



Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

MINUTES

February 17, 2026

Members Present	Members Absent	Others Present
Mr. James Baker, Vice Chair	Mr. Tom Lloyd-Chair	Mr. Rawls Howard, Director
Ms. Betty Lynd,		Mr. David Moon, Deputy Director
Mr. Stan Crumpler		Mr. Rick Moorefield, County Attorney
Mr. Todd Mobley		Ms. Amanda Ozanich, Snr. Admin. Professional
Mr. Mark Williams		Timothy Doersam, Planner II
Mr. Lyndel Ray Jenkins		
Mr. William Walters		
Ms. Jami McLaughlin		
Mr. Charles Jones		

I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Baker called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM. Mr. Mobley delivered the invocation and Mr. Walters led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO / APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Howard noted that Case ZON-26-0003 had speakers signed up in opposition. So, the request should be moved to the contested portion of the agenda.

Mr. Crumpler motioned, seconded by Mr. Walters, to approve the agenda with the noted adjustment. Unanimous approval.

III. PUBLIC MEETING WITHDRAWAL/DEFERRALS

There were none.

IV. ABSTENTIONS BY BOARD MEMBERS

There were none.

V. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 20, 2026

Ms. McLaughlin motioned, seconded by Mr. Jenkins, to approve the minutes, as submitted by staff. Unanimous approval.

VI. CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. Baker read the Chairman's Welcome and the Rules of Procedure.

VII. PUBLIC MEETING CONSENT ITEMS

REZONING CASES

- A. ZNG-001-26:** Initial Zoning of 2.44 +/- acres to R7.5 Residential District, located at 0 Round Stone Ct. The empty lot at the northeast corner of Fairhaven Trl & Muscat Rd. REID 0403857431000 Submitted by Lori Epler dba Larry King & Associates, RLS, PA (applicant) on behalf of Edward Barham dba Barham Builders, Inc (owners). **(Hope Mills)**

The Town of Hope Mills' Planning staff recommends approval of the initial zoning request to R7.5 Residential District, as it is consistent with the 2025 Cumberland County Future Land Use Plan, which calls for Low-Density Residential. The proposed zoning is a strategic fit with the Town's ongoing and future economic growth and development goals. It is also appropriate, given the existing and anticipated nearby land uses, making the request both reasonable and beneficial to the public.

In Case ZNG-001-26, Mr. Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Williams, to recommend approval of the initial zoning request to R7.5 Residential District, as it is consistent with the 2025 Cumberland County Future Land Use Plan, which calls for Low-Density Residential. The proposed zoning is a strategic fit with the Town's ongoing and future economic growth and development goals. It is also appropriate, given the existing and anticipated nearby land uses, making the request both reasonable and beneficial to the public. Unanimous approval.

- B. ZON-26-0001:** Rezoning request from O&I(P) Planned Office and Institutional District to C1(P) Planned Local Business District or to a more restrictive zoning district for a parcel comprising approximately 0.39 +/- acres; located at 2448 Owen Drive; submitted by Vernard Whitfield (Applicant) on behalf of Ronnie, Donnie, and James Marley (Owners).

In Case ZON-26-0001, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from O&I(P) Planned Office and Institutional District to C1(P) Planned Local Business District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan which calls for "Mixed Use" at this location. Staff also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning.

In Case ZON-26-0001, Mr. Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Williams, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from O&I(P) Planned Office and Institutional District to C1(P) Planned Local Business District. The board finds that the request is consistent with the Southwest Cumberland Land Use Plan which calls for "Mixed Use" at this location. The board also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning. Unanimous approval.

- C. ZON-26-0002:** Rezoning request from O&I Office and Institutional District to R-5 Residential District or to a more restrictive zoning district for a parcel comprising approximately 0.34 +/- acres; located on the south side of Ruth St., 100 feet west of the intersection at Broad St.; submitted by George Ferrell III (Agent/Applicant) on behalf of Dorthy Ferrel (Owner). **(Spring Lake)**

In Case ZON-26-0002, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from O&I Office and Institutional District to R-5 Residential District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the Spring Lake Area Land Use Plan which calls for “High Density Residential” at this location. Staff also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning.

In Case ZON-26-0002, Mr. Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Williams, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from O&I Office and Institutional District to R-5 Residential District. The board finds that the request is consistent with the Spring Lake Area Land Use Plan which calls for “High Density Residential” at this location. The board also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning. Unanimous approval.

- D. ZON-26-0004:** Rezoning request from R40A/CUD Residential Conditional Use District to A1 Agricultural District or to a more restrictive zoning district for a parcel comprising approximately 9.73 +/- acres; located at the southeast corner of Goldsboro Rd. and Eason Rd.; submitted by Bobby and Yolanda Barefoot (Owners).

In Case ZON-26-0004, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from R40A/CUD Residential Conditional Use District to A1 Agricultural District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the Bethany Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Rural” at this location. Staff also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning.

In Case ZON-26-0004, Mr. Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Williams, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from R40A/CUD Residential Conditional Use District to A1 Agricultural District. The board finds that the request is consistent with the Bethany Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Rural” at this location. The board also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning. Unanimous approval.

- E. ZON-26-0005:** Rezoning request from RR Rural Residential District and PND Planned Neighborhood Development District to A1 Agricultural District or to a more restrictive zoning district for a parcel comprising approximately 81.80 +/- acres; located at 2801 McBryde St; submitted by Scott Flowers (Applicant) on behalf of McCormick Farms Limited Partnership (Owners).

In Case ZON-26-0005, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from RR Rural Residential District and PND Planned Neighborhood Development District to A1 Agricultural District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the North Central Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Rural/Agricultural” and “Open Space” at this location. Staff also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning.

In Case ZON-26-0005, Mr. Crumpler made a motion, seconded by Mr. Williams, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from RR Rural Residential District and PND Planned Neighborhood Development District to A1 Agricultural District. The board finds that the request is consistent with the North Central Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Rural/Agricultural” and “Open Space” at this location. The board also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning. Unanimous approval.

VIII. PUBLIC MEETING CONTESTED ITEMS

REZONING CASES

- A. ZON-26-0003:** Rezoning request from R40A Residential District to A1 Agricultural District or to a more restrictive zoning district for a parcel comprising approximately 5.00 +/- acres; located at 3943 Crittercreek Rd; submitted by Richard Mamara (Owner).

In Case ZON-26-0003, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from R40A Residential District to A1 Agricultural District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the South-Central Land Use Plan which calls for “Farmland” at this location. Staff also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning.

Mr. Timothy Doersam, Planner II, presented the case information. He noted that A1 is consistent with the area’s land use plan and the stated intent of the owner is to ultimately build an RV park. He also noted that for an RV park to be placed in an A1 zoning, it would need to go before the Board of Adjustment to receive a Special Use Permit as a separate process.

Mr. Baker asked if there were any questions in regard to staff’s presentation.

Mr. Crumpler wanted to know if the Class C road that is in place, would that allow for the traffic that is going to come from the RV park.

Mr. Doersam stated that in the ordinance, it is required that the RV park have direct access to a paved or public street. Prior to the RV park being in place, it would require an upgrade to the road.

Mr. Howard clarified that the board is not voting on approval of an RV park as part of this request. The action before the board concerns only the request to change the underlying zoning district. If the rezoning is approved, any proposal for an RV park would require a separate Special Use Permit (SUP) reviewed by the Board of Adjustment (BOA). That process is quasi-judicial and evidentiary, meaning the BOA must evaluate sworn testimony and evidence to determine whether the applicant can meet all applicable standards.

Mr. Howard also noted that questions related to road improvements, infrastructure needs, and other site-specific impacts would be addressed during the SUP hearing. The BOA would decide whether the applicant satisfies the required criteria based on the evidence presented at that time.

Mr. Crumpler asked how many homes may be served by a Class C street.

Mr. Moon explained that a Class C street may serve no more than four lots. He noted that Crittercreek Road is considered a substandard Class C Street. Although it currently serves more than four lots, the subdivision ordinance and the definition of private streets indicate that Class C is the closest applicable classification. He also noted that the road was created prior to the adoption of County zoning regulations.

Mr. Williams asked how many dwellings could be placed on the property under A1 zoning.

Mr. Doersam stated that two dwellings, either stick-built or manufactured, could be placed on the property.

In response to additional board questions, Mr. Doersam clarified that Crittercreek Road, was created in 1971 and was deeded as a 60-foot right-of-way. While no plats exist, the deeds support this designation.

Mr. Howard added that the 1970s predates the county's zoning ordinance, and at that time such divisions could be completed by deed. As a result, this area may be considered a legal non-conforming subdivision; meaning any further subdivision must follow the current four-lot standard. He noted that A1 zoning would more closely align with the existing lot pattern in the area. He also emphasized that staff cannot accept a Special Use Permit (SUP) application until the zoning and entitlements are in place.

Responding to a board question regarding NCDOT's designation of Crittercreek Road, Mr. Moon explained that the "local road" designation simply means DOT recognizes it as a road providing access to properties. It does not mean the road is DOT-maintained. It remains a private street, named for addressing and E911 purposes.

Mr. Baker opened the public comment period and invited the sole speaker in favor of the rezoning to address the board.

Mr. Richard Mamara, owner of 3943 Crittercreek Road, stated that he is requesting A1 zoning for his property. He noted that he has worked closely with staff to obtain septic and well approvals and has implemented recommended road improvements to stabilize the shared right-of-way and reduce erosion. He stated that his goal is to ensure responsible development and compliance with regulations.

Mr. Howard called the first speaker in opposition to the podium.

Ms. Cynthia McDonald, 3775 Crittercreek Road, introduced herself and stated that her concerns are based on road limitations, property rights, unauthorized activity, environmental conditions, and the overall impact on the neighborhood. She noted that uses such as RV parks, campgrounds, and high-traffic agricultural or commercial activities would significantly alter the character and safety of the area.

Ms. McDonald emphasized that the private road cannot support increased traffic. The access road serving the properties is private and was not constructed for commercial or high-volume use. She stated that it cannot safely accommodate RVs or additional traffic,

particularly given its limited visibility and daily use by families and children. She expressed concern that additional traffic would create dangerous conditions and increase the risk of accidents.

Ms. McDonald also stated that she believed Mr. Mamara placed approximately three tons of asphalt on the dirt road without obtaining permits.

Mr. Howard called the second speaker in opposition to the podium.

Ms. Michaela Sanders, 3836 Crittercreek Road, introduced herself and stated that she brought letters from other community members who could not attend, but who share her concerns. She acknowledged that the board is considering a rezoning request, not an RV park application, but emphasized that this action is the first step toward allowing a 10–20-pad, long-term RV park on the property.

Ms. Sanders stated that the property lies within a watershed protection area. She also noted that residents in the area rely on private wells and that PFAS contamination has already been detected in their water. She expressed concern that the development of 10–20 RV pads on the site could negatively affect groundwater quality and further impact their wells.

Mr. Howard called the third speaker in opposition to the podium.

Mr. Glenn Elliot, 8151 NC Highway 87 South, stated that he and his wife own the property adjoining the northern boundary of the parcel under consideration. He noted that they have lived at their residence since 1978 and continue to reside there today. Mr. Elliot stated plainly that he does not support the request. He added that if he had wanted to live next to a trailer park or an RV park, he would have done so years ago.

Mr. Elliot added that he believes Mr. Mamara may have cut down trees located on his property. He stated that a survey will be needed to confirm whether the trees were removed from his land, and noted that, if so, they were valuable trees.

Mr. Howard called the fourth speaker in opposition to the podium.

Mr. Bruce Skinner, 3834 Tranquility Road, stated that he has lived at his residence since 1978. He explained that he is not opposed to an RV park in the Grays Creek community, but he is not supportive of one on Crittercreek Road. He noted that RVs are difficult to maneuver, are cumbersome on narrow roads, and that it would require significant expense to upgrade Crittercreek Road to safely accommodate them.

Mr. Skinner also referenced Hall Park, stating that the community is unable to book additional ball tournaments because there are no nearby facilities, stores, or recreational amenities to support visitors. He explained that the lack of an RV park in the area forces weekend visitors to stay in hotels at a higher cost.

Mr. Skinner added that he is not in favor of rezoning the property to A1, stating that R40 is more consistent with the existing character of the area. He reiterated that while he supports the idea of an RV park elsewhere in Grays Creek, the zoning and road conditions on Crittercreek Road make it an unsuitable location.

Mr. Skinner also provided four letters from people that were not able to come tonight.

Mr. Howard called the fifth speaker in opposition to the podium.

Mr. Douglas Hopper stated that he has no new comments that haven't already been spoken.

Mr. Howard called the final speaker in opposition to the podium.

Mr. Edward Pone, Chairman of the Board of Trustees for Willis Creek AME Zion Church, located at 3614 Turner Road, stated that the church has been part of the community since 1970. He expressed concern that the rezoning request is a precursor to changing the character of the community, noting that an RV park is, by nature, a transient use.

Mr. Pone stated that he joins with his neighbors and request denial of the rezoning. He concluded by urging the board to stop the process now rather than wasting people's time.

Mr. Baker closed the public comment portion of the meeting and asked whether any board members had comments or questions.

Mr. Walters asked when the property had been rezoned to R40A. Staff did not have that information available. Mr. Howard noted that it would have occurred more than ten years ago, per our rezoning records reflected in the staff report.

Mr. Walters stated that he is very familiar with the area and does not believe it is an appropriate location for an RV park. He expressed concerns about the proposal and about approving the rezoning request.

Mr. Jones reminded the board that issues such as road conditions and environmental impacts for an RV park are not part of the board's review at this stage. Those matters would need to be addressed later in the process through the BOA.

Ms. Lynd emphasized that the applicant is requesting A1 zoning. She acknowledged the concerns raised by neighboring residents but explained that the board must base its recommendation on consistency with the land use plan. If the board recommends denial, it must provide a clear and defensible reason. She noted that if the applicant appeals, the decision will be reviewed, and the board cannot deny A1 zoning simply because of assumptions about a potential RV park. That determination falls under the Board of Adjustment and its findings of fact under state statute. She added that A1 zoning is common in the area and would result in lower density than what currently exists along what has been described as a substandard Class C street. Because this is a straight

rezoning request, the board cannot consider the applicant's intent, and doing so complicates the board's role under its own statutory authority.

In Case ZON-26-0003, Ms. Lynd made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crumpler, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from R40A Residential District to A1 Agricultural District. The board finds that the request is consistent with the South-Central Land Use Plan which calls for "Farmland" at this location. The board also finds that the request is reasonable and in the public interest as it is compatible to and in harmony with the surrounding land use activities and zoning. The motion for approval passed with Mr. Walters voting against the motion.

IX. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

There were none.

X. ITEMS OF BUSINESS

There were none.

XI. DISCUSSION

- A. Data Centers- Mr. Howard informed the board that a codes subcommittee may be established in response to the growing number of data centers proposed in the area. He noted that he is awaiting guidance from the County Commissioners regarding their input and expectations for how these projects should be reviewed and managed. Once that direction is received, Mr. Howard will provide the information to the Planning Board, which will then move forward with calling the subcommittee to address the land-use considerations associated with these centers.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:46pm.