenced current draft language stating that co-location of other regulated land uses within an area designated for a regulated industry is not allowed. He then raised a public commenter's question regarding landfill definitions, specifically noting that the draft definitions describe disposal activities but do not explicitly mention processing activities such as grinding, mulching, composting, burning, or storage of materials. This omission, he said, was central to the concern expressed in Ms. Salo's letter and echoed by Mr. Kirkpatrick: whether the absence of processing language in the definition means such activities could be considered implicitly allowed. County legal counsel responded by reminding the board that the meeting transcript is a public record and that the individuals raising these questions are currently plaintiffs in litigation against the county on the same subject matter. He cautioned that the issues being asked of the board overlap directly with disputed questions in ongoing litigation. Because of this, he urged the board to be mindful of what they choose to address publicly. The board member clarified that his questions were not about the litigation itself but about the UDO language, which will govern the entire county. Legal staff reiterated that the specific issues being asked, particularly how processing relates to landfill definitions, are part of the active lawsuit, and therefore any substantive answers carry legal implications.

One board member suggested that, given the overlapping processes, it may be more appropriate to let the courts resolve the disputed definitions before attempting to answer those same questions in the UDO process. He noted that if the court's decision proves unsatisfactory, citizens could return to seek clarification through the planning process. Public commenters responded that the simultaneous timing of the lawsuit and UDO revisions was not their choice and that none of the proposed ordinance changes originated from them. Staff then pointed out that past meeting minutes, particularly from May 26, included discussion of materials such as yard waste and inert debris, which may help clarify some confusion, and offered to provide copies of letters if needed. At the end of the discussion, a member of the public questioned whether the board had changed its rules about public interaction, noting that recent meetings had allowed more back-and-forth. The chair responded that the board had deliberately relaxed procedural rules for this meeting, framing it as more of a public forum than a formal board meeting. He clarified that this applied to the current meeting because the board was still working through public comments and related questions.

A member of the public expressed frustration about the amount of back-and-forth allowed during recent meetings, noting that in previous years under earlier chairs, public interaction was tightly limited. He questioned whether the rules had changed and whether future meetings would also allow extended dialogue. The chair responded by explaining that, at the beginning of this meeting, he had intentionally relaxed the rules to allow more open discussion during the public comment portion. He emphasized that this applied only during public comments and that once the board transitions into its formal work session, the interaction will stop. The chair also noted that the public had not yet been formally dismissed from the comment

portion, which is why the dialogue was continuing. The same citizen continued expressing concerns that zoning-like restrictions in the proposed UDO would limit his and others' ability to use their land for income-producing purposes such as mobile home parks or campgrounds. He argued that restricting permissible land uses is equivalent to harming landowners by reducing their opportunities, and he voiced frustration that some landowners in certain districts would retain full development options while others would not. He emphasized repeatedly that restrictions on land equate to restrictions on livelihood. A board member responded by clarifying that the Planning Board did not independently create the proposal being reviewed. Instead, the county commissioners directed the board to hold community meetings, gather feedback, and produced a draft based on what they heard county-wide. He explained that although the board hoped for more time to continue outreach and refine the work, leadership requested that they bring forward their findings sooner than expected. The public commenter asked for clarification on this statement, and the board member explained that county leadership, including the county commissioners, requested earlier delivery of the subcommittee's results. Another attendee added that commissioners are under pressure because of potential upcoming state-level decisions about zoning authority, which may have prompted the timeline.

Assistant County Manager Brian Baker introduced himself and clarified his role in recent direction given to the Planning Board. He explained that he had spoken with board members and the subcommittee about the timeline for concluding their community outreach meetings. While more meetings were initially anticipated, he believed it was in the county's best interest to wrap up the Planning Board–led sessions so that any future public outreach could occur with the commissioners' direct involvement. His expectation was that once the draft UDO reaches the commissioners, they will likely hold additional public input sessions across the county before acting.

A member of the public responded by saying he was unaware of such meetings and felt they were not publicly advertised. This led to a brief and heated exchange about whether citizens had been properly informed. A board member countered that the meetings were not secret; they simply required attendance or close following of board activities, noting that the speaker had not been at meetings as consistently as in past years. The board emphasized that continued arguing over notice was unproductive and urged commenters to use their speaking time to offer substantive input rather than grievances about process. The discussion shifted again to the broader question of where and how the Planning Board had gathered public input. A board member explained that the original plan included multiple outreach sessions across different parts of the county, but the directive changed from above, and the board complied. They held one meeting in the Whitney area and then another at the Planning Department, after which county leadership asked for results sooner than expected. Board members reiterated that they serve at the pleasure of the commissioners and that the timeline was not of their choosing. The conversation returned to property rights, future growth, and land development. Board members noted that volunteer service on the board requires substantial personal commitment and that decisions must balance individual property rights with community impacts. One board member pointed out that large-scale, high-density development on agricultural land affects more than the landowner alone and can dramatically change the character of communities like Whitney. A citizen pushed back, arguing that restricting land uses deprives owners of economic opportunity and unfairly creates "winners and losers." He questioned why a neighbor with a small lot should have influence over what he can do with a large tract of land. A board member responded by sharing that even the citizen's late father used restrictive covenants when developing land to prevent incompatible uses from harming nearby property values, noting that such covenants function similarly to zoning. This sparked further disagreement

over whether zoning is inherently "anti-business." The discussion closed with a board member expressing his preference that additional public meetings should have been held before the Planning Board was asked to finalize its proposal for the commissioners, reinforcing that the board acted under directive rather than independently initiating the UDO changes.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Full U.D.O. Revision Draft (October 2026)

Mr. Hoagland gave a short slideshow presentation intended to recap the UDO revision process, outline the work completed so far, and clarify procedural steps moving forward. Slides focused on the major, newer changes to the UDO draft. He noted that the board had previously seen a timeline earlier in the year following the LCID landfill hearings, and this new presentation expanded on that summary to reflect the full progression of work. He explained that the UDO overhaul began in early 2024 with the goal of clarifying and modernizing the county's development regulations. The plan at that time was to bring forward portions of the ordinance incrementally so the board could review each section, understand the reasoning for proposed changes, particularly those tied to updates in state law, and debate revisions as needed. Toward the end of 2024, however, the board was asked to develop a hypothetical land use plan and proposed subdivision changes. That work began in late 2024 and continued well into 2025. The UDO update process paused again when the LCID landfill permit application came before the board, requiring several meetings and public hearings and pushing UDO work into early 2026.

Once that process concluded, the board returned to the UDO update. A subcommittee worked for several months and presented recommendations at the previous meeting. Those recommendations have now been incorporated into the full draft document, totaling 335 pages, which the board is reviewing for the first time in its entirety tonight. Mr. Hoagland highlighted the major updates in the draft. These included the addition of new minimum lot sizes in Rural Preservation Ordinance and Subdivision Standards, per the subcommittee's recommendations; new classifications for small-scale and hyperscale data centers within the heavy-impact development regulations; and a reorganized section housing environmental protection standards. He emphasized that most of the environmental standards, such as watershed rules, flood damage regulations, and the Jordan Lake requirements, already exist in county code but are now being centralized within the UDO so that citizens do not have to search through state administrative code to understand local requirements. Stormwater regulations remain aligned with NCDEQ standards, focusing on stormwater quantity rather than quality. He also noted that the proposed zoning map had not changed since the last discussion.

Mr. Hoagland then clarified the procedural steps that lie ahead. By law, any development regulation must receive a recommendation from the Planning Board before the commissioners can act on it, and the commissioners must hold at least one public hearing. Once the ordinance reaches them, commissioners have full authority to modify any portion, choosing to adopt only parts, make additional changes, or approve the entire draft. Given the size and complexity of the full document, Mr. Hoagland recommended that the board not vote on the UDO tonight. He emphasized the importance of taking time to read through it, generate questions, and fine-tune the details. He suggested that November would be the more appropriate

meeting for a formal recommendation if the goal is to deliver the UDO to commissioners in December, which complies with their request to receive it by the end of the year.

Mr. Isley asked whether the sections related to district boundaries and subdivision standards, which have generated the most public interest, should be separated from the larger UDO draft and forwarded to commissioners as their own item. He reasoned that this could give commissioners more time for county-wide input sessions while still allowing progress on the rest of the ordinance. He emphasized that decisions on districting and lot sizes will affect every property owner and warrant extensive public engagement.

Board members continued discussing the importance of allowing more time for community feedback on the proposed rural district and subdivision standards. They emphasized that decisions made in these sections would affect every property owner in the county and therefore warranted broad, careful engagement. Mr. Hoagland acknowledged this concern.

He also shared that, in response to repeated concerns about transparency and communication, the department has established an email notification system. Anyone who signs up receives agenda packets and supporting documents directly in their inbox, ensuring that residents do not have to search the county website to stay informed. The UDO draft and all supplemental materials are available through this distribution list and on the Planning Board's meeting information page.

Mr. Hoagland concluded his presentation by encouraging board members to take the full 335-page draft home, review it closely, and develop questions or suggested refinements. He explained that while the UDO could be reorganized in different ways, he attempted to minimize disruption to the existing ordinance structure. For example, environmental standards, previously spread across various sections, were consolidated for clarity. Some outdated sections, such as an ordinance tied to a discontinued state grant program for manufactured home disposal, were merged into other sections to eliminate redundancy.

Mr. Kimrey then raised a question about non-conforming uses, specifically referring to Section 3.2.8 on page 50. He asked how long property owners would have to notify the county that they are operating a use that would become non-conforming under the new UDO, and whether such owners would be required to register these uses to receive protection. Mr. Hoagland responded that the draft contains two different timeframes, which he acknowledged may need alignment. The new language he drafted allows property owners three years from adoption to notify the county of any newly non-conforming uses, an intentionally generous window meant to protect property owners during the transition. He contrasted this with a separate existing provision allowing only 180 days for a non-conforming use to be reestablished after discontinuation. He explained that the three-year period applies to initial identification and registration of non-conforming uses, while the six-month period applies to lapses in active non-conforming operations. He emphasized that these timelines are flexible and ultimately subject to the Planning Board's and commissioners' judgment.

Mr. Kimrey then revisited previous examples involving accessory dwellings, noting situations where residents with three to four acres and a three-bedroom septic system frequently ask whether they may add an accessory dwelling or secondary residence. He acknowledged that sharing a well is generally straightforward, but the main complications arise when septic systems are involved. This served as a bridge

back to the earlier conversation about requiring accessory dwellings to share both the well and septic system with the primary residence, to avoid unintended subdivision and increased dwelling counts on private roads. The board agreed that their earlier reasoning still holds maintaining shared utilities is the most effective way to prevent future parcel splits that could trigger major road-upgrade requirements.

Board discussion then shifted to data center classifications within the draft UDO. A member asked how the ordinance treats a facility operating at exactly 10 megawatts, noting that the language defines "hyperscale" centers as having a maximum electric demand of 10 megawatts or more. Mr. Hoagland clarified that under the draft:

• A data center using 10 megawatts of electricity or less would fall under the Class 2 use.
• The draft uses wattage as a dividing line, but electrical demand is not static; it fluctuates.
• Hyperscale data centers typically operate at *much* higher levels, hundreds of megawatts, so the 10-MW threshold may need refinement as the draft evolves.

A question was raised about multiple small-scale data-center buildings on the same parcel, for example, three 8-MW facilities. Staff explained the distinction:

• If all structures operate under one development plan, they would be regulated as one development.
• If they operate as separate, independent data centers, each must independently meet ordinance requirements for each use.

The conversation then turned to the data-center moratorium and who would be responsible for creating the eventual regulatory framework. A board member asked whether individuals with expertise in data-center development, engineering, or operations would be involved, given the mix of accurate and inaccurate public information surrounding the topic.

County legal and planning staff explained:

• No formal structure has been finalized yet.
• The county expects to draw on external resources, including other local governments with established data-center regulations.
• The county may also commission independent professional analysis, though no commitment has been made yet.
• Because the industry evolves rapidly, it will be important for any regulatory framework to be informed by subject-matter expertise, not just internal staff or public comment.

The discussion closed with Mr. Hoagland encouraging board members to reach out individually before the November meeting with any questions or recommended changes to the draft UDO. He emphasized that this is still a working draft and that he welcomes input "sooner rather than later" as the board prepares for potential action in the coming months.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS/DISCUSSION

A. Planning Board applications

Mr. Hoagland reminded the board that three Planning Board member terms will expire at the end of the year, and only one of the current members is eligible for reappointment. He reiterated that application information had already been emailed to members and was also shared through the department's public email notification system. For members of the public, Mr. Hoagland explained that anyone interested in serving on the Planning Board may apply through the county's Boards and Commissions portal on the Alamance County website.

B. November Planning Board member recommendations

Mr. Hoagland reminded everyone that all submitted applications will be collected and brought to the Planning Board at its November meeting, where board members will review them and make their non-binding recommendations to the county commissioners. The commissioners will make the final appointments in December.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Amie Perkins and seconded by Stephen Dodson. The motion passed, and the meeting was adjourned.