



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

**AGENDA**

A. Call to Order

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Invocation
3. Approval of February 23, 2026 Meeting Minutes

B. Regular Agenda

1. TA-26-0003 – LDO Text Amendment to Section 9.1.2.B. Minor Subdivision
2. TA-26-0004 – LDO Text Amendment to Section 6.5.E.4. Fence Height

C. Communications

1. Planning Director's Report
2. Town Attorney's Report
3. Other Business
4. Adjournment



**Planning Board Meeting**  
**February 23, 2026 - 7:00 PM**  
**502 Southtown Circle, Rolesville, NC 27571**

## **MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Mike Moss, Chair  
Donnie Lawrence, Vice-Chair  
Tisha Lowe, Board Member  
Brian Kennedy, Board Member  
Jim Schwartz, Board Member  
Minday Barham, Board Member  
Lenwood Long, Commissioner/Liaison  
Erin Catlett, Deputy Town Attorney  
Stephen Wensman, Planning Director  
Tanner Hayslette, Planner I  
Sharon Hope, Administrative Support Specialist

**ABSENT:** Frank Pearce, Board Member

### **A. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Moss called the meeting to order at 6:59 p.m.

### **A.1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Board collectively recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **A.2. INVOCATION**

Chair Moss delivered the invocation.

## **ELECTIONS OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

### **Nomination and election of Chair**

**A motion by 2025 Vice-Chair Lawrence and seconded by Board Member Lowe. The motion to elect 2025 Chair Moss as 2026 Chair was carried by a 5-0 vote, 5 voted as aye (Lawrence, Lowe, Kennedy, Schwartz, Barham), 0 voted as nay.**

### **Nomination and election of Vice-Chair**

**A motion made by Board Member Schwartz and seconded by Board Member Lowe. The motion to elect 2025 Vice-Chair Lawrence as 2026 Vice-Chair was carried by a 5-0 vote, 5 voted as aye (Moss, Lowe, Kennedy, Schwartz, Barham), 0 voted nay.**

### A.3. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 15, 2025, MEETING MINUTES

Moved by Board Member Lowe and Seconded by Vice-Chair Lawrence. The motion to approve the minutes of the December 15, 2025, meeting was carried with a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Lowe, Kennedy, Schwartz, Barham), 0 voted nay.

### B. REGULAR AGENDA

#### B.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

Mr. Wensman introduced the staff-initiated Text Amendment to strike out a staff variance that is not allowed by statute. The amendment will remove the ability of staff to consider adjacent land uses when considering required perimeter buffers. The Chair asked for questions and heard none.

**Moved by Board Member Schwartz and Seconded by Vice-Chair Lawrence. Motion to recommend approval of TA-26-02 – Text Amendment for Required Perimeter Buffer, to the Town Board of Commissioners, to provide consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Lowe, Kennedy, Schwartz, Barham), 0 voted nay.**

##### b. TA-26-03 - LDO Text Amendment to Section 9.1.2.B. Minor Subdivision

Mr. Wensman introduced the staff-initiated Text Amendment as a typo within the code related to minor subdivision plats. The amendment would state that the entire tract must be 5 acres or less, instead of 5 acres or more in size. This typo makes our code inconsistent with Statute, and amendment is needed.

Chair Moss questioned why TA-26-02 should not follow the Statute as it currently stands and questioned the decision to distinguish the acreage. Chair Moss stated that this amendment would eliminate the ability to create a minor subdivision in the Town of Rolesville and the ETJ areas since a tract less than 5 acres would not be able to be subdivided. One of the current categories of exemption is if the tract is greater than 5 acres and results in no more than 3 lots. A landowner would not be able to subdivide a lot of up to 4 acres under the amended ordinance without having to go through a major subdivision category which would cause undue hardship for the landowner. Additionally, there are properties in the ETJ on a well and septic system that don't need to meet the Requirements of no new roads, easements or utility extensions to qualify as a minor subdivision. Board Members Schwartz and Kennedy had additional questions and comments. Chair Moss continued by reciting NC Statute 160D-802(c) and commented that in some jurisdictions CMP Surveying has exercised this part of the Statute as an exemption to the subdivision ordinance:

- (c) A local government may require only a plat for recordation for the division of a tract or parcel of land in single ownership if all of the following criteria are met:*
- (1) The tract or parcel to be divided is not exempted under subdivision (2) of subsection (a) of this section.*
  - (2) No part of the tract or parcel to be divided has been divided under this subsection in the 10 years prior to division.*
  - (3) The entire area of the tract or parcel to be divided is greater than 5 acres.*
  - (4) After division, no more than three lots result from the division.*
  - (5) After division, all resultant lots comply with all of the following:*

- a. All lot dimension size requirements of the applicable land-use regulations, if any.
- b. The use of the lots is in conformity with the applicable zoning requirements, if any.
- c. A permanent means of ingress and egress is recorded for each lot.

The Town Attorney suggested that the application not move forward, further investigate and process through this and come back next month instead of making a decision tonight.

**Moved by Board Member Schwartz and seconded by Board Member Lowe. Motion to table TA-26-03 - LDO Text Amendment to Section 9.1.2.B., Minor Subdivision to give time for staff and Town Attorney to evaluate was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Lowe, Kennedy, Schwartz, Barham), 0 voted nay.**

**B.2. CPA-26-01 – Amendment to the Community Transportation Plan (CTP)**

Mr. Wensman introduced the map amendment to the Community Transportation Plan which is out of date because it was made prior to the current Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2025). The map amendment will remove a proposed local collector road (East/West) which would divide a proposed commercial development and will remove a proposed local collector road (extension of Classical Way, North/South) leaving Classical Way as a local residential street only.

Board Member Schwartz questioned the entrance for commercial traffic for the commercial development and Vice-Chair Lawrence questioned routes for emergency apparatus.

Public Speaker Michael Givens at 204 Kavanaugh Road expressed that the primary concern of his neighborhood was the cut-through of a 65' wide collector road going from Highway 98 and dead ending into Kavanaugh.

**Moved by Vice-Chair Lawrence and Seconded by Board Member Schwartz. The motion to accept the proposed CPA-26-01 – Amendment to the Community Transportation Plan (CTP) to remove the collector streets was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Lowe, Kennedy, Schwartz, Barham), 0 voted nay.**

**C. COMMUNICATIONS**

**C.1. Planning Director's Report**

**a. LDO Text Amendments To-Do List**

Mr. Wensman introduced the To-Do list of future text amendments created by Meredith Gruber and Stephen Wensman. Mr. Wensman will share the list as it was not included in the Agenda packet.

**C.2. Town Attorney's Report**

**a. Update to Planning Board By-Laws and Rules of Procedure**

Erin Catlett, Deputy Town Attorney, requested members to review the Bylaws document located at each seat during the next month and suggest updates and/or revisions at the March meeting.

**C.3. Other Business**

None currently.

**C.4. Adjournment**

**A motion to adjourn was made by Vice-Chair Lawrence and Seconded by Board Member Lowe. The motion was carried by a 6-0 vote, 6 voted aye (Moss, Lawrence, Lowe, Kennedy, Schwartz, Barham), 0 voted nay. The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.**

---

**Mike Moss, Planning Board Chair**

---

**Stephen Wensman, Planning Director**

# Memo

**To:** The Planning Board  
**From:** The Planning Department  
**Date:** Meeting Held March 23, 2026  
**Re:** TA-26-0003 – Text Amendment for Minor Subdivisions

---

## **Background**

At the February 23, 2026 meeting, the Planning Board made a motion to table TA-26-0003 - LDO Text Amendment for Minor Subdivisions, to give time for Staff and the Town Attorney to evaluate/update the text amendment language. The text amendment has been revised for the March 23, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

## **Proposed Text Amendment Language**

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

### **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 less in size~~ **greater than two (2) acres**, and where ~~four (4) or fewer~~ **no more than three (3)** lots result after the subdivision is completed.
  - 1. **No part of the tract or parcel to be divided has been divided under Section 9 of the LDO in the ten (10) years prior to division.**
  - 2. **After division, all resultant lots comply with all the following:**
    - a. **All lot dimension size requirements of the applicable land-use regulations, if any.**
    - b. **The use of the lots is in conformity with the applicable zoning requirements, if any.**

- c. A permanent means of ingress and egress is recorded for each lot.

## LDO APPENDIX A

### 4.3. MINOR SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT

- C. 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 less in size~~ greater than two (2) acres, and where ~~four (4) or fewer~~ no more than three (3) lots result after the subdivision is completed.

- 3. No part of the tract or parcel to be divided has been divided under this section of LDO Appendix A in the ten (10) years prior to division.
- 4. After division, all resultant lots comply with all the following:
  - a. All lot dimension size requirements of the applicable land-use regulations, if any.
  - b. The use of the lots is in conformity with the applicable zoning requirements, if any.
  - c. A permanent means of ingress and egress is recorded for each lot.

### **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 Motion**

Motion to recommend (approval or denial) of **TA-26-0003 – 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.)

# Memo

**To:** The Planning Board  
**From:** The Planning Department  
**Date:** Meeting Held March 23, 2026  
**Re:** TA-26-0004 – Text Amendment to Residential Fence Height

---

## **Background**

This staff-initiated Text Amendment is a response to resident concerns about the potential need for an eight-foot fence at the outer edges of a subdivision or neighborhood.

## **Proposed Text Amendment Language**

The proposed text is shown in **bold blue and underlined**.

## **6.5. FENCES, WALLS, AND BERMS**

### **E. General Standards.**

4. **Height.** Height shall be measured from the finished grade for all fences, walls and berms.
  - b. The maximum height of a fence or wall within required rear and side setbacks shall be six (6) feet in residential zoning districts. **The maximum height of a fence within required rear setbacks may be eight (8) feet when a residential lot on the perimeter of a subdivision is adjacent to a more intense residential zoning district.** Fences and berms are not permitted in front setbacks unless a subdivision fence or wall is permitted in a site plan for a subdivision.

## **Comprehensive Plan Consistency**

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

- Transportation,
- Economic Development,
- Housing & Land Use, 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. In addition, the introduction section of the Housing & Land Use Focus Area notes managing housing and land use effectively is essential to maintaining a high quality of life for Rolesville's residents. TA-26-0004 – Text Amendment to Residential Fence Height, allows some residents a fence height option that could improve their quality of life.

**Proposed Motion**

Motion to recommend (approval or denial) of **TA-26-0004 – Text Amendment to Residential Fence Height**, to the Town Board of Commissioners, because it is (consistent or inconsistent) with the Comprehensive Plan. (Please include examples of consistency or inconsistency.)