



Planning and Development Services

(Planning) ☎ 919-856-6310
(Permits and Inspections) ☎ 919-856-6222
(Watershed Management) ☎ 919-856-7436

336 Fayetteville St. • Raleigh, NC 27601
P.O. Box 550 • Raleigh, NC 27602

wake.gov

MINUTES OF BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT AUGUST 11, 2026

LOCATION: Wake County Justice Center, 301 S. McDowell St., Room 2700, Raleigh, NC

MEMBERS PRESENT:

1. Mr. Jeffrey Goebel (Chair)
2. Ms. Britany Waddell (Vice Chair)
3. Mr. Joe Cebina
4. Mr. DeAntony Collins
5. Mr. Waheed Haq
6. Mr. Mark Spanioli
7. Mr. Russell Stephenson
8. Mr. Will Wingfield

COUNTY STAFF:

1. Ms. Angie Arzon
2. Ms. Ambryss Brown
3. Mr. Steven Finn
4. Mr. Tim Gardiner
5. Mr. Eric Green
6. Dr. Caroline Loop
7. Mr. Josh McClellan
8. Mr. David Parks
9. Ms. Hana Shaikh
10. Ms. Becca Truluck

COUNTY ATTORNEY:

1. Mr. Kenneth Murphy, Deputy County Attorney

-
1. **Meeting called to order:** Mr. Goebel called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.
 2. **Petitions and Amendments:** None.
 3. **Approval of Minutes of July 14, 2026, Meeting:** Mr. Goebel made a motion to approve the July 14, 2026, minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Collins, and the minutes were approved unanimously.
 4. **PLG-ZV-006555-2026 (Mr. Steven Finn, Land Development Administrator)**
The petitioner is requesting a zoning variance for an existing rear porch to encroach 12.6 feet into the required 30-foot rear building setback in the R-30 zoning district.

Voting Members

Five voting members were identified:

1. Mr. Jeffrey Goebel

2. Ms. Britany Waddell
3. Mr. DeAntony Collins
4. Mr. Waheed Haq
5. Mr. William Wingfield

Location

WAKE COUNTY PIN: 1607 31 5842

ZONING DISTRICT: Residential-30 (R-30)

LAND USE CLASSIFICATION: Community Reserve/Garner growth area

WATERSHED: Middle Creek

CROSS REFERENCE FILES: N/A

APPLICANT: Hannes Ringoot

PROPERTY OWNER: Hannes & Celeste Ringoot

PROPERTY SIZE: 0.87 acres

CURRENT LAND USE: Single-Family Residential

Documentary Evidence Accepted into Record

- Staff Report
- Staff Presentation
- Applicant's Application

TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE PRESENTED

Testimony by Steven Finn

Mr. Finn was sworn in and presented the Staff Report and Presentation, which were accepted into the record. Mr. Finn explained that the applicant is requesting a variance from Article 5, Section 5-11-2 of the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance to encroach into the required 30-foot rear yard setback for a principal dwelling. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow an unpermitted attached covered deck to encroach 12.6 feet into the required 30-foot rear building setback. The site is located at 6512 Nathans Landing Drive in the Panther Branch Township.

Owners Hannes and Celeste Ringoot purchased the property in February 2023. A land use permit was submitted for a patio, brick stairs, retaining wall, and steppingstones in October 2025. During review, the unpermitted covered deck was discovered. The deck was constructed around 2010 and covered in 2013, both without obtaining a building permit.

In 2006, Wake County adopted the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) which defined the front property line as "the side of the lot which fronts on a street. In the case of a lot with multiple frontages, the front of the lot is determined by the road right-of-way which the lot has its principal access. This redesigns the property line parallel to Nathans Landing Drive from a side property line to a rear property line with a 30' building setback. Mr. Finn shared images of the site location in the presentation and noted the property is a corner lot.

Mr. Finn shared that a sign was posted on the property and adjacent owners were notified on July 27 of the August 11 public hearing. County staff received one call from the public. This citizen was seeking general information and there was no stance provided by the citizen in support or in opposition to the request.

Staff recommend that, if the Board reaches positive conclusions on all required findings of fact, that it approves the variance request subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.

Mr. Goebel asked if the existing deck on the site plan would need to be removed if the variance was denied, and Mr. Finn responded that they would not be allowed to seek a permit for the existing structure.

Applicant's Presentation

Testimony by:

- 1) Hannes Ringoot, Applicant and Property Owner
- 2) Celeste Ringoot, Property Owner

Mr. and Mrs. Ringoot were sworn in, and Mr. Ringoot explained that they are the homeowners at 6512 Nathans Landing Drive. While undergoing the permitting process to build a patio in their backyard, County staff discovered that the existing deck was unpermitted.

Mr. Ringoot referenced the site plan in the staff presentation. He stated that the diagonal property line and site conditions create a three-foot drop from their back door without the existing deck. Ms. Waddell confirmed with Mr. Ringoot that stairs to navigate the three-foot drop would also encroach into the setback. Mr. Ringoot testified that he reached out to the adjoining property owner with a proposal to purchase 5,000 square feet of their lot, which would make both properties square, but septic impacts prevented this approach.

Mr. Goebel noted that the applicants included a statement of justification with their materials to address the four findings of fact the Board must make to approve the variance. Mr. Haq asked if it would be possible to decrease the size of their deck to meet the standards. Mr. Ringoot explained that when the neighborhood was built in 2000, the setback was only 10 feet and when the County adopted the UDO in 2006, the corner lot setback became a rear lot setback of 30 feet. Mr. Ringoot noted the request for the variance is strictly designed to return the 10-foot setback as it was prior to the UDO adoption. Mr. Finn added that the Ringoots inherited this issue, as they purchased the property in 2023 and were not involved in the UDO changes or the construction of the patio.

Mr. Goebel opened the floor for public comment. No one appeared to provide further comments for or against the request. Mr. Goebel closed for Board discussion at 9:27 a.m.

Board Discussion

Mr. Goebel noted that the Board must find positive conclusions on the following findings of fact to approve the request:

- 1) Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance.

Mr. Goebel noted that a strict application of the ordinance prevent the applicants from constructing a patio and is likely to require the applicant to demolish the existing deck.

- 2) The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography.

Mr. Goebel indicated that the oblong nature of the lot contributed to the unique conditions faced by the applicant. Ms. Waddell added that the house was already present on the lot before the setback requirements changed, and that the change in setback requirements functionally creates encroachment issues with any element in the backyard.

- 3) The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or property owner.

Mr. Goebel noted that the applicants were not involved in the construction of the deck and purchased the property after it was constructed. Mr. Collins added that the applicant attempted to purchase a portion of the adjacent lot to alleviate the issue but were unsuccessful.

- 4) The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved.

Mr. Goebel stated that requiring the homeowners to remove their deck would not qualify as substantial justice. Ms. Waddell noted that the removal of the deck would have an impact on the property's economic value.

Motion on PLG-ZV-006555-2026

Mr. Goebel made a motion that, in the matter of PLG-ZV-006555-2026, the Board finds and concludes that the petition meets the requirements of Article 19-26 of the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance and the variance request be granted subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Waddell and approved unanimously.

5. PLG-SU-006618-2026 (Mr. Steven Finn, Land Development Administrator)

The petitioner is requesting special use permit approval as required by section 4-11 of the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to rebuild and expand an existing electrical substation in a new location on the property.

Voting Members

Five voting members were identified:

1. Mr. Jeffrey Goebel
2. Ms. Brittany Waddell
3. Mr. DeAntony Collins
4. Mr. Waheed Haq
5. Mr. William Wingfield

Location

WAKE COUNTY PIN: 0679626123
ZONING DISTRICT: Residential-30 (R-30)
LAND USE CLASSIFICATION: Community (Cary)
WATERSHED: None
CROSS REFERENCE FILES: N/A
APPLICANT: Michelle Poletti, Dewberry
PROPERTY OWNER: Duke Energy Progress Inc.
PROPERTY SIZE: 19.24 acres
CURRENT LAND USE: Electrical substation facility
PROPOSED LAND USE: Electrical substation facility

Documentary Evidence Accepted into Record

- Staff Report
- Staff Presentation
- Applicant's Application

TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE PRESENTED

Testimony by Steven Finn

Mr. Finn was sworn in and presented the Staff Report and Presentation, which were accepted into the record. Mr. Finn explained that this item is a special use permit request to rebuild and expand an existing electrical substation facility. The site is located at 8720 Bells Lake Road and is currently zoned Residential-30 and consists of 19.24 acres.

The Wake County Staff Report noted there is currently a single-bank electrical substation on the site that was put into service in 1989. The existing substation banks and circuits exceed their planned load due to load growth. The proposed larger electrical substation will modernize equipment and enhance service. The existing substation will be decommissioned upon completion of the new substation to prevent disruption in service. The existing electrical substation is located in the northern portion of the property. The proposed substation will be directly south of the existing substation. The rest of the site is heavily wooded, except for the 180-foot utility line easement which crosses the property.

The proposed new electrical substation will be located approximately 330 feet from the northern property line. The proposed fenced area consists of 95,300 square feet and will continue to use the existing driveway. The proposed site plan shows the required 40-foot landscape buffer along the northern, western, and southern property line and the required 10-foot streetscape landscape buffer along Bells Lake Road in areas where it will not impact the 180-foot existing transmission right-of-way. The proposed site plan shows the required 25-foot tree and vegetation zone along the north, west, and south property lines, and 50 feet along Bells Lake Road. The site plan shows a vehicle access and turnaround area that will accommodate the required two parking spaces.

Mr. Finn noted a public hearing sign was posted on the property on July 27. Adjacent owners were also notified by mail on July 27. Yesterday evening, August 10, staff received communications from the homeowner's association, a private property owner, and a legal representative of the homeowner's association.

Mr. Finn notes that staff recommend that, if the Board of Adjustment reaches positive conclusions on all the required findings, that it approves the request subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.

Applicant's Presentation

Testimony by:

- 1) Amy Crout, Attorney, Smith Anderson
- 2) Derrick Remer, District Manager, Duke Energy Progress Inc.
- 3) Michelle Poletti, Civil Engineer, Dewberry
- 4) Ethan Marshburn, Senior Engineer, Duke Energy Progress Inc.
- 5) Nick Kirkland, Appraiser, Kirkland Appraisals, LLC

Ms. Crout's witnesses were sworn in, and she introduced herself as an attorney with Smith Anderson working on behalf of Duke Energy Progress Inc. She explained that four witnesses would testify to meet the Board's findings of fact and that other members of their project team were in attendance to address additional questions. Mr. Goebel paused testimony briefly to determine whether the opposing counsel or citizens in opposition were in attendance but there were none. Continuing with

her testimony, Ms. Crout asked that the application presentation and testimony be included in the record, which Mr. Goebel accepted.

Ms. Crout explained that the property is owned by Duke Energy and currently houses an electrical substation. Duke Energy intends to keep the single bank substation in service during construction of the new two-bank substation to the south. Duke Energy will decommission the original substation and remove the equipment once the new substation is online. The existing site will become the gravel parking area. Ms. Crout stated that because the original substation was built prior to UDO requirements, the only way to make necessary upgrades and expand the substation is to proceed with a special use permit. Ms. Crout stated the proposed use is harmonious with the area given its historical use as a substation.

Ms. Crout asked Mr. Remer to address the project background and its public necessity. Mr. Remer introduced himself as a District Manager with Duke Energy Progress working on the proposed substation rebuild and expansion. Mr. Remer stated that the substation project is needed to ensure the capacity to continue to serve existing customers and support continued population growth. Mr. Remer noted the existing site was chosen because it is already in harmony with the existing neighborhood and will minimize overall impacts while meeting the needs of a growing area.

Ms. Crout asked Ms. Poletti to provide information on compliance. Ms. Poletti introduced herself as a civil engineer with Dewberry serving as a consultant to Duke Energy. Ms. Poletti presented the proposed site plan, stating the required buffer standards that would be met, along with a dry pond to satisfy stormwater requirements. Ms. Poletti stated the proposed site will meet requirements for static transformer stations. Ms. Poletti stated that there will be no service and storage yards on the property and the site will continue to be in harmony with the surrounding area. Ms. Waddell inquired about public outreach efforts. Ms. Crout responded, stating that a neighborhood meeting was held and a mailed notice was sent to 200 property owners.

Ms. Crout asked Mr. Marshburn to address the public health and safety impact of operations. Mr. Marshburn introduced himself as a Senior Engineer with Duke Energy. Mr. Marshburn testified that the proposed use of the existing substation site would not be changing. Mr. Marshburn stated that the site is unmanned with no habitable space. He stated it will not require any water or sewer connectivity and will have no traffic component outside of monthly inspections. Mr. Marshburn stated the driveway alignment will remain the same and Duke Energy does not anticipate any noise increase. Mr. Marshburn stated that he holds the opinion that the project would not materially endanger public health and safety.

Ms. Crout asked for Mr. Marshburn to provide information about the neighborhood meeting and whether he was in attendance. Ms. Crout noted the neighborhood meeting was held on June 16. Mr. Marshburn stated that he was in attendance and approximately 18 people attended. Mr. Marshburn notes during the meeting, Duke Energy heard feedback from the neighbors. Mr. Marshburn notes the majority of the concerns expressed by neighbors was regarding vegetative screening and buffering. In response to this feedback, Duke Energy committed to adding an additional 50 feet of buffer on the northern property line, 10 feet of supplemental planting on the western property line, and shrubs and low growth trees within the danger tree clearing area.

Ms. Crout asked Mr. Kirkland to provide information about his impact study on adjoining property values. Ms. Crout presented a copy of the impact study to the Board, which Mr. Goebel accepted. Mr. Kirkland testified that he was hired to determine what impact the proposed expansion and relocation would have on adjoining property values. Mr. Kirkland stated that his professional opinion is that the proposed development will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property and that

the proposed development would be in harmony with the scale, bulk, coverage, density and character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Crout stated that the final criteria she would address is consistency with Plan Wake. She stated that the staff report finds the proposed substation is consistent with Wake County's Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Crout stated that the substation provides a strong electric grid that supports all types of land use, economic development and maintains quality of life. She stated that the submitted Statement of Justification includes detailed information to supplement testimony presented today.

Mr. Goebel opened the floor for public comments. No one appeared to provide further comments for or against the request. Mr. Goebel closed for board discussion at 10:21 a.m.

Board Discussion

Mr. Goebel began discussion regarding the five elements for which the Board would need to make positive findings on to approve the request:

- 1) The proposed development will not materially endanger public health or safety.

Mr. Goebel identified testimony stating this was an unmanned station. There are no changes to the septic system and testimony identified additional measures to add buffering.

- 2) The proposed development will comply with all regulations and standards generally applicable within the zoning district and specifically applicable to the particular type of special use or class of special uses.

Mr. Goebel noted that R-30 zoning allows for a transfer station with a special use permit. This is consistent with the determination of staff and the testimony provided.

- 3) The proposed development will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property or is a public necessity.

Mr. Goebel indicated that Mr. Kirkland stated the project would not substantially injure the value of adjoining property and testified to the public necessity.

- 4) The proposed development will be in harmony with the area in which it is located.

Mr. Goebel identified that the testimony and the justification statement addresses this element.

- 5) The proposed development will be consistent with the Wake County Land Use Plan.

Mr. Goebel noted that staff determined it was consistent.

Mr. Goebel entertained a motion on PLG-SU-006618-2026.

Motion on PLG-SU-006618-2026

Mr. Goebel made a motion that the Board find and conclude that the petition meets the requirements of Article 19-23 of the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance and the special use permit be granted subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Waddell, and the application was approved unanimously.

Mr. Goebel called for a recess at 10:27 a.m. and reopened the meeting at 10:36 a.m.

6. PLG-SU-006498-2026 (Mr. David Parks, Planner II)

The petitioner is requesting special use permit as required by section 4-11 of the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to construct a 250-foot freestanding telecommunication tower.

Voting Members

Five voting members were identified:

1. Mr. Jeffrey Goebel
2. Ms. Britany Waddell
3. Mr. DeAntony Collins
4. Mr. Waheed Haq
5. Mr. William Wingfield

Location

WAKE COUNTY PIN: 1765387314

ZONING DISTRICT: Office and Institutional (O&I) District and Residential-30 (R-30) District

LAND USE CLASSIFICATION: Community / Wendell Growth Area

WATERSHED: Marks Creek

CROSS REFERENCE FILES: N/A

APPLICANT: Kermit Farrow – Delta Oaks Group, PLLC

PROPERTY OWNER: Telamon Corporation

PROPERTY SIZE: 11.31 acres

CURRENT LAND USE: Child Care Center with associated Outdoor Recreation

PROPOSED LAND USE: Telecommunication Tower

Documentary Evidence Accepted into Record

- Staff Report
- Staff Presentation
- Applicant's Application

TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE PRESENTED

Testimony by David Parks

Mr. Parks was sworn in and presented the Staff Report and Presentation, which were accepted into the record. Mr. Parks explained that this item is a special use request to construct a 250-foot free-standing telecommunications tower. The site is located at 1020 Todd Road and consists of 11.31 acres. The parcel is split zoned. It is Office and Institutional (O&I) and Residential-30 (R-30) zoning districts. The new tower will be located on the portion of the parcel that is zoned O&I. Telecommunication towers that are 200' or higher are permitted in the O&I district with a special use permit.

Mr. Parks explained the tower will be accessed from the existing driveway off Todd Road. A new driveway will be constructed to provide access to the leased area for the tower, which will be unmanned. Buffer landscaping is shown on the proposed site plan to the north and west. Existing vegetation along the south and east will provide the required buffering as stated in the Wake County UDO. The applicant has submitted a stamped letter from their structural engineer certifying that, if the tower collapses, it will be within the compound area and will not encroach onto any adjacent property. The applicant is requesting a reduction in the southern and western setback from the adjacent residential district. The applicant has certified in their site plan package that there are no

other existing towers within the required 1,500 feet. If approved, the applicant will be required to submit development plans for review prior to construction of the tower.

Mr. Parks explained that letters to adjoining property owners were mailed on July 14. A public hearing sign was placed on the site on July 16. Staff has not received any phone calls or emails from adjacent property owners.

Mr. Parks explained that staff recommend that, if the Board of Adjustment reaches positive conclusions on all the required findings, that it approves the request subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.

Mr. Haq noted the location of the proposed tower was shown in existing flood-prone soils and asked if that was permissible. Mr. Parks responded that Planning and Development Services' Watershed Management Division will review any flood study requirements for the area or special modifications. Mr. Haq inquired about requirements for the footing and foundation. Mr. Parks noted that will also be reviewed as a part of the County's development review process. Mr. Haq asked about the height of the tower relative to the adjacent parcel, and Mr. Parks responded that while the property to the south is zoned residential, there is no structure in the vicinity of the height of the tower.

Applicant's Presentation

Testimony by:

- 1) Tom Johnson, Attorney, Williams Mullen
- 2) Michael Berkowitz, Appraiser
- 3) Kermit Farrow, Delta Oaks Group, PLLC

Mr. Johnson, Mr. Berkowitz and Mr. Farrow were sworn in, and Mr. Johnson requested that his presentation be entered into the record, which Mr. Goebel accepted. Mr. Johnson introduced himself as an attorney with Williams Mullen and stated that the proposed tower would be a co-location site for T-Mobile, AT&T and Verizon to improve service in the area. He stated that the proposed tower would share the parcel with an existing school.

Mr. Johnson stated that the location of the tower is beneficial due to the properties to the south and west adjoining Duke Energy electrical transmission lines. Due to the existing septic field for the school, the tower's present location was the most viable option to avoid encroachment. Trees will remain on site to the west and south, and the applicant is proposing a landscape buffer to the north and east sides. Mr. Johnson stated that there will be minimal disturbance to the site beyond adding to the existing driveway, electrical, and fiber optic cable. He stated the site will be unmanned with minimal traffic for maintenance vehicles.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Berkowitz to address the impact on adjoining properties and their property values. Mr. Berkowitz introduced himself as a North Carolina licensed appraiser. Mr. Berkowitz stated that paired sales analysis to homes adjacent to a tower with visual impact and without showed no price differential. Other external factors, like the presence of a school, athletic fields, and existing above ground infrastructure would pose more of a visual influence than the proposed tower.

Mr. Cebina expressed concerns about the potential damage to future property value in the adjacent southern property, noting that the owner was not present to provide testimony. Mr. Berkowitz added that the purpose of his appraisal is to capture a snapshot of the property as it is currently.

Mr. Haq asked about any additional equipment on the site, and Mr. Johnson responded that the tower will be surrounded by a fence subject to County UDO requirements. Inside of the fence, the

only equipment on the ground would be utility cabinets and potentially the carrier's generator if power is lost.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Farrow to confirm he submitted the application. Mr. Farrow stated that the application is on behalf of Alpha PropCo Towers 3 LP which is the subsidiary owner of Galaxy Towers, which is the company that will build and own the tower. Mr. Farrow testified that he is employed by Delta Oaks Group, PLLC, the engineering firm responsible for the project.

Mr. Johnson addressed the five findings the Board must make to approve the special use permit. He stated that the proposed settlement is a low traffic site, seeing only maintenance vehicles occasionally. Mr. Johnson stated that the tower's expanded range will provide the public with better access to emergency services. He stated the increased reliability will improve the health and safety of the public. Mr. Johnson stated that the tower is also designed in accordance with building codes for wind and ice loads, it meets the setbacks required by the ordinance, and an engineer's letter meets UDO requirements for adjoining property lines. He stated that Mr. Parks presented evidence that the proposed tower meets all the requirements and is specifically applicable to this type of special use. Mr. Johnson referred to Mr. Berkowitz's testimony that the proposed development will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property.

Mr. Johnson stated that North Carolina Case Law states that a proposed site is presumed to be in harmony if it is allowed as a use in the specific zoning district unless substantial material and competent evidence exists to the contrary. He stated that in this case, no such evidence had been presented. He stated that Mr. Parks stated that the proposed development would be consistent with the Wake County Land Use Plan.

Mr. Goebel opened the floor for public comment. No one appeared to provide further comments for or against the request. Mr. Goebel closed the floor for Board discussion at 11:22 a.m.

Board Discussion

Mr. Goebel began discussion regarding the five elements for which the Board would need to make positive findings on to approve the request:

- 1) The proposed development will not materially endanger public health or safety.

Mr. Goebel stated that the development has some considerations related to the additional traffic, provision of utilities, soil erosion, and protection of public water supplies. Ms. Waddell added that staff accepted a letter that the risk of tower failure was minimal to adjacent properties. She stated that testimony supported that the traffic impact would be minimal. She added that the placement of the tower is outside of the school's septic field.

- 2) The proposed development will comply with all regulations and standards generally applicable within the zoning district and specifically applicable to the particular type of special use or class of special uses.

Mr. Goebel identified testimony that this proposed use is in an O&I district, which is allowable with a special use permit.

- 3) The proposed development will not substantially injure the value or adjoining property, or is a public necessity.

Mr. Goebel noted Mr. Berkowitz's testimony supported that it would not injure adjoining property values.

- 4) The proposed development will be in harmony with the area in which it is located.

Ms. Waddell noted testimony identifying that the tower would be in harmony with other antennas and in the area.

- 5) The proposed development will be consistent with the Wake County Land Use Plan.

Mr. Goebel identified staff testimony that it is consistent.

Mr. Goebel entertained a motion on PLG-SU-0006498-2026.

Motion on PLG-SU-006498-2026

Ms. Waddell made a motion that the Board find and conclude that the petition meets the requirements of Article 19-23 of the Wake County Unified Development Ordinance and the special use permit be granted subject to the conditions identified in the staff report.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Haq, and the application was approved unanimously.

7. Planning and Development Services Report

Mr. Finn updated the Board on the number zoning enforcement cases. Mr. Gardiner introduced himself to the Board of Adjustment, and Mr. McClellan informed the Board that member Irene Butler stepped down at the end of July.

8. Adjournment

Mr. Goebel made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and it was seconded by Ms. Waddell. The meeting was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

=====

REGULAR MEETING
WAKE COUNTY
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
August 11, 2026

All petitions complete, Jeffrey Goebel declared the regular meeting of the Wake County Board of Adjustment for Tuesday, August 11, 2026, adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Signed by:
Jeffrey Goebel
28A6A1DAAC5D42F...

Jeffrey Goebel
Wake County Board of Adjustment

=====