



Planning Board Meeting
February 23, 2026
7:00 p.m.
Rolesville Town Hall

AGENDA

A. Call to Order

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Invocation
3. Approval of December 15, 2025 Meeting Minutes

B. Regular Agenda

1. 2026 LDO Round One – Staff-Initiated Text Amendments
 - a. TA-26-02 – LDO Text Amendment to Section 6.2.2.1.G.1. Required Perimeter Buffer
 - b. TA-26-03 – LDO Text Amendment to Section 9.1.2.B. Minor Subdivision
2. CPA-26-01 – Amendment to the Community Transportation Plan (CTP)

C. Communications

1. Planning Director's Report
 - a. LDO Text Amendments To-Do List
2. Town Attorney's Report
 - a. Update to Planning Board By-Laws
3. Other Business
4. Adjournment



Planning Board Special Meeting
December 15, 2025 - 7:00 PM
502 Southtown Circle, Rolesville, NC 27571

MINUTES

PRESENT: Mike Moss, Chair
Derek Versteegen, Board Member
Jim Schwartz, Board Member
Lenwood Long Jr., Planning Board Liaison
Michael Elabarger, Interim Planning Director
Tanner Hayslette, Planner I
Donnie Lawrence, Vice-Chair
Frank Pearce, Board Member
Tisha Lowe, Board Member
Dave Neill, Town Attorney
Michele Raby, Planner II

ABSENT:

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moss called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

A.1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Board collectively recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

A.2. INVOCATION

Chair Moss delivered the invocation.

A.4. Approval of October 27, 2025, meeting minutes.

Moved by Board Member Lowe and Seconded by Board Member Pearce. The motion to approve the minutes of October 27, 2025, was carried with a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Pearce, Schwartz, Versteegen, Lowe), 0 voted nay.

B. REGULAR AGENDA

B.1. REZ-25-03 – Rezoning Map Amendment for 625 Averette Road

Mr. Elabarger reintroduced the Application by describing the Applicant's request for rezoning 12.283 acres from Residential & Planned Unit Development (R&PUD) to Residential High Conditional Zoning District (RH-CZ).

The Applicant proceeded to describe the reasons and purpose of their request, as well as addressed the Planning Board's previous comments.

The Board collectively asked about the location of the proposed parkland dedication and the previous Approval for this parcel.

A motion to recommend Approval of REZ-25-03 to the Board of Commissioners was made by Board Member Pearce and Seconded by Board Member Schwartz. The motion was carried by a 5-0-0-1

vote, 5 voted aye (Lawrence, Pearce, Schwartz, Versteegen, Lowe), 0 voted nay, 0 absent, 1 recused (Moss).

B.2. REZ-24-05 – Rezoning Map Amendment for Atticus Woods - Wait Avenue

Mr. Elabarger reintroduced the Application by describing the Applicant's request for rezoning 105.619 acres of land from the Residential & Planned Unit Development (R&PUD) Zoning District to a Neighborhood Center Conditional Zoning (NC-CZ) District.

The Applicant proceeded to describe the reasons and purpose of their request.

Michael Givens at 204 Kavanaugh Road emphasized a desire for an increased buffer and a concern about increased neighborhood traffic including the use of the road by commercial vehicles.

Josh Hurst at 208 Kavanaugh Road expressed that this proposed adjacent land use is much less desirable than the property's current zoning. Mr. Hurst also stated that this development is inconsistent with the Mixed-Residential Community future land use category and the LDO's intent of the NC Zoning District.

Molly Hurst at 208 Kavanaugh Road stated that the intent of the previously planned development on this site was to highlight the natural beauty of the site, whereas this proposed development has insufficient buffers and will negatively affect the ecosystem by draining the ponds and displacing the wildlife.

Margaret Watkins at 407 Belmellen Court, Wake Forest, requested that the Planning Board includes a 50' evergreen buffer as part of their recommendation, suggested that the parking should be relocated to the interior of the site, and recommended full cut-off lighting fixtures and hours of operation for the commercial portion of this proposed development.

Ed Ortals at 308 Kavanaugh Road suggested moving the proposed parkland behind the homes on Kavanaugh Road to increase the buffer and tie into the existing pond on the site, and he expressed concern about commercial traffic on neighborhood streets.

George Garcia at 524 Averette Road expressed his dissatisfaction with the Board making land use decisions within the Town's ETJ when the ETJ residents cannot vote for elected officials in the Town of Rolesville.

Heather Engard at 216 Kavanaugh Road expressed concern about how this proposed development would negatively impact her lot and the value of her home, and she asked the Board to consider increasing the buffer along the homes located on Kavanaugh Road.

The Board collectively asked about the location of the parkland dedication and greenway routing, the inconsistencies with the Community Transportation Plan (CTP) and Land Development Ordinance (LDO), the buffer between this development and the adjacent homes, and the drainage of the existing ponds.

A motion to recommend Approval of REZ-24-05 to the Board of Commissioners was made by Board Member Schwartz and Seconded by Vice-Chair Lawrence. This recommendation came with two conditions. The first is an additional condition between the proposed commercial area and the adjacent Elizabeth Springs community on the southside of the plot to meet the standards of a Type 4 buffer between the two locations. The second is while this meets the standards of our Community Transportation Plan (CTP), that the Board of Commissioners consider either an exception to that to limit the thoroughfare access or consider other options around the CTP between those two streets exclusive to Classical Way. The motion was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Pearce, Schwartz, Versteegen, Lowe), 0 voted nay.

A motion to recommend Approval of the Development Agreement associated with REZ-24-05 to the Board of Commissioners was made by Board Member Schwartz and Seconded by Board Member Versteegen. The motion was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Pearce, Schwartz, Versteegen, Lowe), 0 voted nay.

- B.3. TA-25-10 – Text Amendments to LDO Section 3.1.1. Townhome Building Separation Requirements**
Mr. Elabarger introduced the applicant-initiated Text Amendment to modify LDO Section 3.1.1. Townhome Building Separation Requirements which would decrease the minimum separation of two-unit and three-unit townhome buildings from 30 feet to 10 feet.

The Board collectively expressed their thoughts including the minimum building separation between buildings with a different number of units, proposed regulating the minimum separation by width of the building face instead of the number of units, and considered unintended consequences of large façade frontages of wide units.

A motion to recommend Approval of TA-25-10 with the conditions that the maximum of two (2) to three (3) units would have a distance of the same and anything greater would assume the existing 30' building separation and that the Board of Commissioners consider a maximum building width for those two (2) or three (3) unit structures to the Board of Commissioners was made by Board Member Versteegen and Seconded by Board Member Lowe. The motion was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Pearce, Schwartz, Versteegen, Lowe), 0 voted nay.

- B.4. TA-25-11 – Text Amendments to LDO Table 6.2.2.2. Perimeter Buffer Requirements**
Mr. Elabarger introduced the applicant-initiated Text Amendment that proposed modifying the Perimeter Buffer Requirements to eliminate walls between residential developments.

The Applicant proceeded to describe the reasons and purpose of their request.

The Board collectively expressed their thoughts including increasing the rate and opacity of plantings in replacement of the wall.

A motion to recommend Approval of TA-25-11 to the Board of Commissioners with the consideration of adding additional plantings at a rate of 25% at all levels per 100 feet was made by Board Member Versteegen and Seconded by Vice-Chair Lawrence. The motion was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Pearce, Schwartz, Versteegen, Lowe), 0 voted nay.

C. COMMUNICATIONS

C.1. Planning Director's Report

Mr. Elabarger made mention of the following: a status update on the GovWell platform, the recent decrease in development applications and expected increase in the volume of permits, the multitude of newly approved development applications, and a status update on the newly opened businesses in Town.

C.2. Town Attorney's Report

Mr. Neill informed the Board about permit choice in North Carolina.

C.3. Other Business

This Planning Board meeting was Board Member Versteegen's and potentially Board Member Lowe's last meeting while serving on the Planning Board.

C.4. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made Board Member Lowe by and Seconded by Vice-Chair Lawrence. The motion was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Pearce, Schwartz, Versteegen, Lowe), 0 voted nay. The meeting was adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Mike Moss, Planning Board Chair

Tanner Hayslette, Planner I

Memo

To: The Planning Board
From: The Planning Department
Date: Meeting Held February 23, 2026
Re: LDO 2026 Round 1: TA-26-02 – Text Amendment for Required Perimeter Buffers and TA-26-03 – Text Amendment for Minor Subdivisions

Background

This year, Planning Staff will be bringing forward batches or rounds of Text Amendments for the Planning Board's review and recommendation to the Town Board of Commissioners. The first round for 2026 includes two straightforward items--one being the removal of an unnecessary subjective statement (TA-26-02) and the other being the correction of an error (TA-26-03).

Proposed Text Amendment Language

The proposed text is shown in **bold blue and underlined**, and deletions are shown in ~~red-strike through~~.

TA-26-02 Text Amendment for Required Perimeter Buffers

The purpose of this Text Amendment is to remove a subjective statement about required perimeter buffers.

6.2.2.1. PERIMETER BUFFERS

G. Required Perimeter Buffer by District

1. **Required Perimeter Buffer.** Table 6.2.2.2: Required Perimeter Buffer by District, shall control the required perimeter buffer type required between zoning districts. ~~While Table 6.2.2.2 is intended to provide for buffers based on zoning district, the Land Development Administrator may take into consideration existing and proposed uses to achieve the intent of this section.~~

TA-26-03 Text Amendment for Minor Subdivisions

The purpose of this text amendment is to correct an error about minor subdivisions.

9.1.2. SUBDIVISION TYPES

- A. **Major Subdivision.** All subdivisions shall be considered major subdivisions except those defined as minor subdivisions in this section.
- B. **Minor Subdivision.** A minor subdivision is defined as one involving no new public or private streets or roads, or right-of-way dedication, no easements, no utility

extension, where the entire tract to be subdivided is five (5) acres or **lessmore** in size, and where four (4) or fewer lots result after the subdivision is completed.

LDO APPENDIX A

4.3. MINOR SUBDIVISION PLAT

A. Purpose

4. A minor subdivision is defined as one involving no new public or private streets or roads, or right-of-way dedication, no easements, no utility extension, where the entire tract to be subdivided is five (5) acres or **lessmore** in size, and where four (4) or fewer lots result after the subdivision is completed.

Comprehensive Plan Consistency

The Rolesville 2050 Comprehensive Plan Focus Areas include looking at challenges and opportunities as they relate to:

- Transportation,
- Economic Development,
- Land Use & Housing, and
- Parks, Recreation, & Community Character.

Having clear and effective development regulations has the potential to support all the Focus Areas in Rolesville's Comprehensive Plan.

Proposed Motions

TA-26-02 Text Amendment for Required Perimeter Buffers

Motion to recommend (approval or denial) of **TA-26-02 – Text Amendment for Required Perimeter Buffers**, to the Town Board of Commissioners, because it is (consistent or inconsistent) with the Comprehensive Plan. (Please include examples of consistency or inconsistency.)

TA-26-03 Text Amendment for Minor Subdivisions

Motion to recommend (approval or denial) of **TA-26-03 – Text Amendment for Minor Subdivisions**, to the Town Board of Commissioners, because it is (consistent or inconsistent) with the Comprehensive Plan. (Please include examples of consistency or inconsistency.)