

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
GOLDSBORO PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
FEBRUARY 23, 2026**

The Planning Commission/Board of Adjustment of the City of Goldsboro, North Carolina, met in Regular Session in the Large Conference Room, City Hall Addition, 200 North Center Street, at 6:00 p.m. on February 23, 2026.

Present:

Ms. Shirley Edwards, Vice-Chair, Presiding
Mr. Ronald Waters
Mr. Duke Cox
Mr. Glen Barwick

Also Present:

Mark Helmer, Planning Services Manager
Kenny Talton, Assistant Planning Services Manager
Holly Jones, Planning Executive Assistant

Absent:

Mr. William Rose, Chair
Ms. Viola Figueroa

Ms. Edwards began the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Cox made a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Waters and unanimously carried.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Cox made a motion to approve the minutes Regular Meeting of November 24, 2025 and the Special meeting of February 4, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mr. Barwick and unanimously carried.

Board of Adjustment

BOA-04-25 – Variance – 108 Hilddale Lane – Northeast side of Hilddale Lane, between Overbrook Road and North Hillcrest Drive. The item was presented by Kenny Talton, Assistant Planning Services Manager, after being properly sworn in.

The applicant is requesting a variance of Section 5.3.2 Residential Districts of Goldsboro's Unified Development Ordinance. Specifically speaking, the applicant is requesting a variance of the requirement that no principal structure not otherwise regulated by Goldsboro's Unified Development Ordinance shall be located within the required or established side setback or side yard of a single-family or two-family residentially developed property.

Variances as stipulated in the North Carolina General Statutes Section 160A-388(d):

“When unnecessary hardships would result from carrying out the strict letter of a zoning ordinance, the Board of Adjustment shall vary any of the provisions of the ordinance upon a showing of all of the following:

- (1) Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance. It shall not be necessary to demonstrate that, in the absence of the variance, no reasonable use can be made of the property.
- (2) The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography. Hardships resulting from conditions that are common to the neighborhood or the public, may not be basis for granting a variance.
- (3) The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. The act of purchasing property with knowledge that circumstances exist that may justify the granting of a variance shall not be regarded as a self-created hardship.
- (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.

DISCUSSION

The owner of the property is identified as Robert Alexander Jeffreys.

The applicant for the variance is the owner.

The subject property is located at 108 Hildale Lane, Goldsboro, North Carolina.

The subject property is located in the Residential-16 Zoning District.

The subject property is located within Goldsboro’s corporate limits.

The subject property is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area.

The applicant proposes constructing a 20.4 ft. x 28.6 ft. (583.44 sq. ft.) addition to serve as an open carport and as an addition to his existing 2,993 sq. ft. home.

The applicant proposes locating the attached open carport in the side yard of the residence.

According to the current city Unified Development Ordinance, the building side yard setback is 16 ft.

According to a survey submitted by the owner as part of the completed variance application, the proposed addition would encroach 11.25 ft. into the side yard of the principal residence.

The home and lot are in an R-16 (Residential) zoning district. Setbacks for the Residential (R-16) zoning district are as follows:

R-16 Residential Zoning District	
Front	40 ft.
Rear	25
Side	16 ft.
Corner Side	32 ft.
Minimum Lot width (Frontage)	100 ft.
Minimum Lot Area	16,000 ft.

FINDING OF FACT

Planning staff make the following Finding of Fact as it relates to the variance request and Section 160A-388(d):

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

Finding: Applicant will suffer unnecessary hardship from strict application of the ordinance. The existing residential structure offers insufficient setback distances to make reasonable use of the property. Although sufficient acreage is available for the addition to be built on the western side of the home, it would not be practical or reasonable for the intended use of the property.

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

Finding: The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property. Subject property is in an older subdivision developed prior to the adoption of City zoning regulations.

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

Finding: The hardship does not result from actions taken by the property owner.

- (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.”

Finding: 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.

Planning staff believe that the proposal would be in character with existing structures within the neighborhood. In addition, staff believe that the variance will not adversely affect neighboring property values. Lastly, staff believe that granting of the variance will not create safety concerns for residents of the neighborhood.

***NOTE: Before granting a variance, the board must take a separate vote to affirm by a (4/5) four-fifths majority on each of the four required findings stated above.**

A motion to deny a variance may be made on the basis that any one or more of the four criteria stated above are not satisfied. Such a motion shall include a statement of the specific reasons or findings of fact that support it. This motion is adopted as the board's decision if supported by a simple majority of the board's membership.

Ms. Edwards opened the public hearing. The following person spoke after being properly sworn in:

1. Jim Scott, Contractor for the project, stated that the home was built in the 1960's before setbacks were thought of. He stated he has not heard any opposition from the neighbors. He stated that the drawings were correct, but the memo should state the structure in 24'x28'.

Mr. Cox asked if this would leave about nine feet from the property line. Mr. Scott confirmed that it would.

No one else spoke and the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Edwards read each finding and requested a motion to approve or deny.

Mr. Cox made a motion to approve finding 1. The motion was seconded by Mr. Barwick and unanimously carried.

Mr. Waters made a motion to approve finding 2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cox and unanimously carried.

Mr. Barwick made a motion to approve finding 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cox and unanimously carried.

Mr. Barwick made a motion to approve finding 4. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cox and unanimously carried.

There being no further business, Ms. Edwards asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Waters made the motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Cox. The motion was unanimously carried, and the meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.


Shirley Edwards
Vice-Chair


Holly Jones
Planning Executive Assistant