

**MINUTES**  
**Planning Board Regular Meeting**  
**E.S. Douglass Community Center, 1185 W. Pennsylvania Avenue**  
**Thursday, April 23, 2026, at 6:00 PM**

Chair Walden called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Chair Matthew Walden, Monica Brickey, Jason Scribner, Jennifer Garner, Andrew Speck and Michael Skolnick were present.

Monica Brickey made a motion, seconded by Michael Skolnick, to approve the Minutes of the March 2026 regular meeting. The motion carried.

**PRELIMINARY FORUM**

**SU-01-26: Special Use Permit for 305 Rothney Avenue**

Reno Rolle, on behalf of Barnyard Ventures, LLC, has submitted a Special Use Permit application for the expansion of an existing nonconforming site. The expansion includes site improvements to support an event venue including outdoor land use in addition to the existing restaurant, along with related site improvements. Per the Moore County tax record, the property is identified as PIN 857100860036 (PARID 00046498) and owned by Barnyard Ventures, LLC.

Chair Walden opened the preliminary forum.

Planner Gene Ruiz provided an overview of the proposed improvements which would include additional seating space on the second floor of the existing building, a new outdoor structure, landscaping upgrades and operational enhancements. Mr. Ruiz added that Planning staff was in support of the proposal.

Mr. Rolle shared an overview of his business experience and reiterated the plans for the property.

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Walden closed the preliminary forum.

Monica Brickey made a motion, seconded by Michael Skolnick, to adopt the following for transmission to the Town Council as a result of the April 23, 2026 Preliminary Forum on application SU-01-26: Information presented at the forum indicated that there were no issues in applying the criteria for a Special Use Permit to application SU-01-26. In addition, no concerns were raised during the forum. The motion carried.

---

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **PD-01-26: Planned Development District - Conceptual Development Plan for 12.89 Acres on Waynor Road**

Kevin Lindsay of Crawford Design Co., on behalf of Chandler Pond Properties, LLC, submitted an application to rezone the property from Planned Development (PD) to Planned Development (PD) with an approved Conceptual Development Plan to allow for the construction of a religious institution on 7.41 acres and a subdivision of the remaining 5.48 acres into six (6) single-family residential lots. The property is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Waynor Road and NC Hwy 22 and is identified as PIN 857400914852 (PARID 00991862). The property owner is listed as Chandler Pond Properties, LLC.

Chair Walden opened the public hearing.

Planner Mason Mattox presented the application and stated that the applicant has offered to provide a 100 ft. undisturbed buffer along NC Hwy 22 which has warranted staff support and some flexibility regarding other standards, such as the applicant's request to extend some of the parking into the Highway Corridor Overlay area of the property. Mr. Mattox stated that staff would like more time to consider that request, as well as an alternative to the proposed cul-de-sac within the residential portion of the development.

Kevin Lindsay stated that the proposal was an attempt to meet the multi-use criteria. They have included a 100' setback on NC Hwy 22 as required by the Highway Corridor Overlay, a 50 ft. setback on Waynor Road, and a 30 ft. setback on North and West sides of the property and a 100 ft. undisturbed buffer on the right side of the property with the exception of the entrance. The current landowner is donating the land for the church but she will retain the remainder of the parcel which will be limited to RS-3 use and they are questioning the hesitancy of the Town to accept the cul-de-sac as a public street.

Planning Director BJ Grieve stated that staff wanted to request a continuance to allow time to work through the issues.

Mr. Lindsay stated that the applicant wanted the Town take over the cul-de-sac.

Matt Cummings, real estate manager for the church, stated that they are grateful to the property owner for donating the property for the church and they are dedicated to creating the best opportunity for success for Mrs. Samuelson.

Member Brickey inquired about the criteria for the Town to adopt a private road.

Mr. Grieve responded that they look at the totality of the circumstances but the Town is not required to accept an offer of dedication of a private road.

Member Brickey asked if the church would be bound to not having a daycare.

Mr. Grieve responded that staff has no issue with the church operating a daycare or school as those uses are accessory to a church.

Thomas Van Camp, attorney representing the applicant, asked Mr. Grieve if staff was open to discussing alternatives.

Mr. Grieve responded that staff was not outright opposed to it, but was asking for more time for discussion.

Mr. Van Camp stated that the applicant was agreeable to a one-month continuance to allow time for further discussion.

Burt Smith, 101 Amelia Drive, inquired about the potential traffic impact.

Mr. Lindsay stated there would be a right end/right out onto NC 22 and other traffic mitigation measures would be addressed.

Discussion ensued regarding dedication of the cul-de-sac and the Fire Marshal's feedback.

Member Garner commented that she loved the plan and thought it was a great use of the property but she was not a fan of private cul-de-sacs and taking over a private street is at the Town's discretion.

Member Brickey asked if a walking path was created around the church and the residential homes would be more in line with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Grieve responded that a loop around this property would not lead to another development, and the cost of maintaining a path would become an issue.

Monica Brickey made a motion, seconded by Andrew Speck, to continue the public hearing to the May 21, 2026 Planning Board meeting. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0, with Member Scribner having departed from the meeting.

---

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **OA-02-26: Proposed Planning Staff Initiated Amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance**

The proposed amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance are to clarify and prioritize how required open space is designed, emphasizing preservation of natural features such as mature trees, sensitive areas and buffers while maintaining existing open space quantity requirements. The proposed amendments introduce defined open space categories, establish minimum tree preservation expectations, add flexibility through administrative modifications and include incentives to encourage developments that maximize preservation of existing natural resources.

Chair Walden opened the public hearing.

Planner James Broadwell stated that the amendments would define what open space should comprise and expanded on the five types of open space listed in order of priority: sensitive natural areas; tree protection areas; undisturbed buffers; usable open space; and planted buffers.

UDO §4.9.1(C) would require Planning staff to approve minor modifications to the open space type, location and/or composition if the site is rendered undevelopable, inaccessible, the otherwise allowable density would be reduced, or the site is precluded from meeting another applicable UDO requirement. As written, at least 50% of open space must be preservation-type areas, if present, and there are incentives to encourage 100% of the open space as preservation-type areas.

If preemptive or unauthorized clearing of a property had occurred and could be proven, the Town could delay development approval for three (3) years, require the replanting of any area that would otherwise count as open space, or double the size of the buffers.

Mr. Broadwell stated that as it is written, 50% of open space shall be designated type 1, 2 or 3 versus 100% of open space be preservation-type areas to preserve as much natural area as possible, which creates a policy dilemma. If the language remains as written, a few less trees might be saved but there are incentives and it is more flexible and less restrictive for the developer. Whereas, if the incentives are removed and we make it a hard rule of 100% we will probably save more trees but there will not necessarily be the incentives or the flexibility and it would be more restrictive. Both options are consistent with the Comp Plan but which option is more consistent and better furthers its intent is really a policy choice question for the Board and the Town Council. The focus group overall was leaning more towards keeping the flexibility but he was interested in hearing the Board's recommendation.

Member Speck asked what the changes would look like.

Mr. Broadwell responded that if 12,000 SF of tree protection area was required, 100% of open space would have to be either undisturbed buffers, tree protection areas or sensitive areas, then 12,000 SF of that is probably going to be tree protection area. Whereas, if we keep it as written, the developer can reduce it to only 6,000 SF of preserved trees and the other portion could either be a recreational area or just replanted and that is the tradeoff. As it is currently written, if they retain all 12,000 SF, they get the incentives but if they just want to keep 6,000 SF of trees and replant the buffer, that is their choice.

Chair Walden closed the public hearing.

Board discussion ensued.

Monica Brickey made a motion, seconded by Andrew Speck, that after reviewing the proposed text amendments to the UDO and considering the criteria for approval of text amendments found in §2.17.10, the proposed amendments are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the approval criteria for the reasons set forth in Attachment 1 of staff report OA-02-26 as revised by the Planning Board as follows:

- Review original and revised staff report with the Planning Board's recommendation to review option 2;

and therefore, to recommend approval of OA-02-26 to the Town Council with the revised option. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

---

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

No new business was discussed.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

Planning Director Grieve stated that the Planning Board would hold its regular meeting in May.

Michael Skolnick made a motion, seconded by Jennifer Garner, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Cindy Williams  
Secretary to the Planning Board