



**TOWN OF CARTHAGE
PLANNING BOARD
April 2nd, 2026
6:00 P.M.**

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. INVOCATION**
- 3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA** - Members of the board may remove or add items to the agenda prior to commencing the meeting. Motions/votes are not required to approve the agenda but there must be unanimous consent before proceeding.
- 5. CONSENT AGENDA** - All items listed below are considered routine and will be enacted by one motion. No separate discussion will be held except on request of a member of the Planning Board to remove an item from the consent agenda and place it on the regular agenda.
 - a. Approval of minutes from March 5th, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes.
- 6. PUBLIC COMMENT** - Members of the public may use this time to address the Planning Board with any presentations, questions or concerns. Those who wish to speak should fill out the sign-up sheet in the building's entryway to be recognized during the public comment session or raise their hand and wait to be recognized by the presiding member. All public comment made as part of a public hearing should be withheld until the public hearing has begun and the floor is given to public comments. The chairperson may place time limits on speakers prior to the start of the public comment session.
- 7. OLD BUSINESS**
 - a. No old business.
- 8. NEW BUSINESS**
 - a. S-03-26: Site Plan Review for James Gaston located at 832 Dowd Road, Parcel 20040368; Airport-Conditional Zoning; Petitioner: James Gaston.
 - b. TA-04-01: UDO Amendment Section 100.44: Call for Public Hearing or Decision to Summarily Dismiss.
- 9. OTHER BUSINESS OF THE BOARD**
 - a. No other business.
- 10. ADJOURNMENT**

City of Town of Carthage

Planning Board Meeting

March 5, 2026 Meeting minutes

Attendance

In attendance were Chairman, David Norris, Bill Smyth, Victoria Riddle, Ian Lumgair, Corey Deibel, John Ferrari, and Antoinette Kelly. Those absent were Christopher Denfeld and Mark Lawler.

Call To Order

Chairman, David Norris, called the Planning Board meeting to order at 6:00 PM on Thursday, March 5, 2026.

Invocation

Chairman, David Norris, led the invocation.

Pledge Of Allegiance

The board and attendees recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval Of Agenda

The Chairman asked for any discussion on the agenda. Hearing none, all members approved the agenda by voice vote.

Consent Agenda

The consent agenda included approval of minutes from the February 5th, 2025 regular meeting. With no changes or additions requested, the consent agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Public Comment

The Chairman asked for public comments, noting that comments specific to the Priest Hill project should be reserved for that agenda item. No general public comments were made.

Old Business

No old business was presented.

New Business

S-02-26: Site Plan Review for Leenheer Storage Units Located At 3760 US 15-501, Parcel ID #20170229; Jeffrey Leenheer

Abby Manning from Central Pines Regional Council presented the site plan application for Jeffrey Leenheer's storage unit facility. The property was recently rezoned to industrial, making storage units a permitted use by right. The proposal includes two storage buildings totaling 9,600 square feet, with fencing and landscaping at the front and rear. The fire marshal's office and public works had no comments on the plan.

Board member Ian Lumgair expressed concerns about continued development along US 15-501, particularly regarding traffic safety given the high speeds and lack of turn lanes on that corridor. He worried about creating more stop-and-go traffic situations.

Applicant Jeffrey Leenheer responded that storage units typically generate minimal traffic, estimating perhaps 10-15 cars per day based on observations of similar facilities. He noted that customers often prefer to visit during off-peak hours in the evenings. The storage units are not climate-controlled and will offer various sizes from 5x10 to 10x15 feet.

The Chairman inquired about the typical rental patterns, and Leenheer indicated it would be a mixture of short-term and long-term rentals, though he prefers long-term customers.

Motion: Bill Smyth moved to approve S-02-26 as written and presented. Ian Lumgair seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

PUD-01-26: Conditional Zoning Request for Project Known As "Priest Hill" – A Mixed-Use Development From RA-40, RA-20 And TBD To PUD; Petitioner: Rhetson Companies

Abby Manning presented the conditional rezoning application for the Priest Hill mixed-use development covering approximately 134 acres across seven parcels. The project proposes townhomes, single-family homes, commercial space, industrial flex space, offices, and retail, with completion estimated around 2034.

The traffic impact analysis assumed 130 single-family detached homes, 90 townhomes, 166,000 square feet of shopping center, 34,000 square feet of business park, and various office and restaurant spaces. Three full movement driveways are proposed with two off US 15-501 and one driveway off Priest Hill Road.

Developer Presentation

Matt Taggart from Rhetson Companies emphasized their commitment to working with the town to create a thoughtfully planned mixed-use community. He highlighted the project's phased approach, starting with flex space for light industrial and service businesses, followed by residential components offering various housing options.

Bob Koontz provided detailed technical information about the site's constraints and opportunities, including significant topography, wetlands, and perennial streams. The development plan designates specific areas: Area A for industrial flex space, Area B for mixed commercial and residential along major roads, and Area C for residential-only development.

The concept plan shows commercial outparcels along US 15-501, with residential areas further back utilizing natural buffers created by wetlands. Koontz emphasized their commitment to native landscaping without turf grass to address water conservation concerns.

Board Questions and Concerns

Corey Deibel raised concerns about the timing of the traffic study, noting it was conducted in December rather than during peak agricultural season when traffic is heaviest on these roads. He also expressed worry about traffic bottlenecks, particularly given that Priest Hill Road and Union Church Road are already being used as cut-throughs from new residential developments.

John Ferrari identified significant discrepancies between the traffic impact analysis, the conceptual plan, and the development plan. The traffic study analyzed 220 residential units while the development plan allows for up to 400 residential units plus 200 assisted living units. He expressed concern about underestimating traffic impacts and the precedent this sets for future development phases.

Ian Lumgair questioned the town's capacity to provide water and sewer services, noting that some developments have been unable to proceed due to infrastructure limitations. He also raised concerns about the lack of school board and county commissioner representation at the meeting, given the potential impact on school capacity.

Infrastructure and Utilities

Multiple board members pressed developers on water and sewer capacity issues. Bob Koontz acknowledged working with town staff to understand water limitations and committed to phasing development based on available capacity. The first phase would be the flex space, which has lower water demand than residential development.

Corey Deibel, a local resident, shared that he has experienced significant reduction in his well's water production due to existing development impacts on the local aquifer, dropping from 50 gallons in 10 minutes to 25 gallons.

Public Input

Priscilla Riley, a local landowner who sold property to the developers, spoke in support of the project. She praised Rhetson Companies' track record and expressed confidence in their ability to create a development that benefits both residents and the broader community.

John Riley described his family's long history with the property and his belief that the development would benefit Carthage's economic growth while maintaining the area's character.

Kim Honan, representing nearby residents on Caribou Road, expressed concerns about traffic, noise, and stormwater impacts on their neighborhood, which sits behind the proposed industrial area. She requested consideration of buffering and mitigation measures.

Conditions and Compromises

Following extensive discussion, the developers agreed to two key conditions to address board concerns:

- Limiting residential units to 250 total (rather than the 400 maximum in the original proposal)
- Providing a 50-foot buffer zone along the northern boundary adjacent to existing residential properties

Matt Taggart emphasized that any future assisted living facility would require returning to the board for approval, which members indicated they would likely support given the community need.

Consistency and Approval

Motion: Bill Smyth moved to approve PUD-01-26 as described and find it consistent with the adopted land use plans, specifically goals 2, 5, and 9. Bill Smyth seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Bill Smyth moved to approve PUD-01-26 with conditions limiting housing units to 250 and requiring a 50-foot buffer zone in the commercial flex area along the northwestern boundary. Ian Lumgair seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business of the Board

No other business was presented.

Adjournment

Motion: Bill Smyth motioned to adjourn. Corey Deibel seconded the motion. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM.



MEMORANDUM

Date: April 2, 2026
To: Planning Board
From: Jennifer Locklear, Town Planner
Subject: S-03-26: Site Plan Review for James Gaston located at 832 Dowd Road, Parcel 20040368;
Zone: Airport- Conditional Zoning; Petitioner: James Gaston

I. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION REQUEST:

Applicant James Gaston received conditional zoning approval on April 21, 2025. Subject to Ordinance 25.04, conditional zoning allows for up to 20,000 square feet of commercial space to be built to accommodate the various defense tech incubator uses.

Please view **Attachment 1 for the Site Plan**. This site plan is for an additional 12,000 square foot building to be added to this site, 832 Dowd Road.

The building and setbacks are still subject to Section 100.57, Table of Dimensional Standards, which says, "Maximum building coverage is 50% percent of lot" in the Airport District. The building coverage for this proposed 12,000 square foot building and the existing building of approximately 11,000 square feet is roughly 15%. This meets standards.

The site plan review is based on Section 100.64 and is required due to the new building being built on site.

Figure 1: Site Location outlined in blue.



II. PROJECT INFORMATION:

1. PARID: 20040368 (PIN: 856700975613)
2. Applicant/Owner: JCG PROPERTIES, LLC
3. Owner: JCG PROPERTIES, LLC
4. Long-Range Plan Designation:
This future area of this land appears to be Rural per the adopted 2040 Land Use Plan.
5. Current Zoning:
The current zoning is AP-CZ (Airport Conditional Zoning). It was approved April 2025.

III. APPLICATION REVIEW:

A. Review Process:

Applications for site plan review are pursuant to UDO Section 100.32, Section 100.44 and Section 100.64 "Site-Specific Vesting Plan."

Sec. 100.32 Planning Board – Powers and Duties

In addition to its specific duties set forth in this and other Town Ordinances and policies, the Planning Board shall have the following powers and duties:

1. *To make studies of the Town and surrounding areas;*
2. *To determine objectives to be sought in the development of the Town;*
3. *To propose and recommend plans for achieving these objectives;*
4. *To develop and recommend to the Board of Commissions policies, ordinances, administrative procedures and other means for carrying out plans in a coordinated and efficient manner;*
5. *To advise the Board of Commissioners concerning the use and amendment of means for carrying out plans;*
6. *To exercise such functions in the administration and enforcement of various means for carrying out plans as may be assigned by this article or other ordinances of the Town; and*
7. *To perform other related duties as may be assigned by this article or other ordinances.*

Section 100.44 (4) Planning Board

All proposed Development Ordinance amendments must be given review by the Planning Board for a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. They are not required to conduct a public hearing, but they are encouraged to accept public input. The Planning Board shall evaluate all proposals for consistency with any adopted long-range plans and adopt a statement of consistency with said plans before voting to recommend approval or denial of the request.

C. Staff Comments:

This is an approved use based on the approved conditional zoning, Ordinance 25.04. The applicant has agreed to meet the UDO requirements and conditional zoning requirements. Staff are still reviewing the site plan for comments. The applicant is eager to move forward. Please view Attachment 1 for the site plan.

IV. PLANNING ATTACHMENTS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Attachment 1: Site Plan

V. PLANNING BOARD ACTION:

The Planning Board shall evaluate all proposals for consistency with any adopted long-range plans and adopt a statement of consistency with said plans before voting to recommend approval or

denial of the request. All proposed Development Ordinance amendments must be given review by the Planning Board for a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. They are not required to conduct a public hearing, but they are encouraged to accept public input, per UDO Section 100.42 and 100.44.

The Planning Board shall vote on the petition (***one motion required***). The Resolution of Consistency may take one of three forms consistent with N.C.G.S 160D-604(d); 605(a); 701.

PETITION MOTION (Required Motion)

And, therefore, I move to:

OPTION 1

Approve S-03-26 as written and presented.

or

OPTION 2

Approve S-03-26 with the following conditions.....

OPTION 3

Deny S-03-26 for the following reasons.....

Town of Carthage Planning Board



MEMORANDUM

Date: April 2nd, 2026
To: The Planning Board
From: Jamie Sandoval, Management Analyst
Subject: UDO Text Amendment to allow Planning Staff to set Public Hearings without Resolutions.

Planning staff recommends that the Board of Commissioners approve an amendment to Section 100.44 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Staff believes it is reasonable to allow administrative staff to schedule public hearings without the need for a formal resolution. Many other municipalities and counties permit planning or administrative staff to set public hearings administratively, without requiring a resolution from the governing board.

Current Language in UDO Section 100.44

2. Call for Public Hearing or Decision to Summarily Dismiss

The Board of Commissioners shall set a date for public hearing of any petition for amendment. At that time, the Board may determine that they do not wish to consider amending the Zoning Map or Land Development Ordinance. If such is the case, the Board may vote to summarily dismiss the case and not conduct a public hearing. The reason the case shall not be heard is to be included in the public record of the meeting.

A proposed zoning map amendment may not be reconsidered and may be summarily dismissed if an amendment for the same property is submitted again within one year's time unless the Board of Commissioners determines that there is a compelling reason to rehear a map amendment.

In setting the public hearing date, sufficient time shall be provided to allow for input from the Planning Board and for all public notice requirements to be met.

Proposed Language in UDO Section 100.44

~~2. Call for Public Hearing or Decision to Summarily Dismiss~~

~~The Board of Commissioners shall set a date for public hearing of any petition for amendment. At that time, the Board may determine that they do not wish to consider amending the Zoning Map or Land Development Ordinance. If such is the case, the Board may vote to summarily dismiss the case and not conduct a public hearing. The reason the case shall not be heard is to be included in the public record of the meeting.~~

~~A proposed zoning map amendment may not be reconsidered and may be summarily dismissed if an amendment for the same property is submitted again within one year's time unless the Board of Commissioners determines that there is a compelling reason to rehear a map amendment.~~

In setting the public hearing date, sufficient time shall be provided to allow for input from the Planning Board and for all public notice requirements to be met.

SUGGESTED MOTION(S)

LUP CONSISTENCY MOTION (1st Required Motion)

I move to:

OPTION 1

Approve the text amendment and describe its consistency with the adopted Land Use Plan.

or

OPTION 2

Reject the text amendment and describe its inconsistency with the adopted Land Use Plan.

or

OPTION 3

Approve the text amendment and deem it a modification of the adopted Land Use Plan. The Planning Board believes this action taken is reasonable and in the public interest because.....

PETITION MOTION (2ND Required Motion)

And, therefore, I move to:

OPTION 1

Approve TA-03-26 as written and presented.

or

OPTION 2

Approve TA-03-26 with the following conditions.....

OPTION 3

Deny TA-03-26 for the following reasons.....

**TOWN OF CARTHAGE
PLANNING BOARD
STATEMENT OF LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY
FOR PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE SECTION
100.44: CALL FOR PUBLIC HEARING OR DECISION TO SUMMARILY DISMISS**

WHEREAS, amendments to the Town of Carthage Unified Development Ordinance have been proposed, which amendments are identified as follows:

Section 100.44: Call for Public Hearing or Decision to Summarily Dismiss

NOW THEREFORE, the Planning Board of the Town of Carthage resolves as follows:

Section 1. The Planning Board concludes that the above-described amendment(s) **are/are not** consistent with the Town of Carthage 2040 Land Use Plan, as amended based on the following:

- Goal 1: Preserve and celebrated small-town community roots.**
- Goal 2: Coordinated, intentional, and well-planned growth and development.**
- Goal 3: Protection of open space and critical natural features.**
- Goal 4: Ample employment opportunities and support for business development.**
- Goal 5: Vibrant commercial areas that provide a variety of goods, services, entertainment options, and amenities.**
- Goal 6: A well-connected multi-modal transportation system.**
- Goal 7: High-quality parks and recreational facilities that are accessible to all.**
- Goal 8: Protected and preserve historic and cultural resources.**
- Goal 9: Adequate supply and high quality of housing.**
- Goal 10: Informed, engaged, and active residents that represent a variety of neighborhoods and citizen groups.**
- Goal 11: Regulations that are consistent with the Town’s vision.**
- Goal 12: Cultural, educational, recreational, and other amenities that contribute to the quality of life of Carthage’s citizens.**

Planning staff recommends that the Board of Commissioners approve an amendment to Section 100.44 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Staff believes it is reasonable to allow administrative staff to schedule public hearings without the need for a formal resolution. Many other municipalities and counties permit planning or administrative staff to set public hearings administratively, without requiring a resolution from the governing board

Section 2. Please state the Planning Board’s reasonings/findings for the approval or disapproval of this consistency statement based on the above selected goals.

Section 2. The Planning Board concludes that the above-described amendment(s) **are/are not** reasonable and in the public interest as they **do/do not** fulfill a direct objective of the Land Use Plan.

This statement adopted the _____ day of _____, 2026

David Norris, Chair

Jamie Sandoval, Clerk to the Planning Board