



Cumberland County Joint Planning Board

MINUTES

April 21, 2026

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

I. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

In the absence of the Chair, Mr. Baker called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Ms. McLaughlin delivered the invocation, and Mr. Walters led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO / APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Howard noted there is one adjustment to the agenda. Case ZON-26-0015 needed to be placed on the contested portion of the agenda due to citizens signed in opposition.

Ms. McLaughlin motioned, seconded by Ms. Lynd, to approve the agenda with the adjustment. Unanimous Approval.

III. PUBLIC MEETING WITHDRAWAL/DEFERRALS

There were none.

IV. ABSTENTIONS BY BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Mobley requested a recusal for himself from Case ZON-26-0015, as he was the applicant and has a vested financial interest in the case.

V. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 17, 2026

Mr. Jenkins motioned, seconded by Mr. Walters, 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. **ZON-26-0011:** Rezoning request from O&I Office and Institutional District to R-6 Residential District or to a more restrictive zoning district for two parcels comprising approximately 0.73 +/- acres; located at the southwest corner of the Elizabeth Street and John Street intersection; submitted by Drafting and Design Services, Inc. (Agent) on behalf of Kingdom Community Development Corporation (Owner). **(Spring Lake)**

In Case ZON-26-0011, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from O&I Office and Institutional District to R-6 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-26-0011, Ms. Lynd motioned, seconded by Mr. Jenkins, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from O&I Office and Institutional District to R-6 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.

- B. **ZON-26-0013:** Rezoning request from C3 Heavy Commercial District and RR Rural Residential District to M1(P) Planned Light Industrial District or to a more restrictive zoning district for a parcel comprising approximately 4.31 +/- acres; located at 3617 and 3623 Clinton Rd; submitted by Maps Surveying (Agent) on behalf of Benjamin and Heather Hutchins (Owners).

In Case ZON-26-0013, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from RR Rural Residential District and C3 Heavy Commercial District to M1(P) Planned Light Industrial District and find that: 1. Approval is an amendment to the adopted, current Vander Area Land Use Plan and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request. 2. The requested district is appropriate to preserve the current use, to bring the site more into zoning conformity, and allow the applicant to expand their business. 3. Existing industrial zoning designations are prevalent immediately adjacent to the proposed site. 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-26-0013, Ms. Lynd motioned, seconded by Mr. Jenkins, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from RR Rural Residential District and C3 Heavy Commercial District to M1(P) Planned Light Industrial District and find that: 1. Approval is an amendment to the

adopted, current Vander Area Land Use Plan and that the Board of Commissioners should not require any additional request or application for amendment to said map for this request. 2. The requested district is appropriate to preserve the current use, to bring the site more into zoning conformity, and allow the applicant to expand their business. 3. Existing industrial zoning designations are prevalent immediately adjacent to the proposed site. 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-26-0014:** Rezoning request from A1 Agricultural District to RR Rural Residential District or to a more restrictive zoning district for two parcels comprising approximately 2.67 +/- combined acres, located on the east and west sides of Godwin Falcon Road and north of Leitha Lane; submitted by Nickolas Umbs (Applicant / Owner) on behalf of Roxy Land LLC (Owners).

In Case ZON-26-0014, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural District to RR Rural Residential District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the Northeast Cumberland Land Use Plan which calls for “Suburban 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-26-0014, Ms. Lynd motioned, seconded by Mr. Jenkins, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural District to RR Rural Residential District. The board finds that the request is consistent with the Northeast Cumberland Land Use Plan which calls for “Suburban 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-26-0016:** Rezoning request from R6 Residential District to C2(P) Planned Service and Retail District or to a more restrictive zoning district for a parcel comprising approximately 0.20 +/- acres; located on the south side of Burbank Street and 210 feet east of Natal Street; submitted by Lino Abreu (Owner).

In Case ZON-26-0016, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from R6 Residential District to C2(P) Planned Service and Retail 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-26-0016, Ms. Lynd motioned, seconded by Mr. Jenkins, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from R6 Residential District to C2(P) Planned Service and Retail 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.

- E. **ZON-26-0018:** Rezoning request from R10 Residential District and C(P) Planned Commercial District to R10 Residential District and C(P) Planned Commercial District or to a more restrictive zoning district for approximately 0.61 +/- acres within two parcels totaling 5.17 +/- acres; located north of Clinton Road and 300 feet east of Bainbridge Road; submitted by Will Marsh (Agent/Applicant) on behalf of Marsh Investment Group, LLC (Owner).
(Stedman)

In Case ZON-26-0018, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from R10 Residential District and C(P) Planned Commercial District to R10 Residential District and C(P) Planned Commercial District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the Stedman Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Commercial” 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-26-0018, Ms. Lynd motioned, seconded by Mr. Jenkins, to recommend approval of the rezoning request from R10 Residential District and C(P) Planned Commercial District to R10 Residential District and C(P) Planned Commercial District. The board finds that the request is consistent with the Stedman Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Commercial” 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-26-0015:** Rezoning request from A1 Agricultural District to R30 Residential District or to a more restrictive zoning district for two parcels comprising approximately 27.21 +/- combined acres; located on the east and west sides of Mary McCall Road and 125 feet south of Harvestgrain Drive; submitted by Todd Mobley (Agent/Applicant) on behalf of Jesse W. Hall, Jr. (Owner).

In Case ZON-26-0015, Planning and Inspections staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural District to R30 Residential District. Staff finds that the request is consistent with the Stedman Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Suburban 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.

Mr. Mobley recused himself from the dais and sat in the audience.

Richard Fagan, Planner II, presented case ZON-26-0015.

Mr. Fagan noted that the property contains wetlands and hydric soils but no water or sewer lines along Mary McCall Road.

Mr. Baker opened public comments.

Mr. Hall, owner, was called to the podium and is the only person signed up to speak in favor. He emphasized the property's heritage and the intent to preserve the Mary McCall homeplace while allowing residential development similar to the development that is connecting. He stated that he wants to keep all 3 houses in compliance with zoning and separate them from the property all with 1 acre or more. He emphasized he wants quality housing and to convert the inefficient rural land into quality housing. Land has been in his family for generations and asked the question, is there any reason why I can't benefit and sell the property for the highest and best, in today's market for residential in eastern North Carolina. He stated that there is a water and sewer district being planned that will bring municipal water to the area.

Mr. Walters asked if there is a plan for the development.

Mr. Hall said no, there is no development plan. There is a 2-step process that is under consideration. Family wish to purchase part of the property and that would be divided out.

Mr. Travis Kinlaw was called to the podium as he is the first speaker signed up in opposition.

Mr. Kinlaw stated the first problem he had was that something like this was brought up a couple of years ago with two other people a little further down on Mary McCall Road. It was shot down because they were trying to put zero lot line. There are only 2 lanes out there and roads are already terrible. The other issue he had is with a ditch on the property that is overgrown with full grown trees coming out of it. When community members brought this to Mr. Hall's attention Mr. Kinlaw stated that Mr. Hall said that they should have a community meeting and get an engineer to evaluate to see what the solutions would be. Mr. Kinlaw stated that we do not have community meetings.

No questions from the board of Mr. Kinlaw.

Mr. Richard Freeman, second speaker in opposition, was called to the podium.

Mr. Freeman pointed out that he went to all the meetings about the Stedman use plan and that there was no voting on the use plan. He wanted to know how they could come up with compliance when the community has never seen it. He stated they had many meetings but it all died out.

Mr. Freeman discussed the proposed water and sewer district. We don't have a proposal. It is yet to be approved. Roads, schools, infrastructure is not ready for growth. We would also like to preserve our tiny community.

Mr. Freeman also brought up that schools have not been improved and the daycare needs are not set up for that type of development. One acre lots are fine but when you go to R30 or zero lot clearance and being all cookie cutter housing developments stacked on each other. Mr. Freeman also brought up road congestion.

No questions for Mr. Freeman by the board.

Ms. Lynd ask staff to clarify that we no longer have zero lot lines in the county and if the Stedman Land Use plan was approved.

Mr. Howard stated that zero lot lines had been done away by the Board of Commissioners. The Stedman Land Use Plan had two approvals. One by the Stedman town council in 2020 and one by the County Commissioners for the unincorporated areas in 2020.

Mr. Robert Rhodes, third speaker in opposition. He stated that this is not responsible growth. The development without the infrastructure, planning, or safeguards needed to support it. Our roads cannot handle this project as proposed. The surrounding roads are rural, limited and under pressure. There are no commitments to road improvements or traffic mitigation or safety upgrades.

Mr. Rhodes also stated the schools are overcrowded and adding more homes without a real plan for the school capacity is neglect. Emergency services are also stretch thin. We are also nearly 20 miles from the nearest hospital.

Mr. Rhodes continued with water concerns and that most houses are on wells that have been documented with PFAS contamination. More development is more risk to public health. This proposal shifts the agricultural land to high density residential that does not fit the character of the community.

Mr. Rhodes continued with the Town of Stedman doesn't have the resources to absorb costs for this type of growth which will push the burden onto the existing residents.

Mr. Rhodes closed stated that growth should follow the infrastructure not the other way around. He asked to deny or to defer until real committed improvements are provided for water, sewer, roads, infrastructures, emergency services and schools.

Mr. Walters asked about the contamination.

Mr. Rhodes stated that there is still litigation on the contamination.

Ms. Carrie Haney was called to the podium as the fourth speaker in opposition.

Ms. Haney stated she built her house in 2005 and was one of the first people to have our water tested. Since the water testing about 3 years ago, we have only had drinking water that has been brought in. I do not have the thing put outside yet as I am one of the people in the lawsuit. My daughter was born with a bilateral cleft palate and that is one of the side effects from the water contamination. She also has daughters in all the schools. These kids are in huts outside of the schools. The schools are overcrowded. They are building

more houses but nothing for the community. The recreation center is run down. The gym has been there for a long time, but that is all.

Mr. Gerald Green Jr was called to the podium as the final speaker in opposition.

Mr. Green's additional concern is the drainage issues that effect the housing development behind him. He also stated he sold his house in Hope Mills to move to Stedman as to keep the rural living but if continued it is going to be Hope Mills all over again. He also agreed with prior speakers and added that there is only one cop on call, this will stress those emergency workers.

Mr. Hall wanted to clarify that the comments about drainage and engineer were intended to be a positive and constructive position on his part. If the neighbors who are concerned about drainage would get together and hire a someone to determine the real issue, he would work with them to reach a quality solution. It was not intended as defiance or disregard from his position.

Mr. Mobley asked to speak as the applicant from the audience.

The County Attorney advised that board member Mr. Mobley should not comment due to a conflict of interest with his membership on this board and this case.

Mr. Baker closed public comment.

Mr. Walters questioned the previous zoning in the neighborhood behind the property and the zero lot line.

Ms. Lynd pointed out its zoned A1, and if it is zero lot line, and if they don't have an HOA they probably paid the parks and rec fee and not have a common area.

Ms. Lynd asked if we knew off hand when that other property was zoned R30.

Mr. Howard stated there were no noted zoning cases in the past 10 years.

Mr. Walters asked Mr. Hall whether he would consider rezoning to R40, noting that this designation would still allow him to subdivide his property in a similar manner while meeting density requirements.

Mr. Hall responded that the R40 zoning classification would not meet his intended plans for the property.

Board members discussed zoning classifications, the preservation of the Mary McCall homeplace, and infrastructure concerns. Some members suggested that R40 zoning might better align with the surrounding community and help preserve the home site, while others emphasized the absence of a development plan and the need to consider all potential uses permitted under the zoning designation.

The discussion included whether R30 or R40 zoning would be more appropriate to support preservation efforts.

Mr. Hall asked if Mr. Mobley could speak on his behalf. Mr. Baker informed Mr. Hall that Mr. Moorefield already established that Mr. Mobley could not speak on this case.

Mr. Baker stated that Mr. Mobley will have an opportunity to speak when it goes to the Board of County Commissioners.

Concerns regarding water issues and overall infrastructure capacity were significant factors in the final deliberations among Board members.

In Case ZON-26-0015, Mr. Walters made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lynd, to recommend denial of the rezoning request from A1 Agricultural District to R30 Residential District. The board finds that the request is not consistent with the Stedman Area Land Use Plan which calls for “Suburban Density Residential” at this location. The board cited the absence of a development plan, insufficient infrastructure, and confusion surrounding the nature of the request. The motion for denial passed, with Ms. McLaughlin and Mr. Baker voting against the motion for denial.

IX. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. **DEV-0010-26:** Consideration of Subdivision Waiver(s) from Section 2304.C.4.c.(5), Private Street Specifications, Cumberland County Subdivision Ord., to allow a maximum of three residential units per lot on a parcel comprising 9.90 +/- acres, located at 6615 and 6633 Norvell Road; submitted by Eric Stoddard (Agent) on behalf of James Melvin (Owner).

Mr. Baker informed the audience that, unlike the previous cases, a subdivision waiver is a quasi-judicial hearing, and testimony must be given under oath. He also noted that while zoning cases are ultimately decided by the Board of Commissioners, subdivision waiver cases are decided by the Planning Board, which serves as the final authority.

Mr. Baker called the hearing to order and administered the oath to staff.

Sabrina Greer, Planner I, presented staff's PowerPoint for Case DEV-0010-26. She explained that the applicant is requesting a waiver to allow three homes on a single lot accessed by a Class C private street, exceeding the typical maximum of two units. The request is intended to accommodate family members, including disabled relatives requiring care. The site consists of approximately 9.9 acres zoned A1, which meets density requirements.

Ms. Greer noted that a similar case on Norvell Road was approved in early 2026, and that the previous road upgrade was completed in conjunction with the first Group Development Permit.

Ms. Greer reminded the Board that it has the authority to approve, deny, or approve with conditions the subdivision waiver. Any conditions must be reasonable and practical. She reviewed the three criteria in Section 2601, *Waivers*, which must be satisfied:

Mr. Baker opened public comment.

Applicant James Melvin was called to the podium and swore in by Mr. Baker.

Mr. Melvin testified that he purchased his property 30+ years ago and moved a military barracks onto the property. Mr. Melvin explained that he has knee and back problems and

that he is a veteran. He questioned why there isn't a grandfather clause or something to protect him.

Mr. Melvin explained that the need for the third home to support care for him so that he can enjoy the rest of his days with them. Mr. Melvin described challenges with road conditions and that mansions can get approved behind him with same road. Testimony included personal health issues, Health issues of a nephew, the need for proximity, and ongoing efforts to improve the private road.

Ms. Ola Melvin was sworn in by Mr. Baker.

Ms. Melvin stated that she would love to be close to her dad and take care of him. She is just trying to be a family. Ms. Melvin included personal health issues, Health issues of a nephew, the need for proximity. She also stated that they have slowly made efforts to improve the private road and it has been a challenge.

Willie Melvin and Jacquelen declined to speak.

Board members asked clarifying questions about road upgrades and the number of existing homes on the property.

Ms. Lynd made a motion, seconded by Mr. Walters, to approve the subdivision waiver as the request met the required ordinance criteria provided by staff. Unanimous approval.

X. DISCUSSION

A. DATA CENTERS

Mr. Howard provided an update on the data center ordinance, noting that the code committee has met with other parties and is making good progress on drafting the ordinance. The timing of bringing the ordinance to the board depends on forthcoming direction from the Board of Commissioners.

B. UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) UPDATE

Mr. Howard updated the board on the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) revision process, including recent work on updated flood and watershed ordinances. The consultant has submitted drafts to the State for review of the ordinance language that guides their requirements, and the flood ordinance is modernized with required state inclusions.

C. OFFICERS ELECTIONS

Mr. Howard informed the board that officer elections and committee assignments are coming up in June.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.