PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, MAY 05TH, 2022
ASSEMBLY HALL
395 MAGNOLIA ROAD
PINEHURST, NORTH CAROLINA
4:00 PM

Board Members Present:	Board Members Absent:	Staff Present:
Jeramy Hooper, Chair	Julia Latham, 2nd Vice-Chair	Darryn Burich, Planning Director
Jack Farrell, 1st Vice-Chair	Paul Roberts	Alex Cameron, Planning Supervisor
Matt Jones		Shannon Konstantinou, Clerk to the Board
David Alzamora		
Phillip Shumaker		
Louise Mercuro		
Sonja Rothstein		

Approximately 19 member(s) of the public in attendance.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Hooper called the meeting to order at 04:00 PM, confirmed a quorum was present, and explained the purpose of this meeting. Mr. Hooper noted the absence of Ms. Latham and Mr. Roberts, and noted the late arrival of Ms. Mercuro and Mr. Shumaker.

Ms. Mercuro joined the meeting at 04:04 PM.

Mr. Shumaker joined the meeting at 04:22 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. 04-07-2022 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Farrell moved to approve the minutes of the April 07th, 2022 Regular Meeting. Seconded by Ms. Rothstein. Approved by a vote of 5-0.

III. New Business

A. Consideration of Small Area Plans (Village Place and Pinehurst South)

The purpose of this item is for the Planning and Zoning Board to discuss and provide a recommendation to the Village Council on the Village Place and Pinehurst South Small Area Plans.

The Board will take separate action on the Plans.

The Board, Mr. Burich, and Mr. Cameron discussed the Village Place area of the Small Area Plans. Mr. Burich stated the goal for the meeting is to finalize a recommendation for the Small Area Plans to be forwarded to Village Council. Mr. Burich reviewed the recommendation options available to the Board and the need for a majority vote in order to move forward with a recommendation to Council. Mr. Burich clarified the recommendation of the Plans is the first step in the process of implementing the Plans and further actions, such as developing a Form Based Code (FBC) and Zoning changes will be required.

Mr. Burich reviewed the documents provided to the Board, gave an overview of the Village Place area, and analyzed the Small Area Plan recommendations for this area.

Mr. Burich reviewed the four options for recommendations regarding Village Place as provided in the Staff Report and provided details on how the recommendations of each option would influence the Small Area Plans.

Mr. Hooper opened discussion to Public Comments from attendees.

Ms. Lynn Goldhammer, 11 Salem Ln.: questioned the ownership of potential attached houses. Mr. Burich stated the proposed attached houses would be townhouse style properties where ownership of one townhouse would be separate / different from ownership of the one next door. Ms. Goldhammer questioned maintenance responsibilities in relation to the attached houses. Mr. Burich stated maintenance responsibilities would depend on the structure of ownership. Ms. Goldhammer stated when two different owners own different sides there is a potential to get shabby really quickly due to different ownership, and questioned how many properties would be built in this area. Mr. Hooper stated the Board and / or Staff may not be able to answer all questions due to the fact that the Plans are meant to be an overall plan for the area not to provide specifics on future development.

Mr. Steve Saye, 5 McDonald Rd. E: stated he controls a 3.9 acre parcel in the area. Mr. Burich verified Mr. Saye owns the property at 20 McCaskill and asked Mr. Saye his thoughts on the Plans proposed for the Village Place area. Mr. Saye stated more flexibility is always good, he is worried about next 100 years not the next 10 days, and is fortunate to have that timeframe. The intent is to put a legacy property at this address that in 100 years will be looked upon as the right thing. Parking is a major issue, the Village does need to address parking and traffic (the #1 issue) but traffic doesn't preclude people from moving here. Come up with the best plan possible but this not a "Soviet" style Plan, how do we best fit what the community needs going forward, Pinehurst is going to grow, cannot put the gates up around Pinehurst, people are going to find places to put their product whether others like it or not, irrelevant and out of the town's area. Mr. Hooper asked if the Village and / or Board may call upon Mr. Saye as a property owner in the Village Place area should a direct question arise. Mr. Saye stated he would be happy to comment.

Mr. Ted Copper, 105 Rattlesnake Trail: doesn't notice a lot of change for his property, concern over the change of multi-family to single family and "gentrification" part of the Plans as it will push a lot of support staff for local businesses who rely on this type of housing further and further from town increasing commute times, doesn't see who this change is helping.

Mr. Frank Maser, 45 Community Rd.: understands the intent is to look at the big picture, 20-30-40-50 year plan, but, when the recommendations come down to specific zoning, the Board should retain the diversity of uses and the flexibility for developers to create what they want to create. Likes the concept but there is a long way to go and continue it. Need diversity in zoning. Village mixed use is a very good zoning district to help create what the developers want to create. Asks for thoughtful consideration before changing zoning to some very specific single use zoning as mixed use zoning is what is needed.

Mr. Kevin Drum, 41 Shaw Rd.: thanked everyone, is impressed with work Staff has done by giving the Village a strategy for the future in Form Based Codes, whatever the use is it will be good looking, and hopes this is the beginning of the use of Form Based Code within Pinehurst. Mr. Drum gave a background of the ownership of the three undeveloped lots he owns with his wife, Ms. Jennifer Stoddard, on Magnolia Rd. Is concerned with the lack of flexibility for the future by zoning lots residential instead of mixed use. Gave a brief overview of the area surrounding his lots and the industrial history of this area within Village Place. Feels his properties have been singled out and is asking for the Board to have an open mind and listen to the professionals due to the market driven nature of the area and development. The luxury of Form Based Codes and the Historic Commission having to approve projects gives the Board a layer of protection. See the possibility of residential development for personal use but mixed use seems to be the best zoning for this area. Will do what the Village decides as always. Stated he is open to speaking with the Board should they wish.

Mr. John Webster, 140 McKenzie Rd. W: stated he sees very little change in the Plans, meeting after meeting the Public always has things to say but it doesn't seem to matter, go through the process but nothing changes as Staff has made a decision and that is what we are going to get again and again. The properties owned by Mr. Drum weren't originally included in the Plans, then they were, and are now potentially out of the Plans again. All of this is happening against residential property owners on Caddell Rd. and no one seems to worry about them. To take the Public Services facilities to Monticello at the cost of noise and smell seems very unfair to people who live there. Marketing plans should not drive Plans, it should be what we want of this place, don't have to cater to marketing. If people are saying over and over again they want low density, you should listen.

Mr. Hooper stated the list of speakers had concluded and invited any additional audience members who would like to speak to do so. None asked to speak.

Mr. Hooper asked the Board to provide general comments, as a Board there are many elements to consider and there is a lot of input, and the Board is responsible for funneling this down to a decision. If the Board has a concern or recommendation, please, have a solution to provide.

Mr. Shumaker apologized for his late arrival, noted items mentioned by attendees, such as quality over quantity, flexibility, no single family, preserve single family, form based code, and consistency. Have to get out in front of the issue, growth will happen. The Village must have some sort of plan, nothing that is concrete it will be fluid. Without plans something could get built that isn't what is wanted. The Village must have some sort of roadmap in place, growth is coming and is going to happen. There can be conversations around preservation or conservation, but must have a plan moving forward otherwise growth will take its own form.

Ms. Rothstein stated the Monticello facility was addressed at the previous meeting, and discussed Magnolia staying residential, especially the three lots owned by Mr. Drum, and should stay residential.

Mr. Alzamora thanked participants, a plan gives an opportunity to get in front of what is inevitable. The area has changed significantly in 30 years, perspective of a kid growing up here is different from someone who has moved here. The goal is for everyone to enjoy the resources and charm of the area. The area needs to serve all of us, not just those who live here (all the visitors / out of town workers / those who spend a day of their life here). The area will change over time and we need to consider how to make this beneficial for all. The flexibility provides housing / business /employment opportunities. A lot of people are getting stuck on details, plans give an opportunity to decide usage doesn't mean this is exactly how this area will look. Agree flexibility would be most favorable in this area, don't want to short side yourself. The concerns over prior uses doesn't mean something will get torn down while current uses are in place, they will be grandfathered in. Affordable housing is definitely an issue in area as a whole, like the flexibility of opening this to something other than Single Family Dwelling, would potentially alleviate some of these issues.

Mr. Farrell seconded prior comments and stated the plans as seen from the consultants show buildings in certain spots but these buildings are just filler blocks, this is not where / how building will exactly be, meant to give a feeling of how buildings / streets / blocks will look. The Small Area Plan is meant to give a vision of how the area could develop. Favorable to flexibility, it is a mistake to lock down to only Single Family Dwelling. The Board talked about road structure, traffic, spent quite a bit of time on these issues. There was less concern about Village Place design than Pinehurst South, overall the community feels good about this design. The expansion of commercial infill to the three empty lots along the west side of Magnolia is in conflict with the 2019 Comp Plan. Staff was involved in developing the 2019 Comp Plan. In addition, all Public Workshops and breakout rooms showed the borders excluding these lots. It is a mistake to change the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mercuro stated generally agrees with everything said. This is a good, solid plan and is a comprehensive, long-range plan (not something that will happen tomorrow). Need to educate the public about Form Based Code. The plan is well thought out form based code, which is the perfect type of code to use in the Village. In general, is a really good plan and serves as a guiding principle moving forward.

Mr. Jones reiterated Ms. Mercuro's comments on Form Based Code and stated Form Based Code gives flexibility, and re-iterated Mr. Alzamora's comments regarding implementation of the plans not altering use for current property owners. Mr. Burich stated Mr. Jones is correct, use will continue as is and does not change with the sale of property, only changes when use changes. Mr. Jones asked for clarification on how the four recommendation options to Council effect zoning for the underlying properties and how restrictive will the decision be on future development. Mr. Burich stated Form Based Code has to be implemented, uses will be included in the regulating plan, if a use is objectionable this can be addressed in the recommendations and changes made to the illustrations as the illustrations need to match up with the vision for the future. Mr. Jones asked for clarification on the zoning for the three lots in question on Magnolia along with the adjacent 3.9 acre lot, and whether the Board is being asked to make a decision on the use of these lots. Mr. Burich stated the three empty lots along Magnolia are zoned R10 (residential and VR), the four options provided are to help the Board move forward with a recommendation to Council, the statement by Mr. Farrell is correct regarding the Comp. Plan, whichever way the Board moves forward there needs to be a consensus or support for the determined use for the three lots. Mr. Burich reviewed the four options provided for the Board to use in determining a recommendation for Council.

Mr. Hooper clarified the four options provided by Staff are based on concerns or hot topics that had come up in prior meetings and Workshops, and Staff is providing the options as a tool for the Board to use in determining their recommendation to Council. Mr. Hooper further reminded the Board to recall concerns or hot topics from prior meetings that may not have been covered during the current meeting when making a determination on their recommendations to Council. Mr. Cameron stated the options are Staff's best attempt to paraphrase hot topics from Work Sessions, Staff laid out options the best way possible from prior comments made by Board members.

Mr. Farrell stated the Staff failed to mention in the Staff Report that this subject matter was discussed in meetings with a majority of Board members attending where it was decided to revert back to the original boundaries for Village Place. Mr. Cameron stated Staff painstakingly reviewed meeting videos, minutes, and notes; and it was not a clear consensus or majority on excluding the lots in question. Mr. Burich stated the opinion of the Board was pretty split, some for, some against, and a gray area in the middle.

Mr. Hooper stated this topic is going to be pretty well discussed by Council, the Board's job is to make recommendations as correct and in-line with zoning changes that will make the implementation of the Small Area Plans possible. If the Board ends up singling out any properties, the Board needs to be specific to any zoning changes that will need to be made in implementation of the plans.

Mr. Jones stated clarification on what the decision made today will do in terms of what it will prohibit and not prohibit the Village from doing in the future was given. In terms of flexibility for the future, option four seems to provide the most flexibility. Mr. Burich displayed the options for the Board to review. Mr. Hooper clarified that, should the Board not choose any option, the plans would move forward as is.

Mr. Jones stated he was in favor of the three lots in question remaining residential with the rest being mixed use or whatever is most flexible as mentioned in prior meetings.

Mr. Hooper asked the Board to begin formulating a motion and reviewed the motion template provided as a tool in formulating a motion.

Mr. Hooper asked Staff to outline the next steps to be taken in implementing the plan. Mr. Burich reviewed the process moving forward after the adoption of the Plan, and how Form Based Code does not control uses so implementing the plans will be a hybrid of zoning regulation and Form Based Code. When the regulating plan gets developed that is where any zoning changes would need to be considered and made in order for development to happen according to the plans. The Board clarified the zoning of areas could be changed in the future with zoning requests. Mr. Burich stated the process doesn't have to happen overnight can be done over time.

Mr. Farrell asked for clarification on what is being shown in the map for the area along McCaskill and Magnolia Roads. Mr. Burich stated this area of the map shows mixed use buildings.

Mr. Hooper asked for clarification on how zoning requests would affect use in this area. Mr. Burich stated the overlay will stay the same, FBC will determine the building types allowed in this area, and when the overlay is created the type of building will be determined by the regulating plan.

Mr. Farrell asked for clarification on how Form Based Code would be applied to Single Family Detached development. Mr. Cameron stated the Village Place area being located within the Historic District acts in the Village's favor, however, it depends on what portion of form based code is being considered, any design elements defined outside of the Historic District statutes the answer would be, "No".

Mr. Farrell asked for clarification on whether it is possible to apply a zoning requirement or prohibition to the overlay for the district that would prohibit the lease or rental of a residential structure for less than <u>six</u> months. Mr. Burich and Mr. Cameron both the answer to this question is yet to be determined.

Mr. Cameron stated the 3.9 acre "Traditions" parcel might be the best example of how the base zoning might need to change after the plan is adopted.

Mr. Farrell questioned whether, based on previous comments, it was better to allow for maximum flexibility then use form based code to get the best design. Mr. Burich stated it depends on how flexible the Board wants to be, if there is a specific building type the Board does not want to see in the area then that building type is excluded from the plan, will want to have some limitations to that flexibility, it is important to get things right on the base plans because as the form based codes and zone changes are crafted things will have to line up.

Mr. Farrell asked for clarification on whether it makes sense to divide a parcel up by use, restricting commercial only on one side and residential only on the other side of the same parcel. Mr. Burich stated that should be possible to do, the overlay can be divided in this way.

Ms. Mercuro stated not all mixed use is the same, could be residential/commercial mixtures, height of buildings is more important to Form Based Code, but use inside might allow a mix of residential / commercial / office use, more about how the community sees the area, this is a village and want to remain a village.

Mr. Burich asked the Board to consider the pattern of use the Board wants for this area, from a planning standpoint try to align uses on each side of the street, if additional flexibility is desired that can be done as well, can be as limiting or as flexible as the Board wants but the process starts with this type of land use plan, and the details of how to implement the plans are up to Staff but the Board needs to tell Staff what the vision for the future of the area is.

Mr. Hooper asked for clarification on the next steps in the process and a timeline. Mr. Burich stated the next step will be to develop the Form Based Code and make updates to the PDO (concurrently), but before work can begin on Form Based Code and the PDO the Village Council has to give their approval.

Mr. Hooper asked that the Board ensure they have identified concerns so those concerns can be passed on to Council with a recommendation that gives insight and thought process, and that the Board be sure they are prepared to give a recommendation to Council (always the first question to themselves). If the Board is prepared to make a recommendation, what will that recommendation be / look like. A lot of hours were spent considering the plans and the public comments have been addressed by the Board in previous discussions. The plan is a guiding principle and illustrative of what could happen if the overall theory is adopted. The plan is not a new plan, per se, just a new direction. There is talk of market / outside pressures, what is important is whether the plan is driving towards what the community wants / desires as well as what the Village's capabilities are. In terms of the definition of community; Moore County is the community, a series of small towns, what one town does affects the other, and oftentimes there is duplication of uses (something for the Board to consider). Does this plan support the direction that the current residents want and the "retirement settler", understand the changing demographics but the area has always been a niche attractive to retirees, the Village needs to continue to ensure the community is attractive to retirees as this is something unique to this area.

Mr. Farrell clarified the Village Council will be comparing Form Based Code and regulating documents against these plans.

Mr. Hooper stated it is important the Village not be put in any future compromising positions based on unforeseen concerns, and questioned whether there was anything in the plans that could potentially make this happen. Mr. Hooper asked the Board to give feedback.

Mr. Jones stated he is leaning towards option four, which would allow residential or commercial along Magnolia. Mr. Burich stated this option would allow either / or and would build flexibility into the plans. Mr. Burich reviewed option four with the Board.

Mr. Farrell gave support for option four if revised to exclude the three empty lots in question along Magnolia Rd. and going back to the original boundary of the Focus Area.

Mr. Alzamora clarified the three lost in question for the boundary area are Mr. Drum's. Ms. Jennifer Stoddard asked to speak.

Ms. Stoddard stated she didn't realize the meeting would be about the three lots they own and cannot wrap her head around why their three lots are the subject of discussion. Mr. Alzamora stated the three lots are subject to discussion due to their location on the edge of the plan and weren't included in the 2019 Focus Area. Ms. Stoddard stated she is still confused as to why their properties are being singled out. Mr. Alzamora stated it is purely due to the difference between the two sets of plans, which resulted in the boundary line shifting to include their properties. Mr. Farrell stated the concern is over potential commercial development in the backyard of existing single family housing. Ms. Stoddard stated the three lots in question face a big brick industrial building (CenturyLink) and it was stated it is important to have continuity across the street, not backyard to backyard but across the street. Mr. Drum further stated should the two new roads not be added, the three lots in question remain in a state of quasi-residential.

Mr. Alzamora stated the owners of the three lots seem to be in agreement with the plans, and are part of the plan to allow the commercial development in this area.

Mr. Farrell stated the concern is the Public has been told for two years that the boundaries are such and it is a mistake to tell the Public one thing and do something else.

Mr. Shumaker stated the three lots in question were specifically called out by public comments in previous meetings, which is why the lots are being discussed.

Mr. Hooper stated the discussion of the three lots in question arose due to a consideration of where exactly to put the stopping point for commercial development in the plans. The concern for today's discussion is the impact of commercial development on the residential development along Caddell Rd., especially with parking being in the rear of the commercial development along Magnolia Rd. as illustrated in the plans. Need to keep moving forward towards a recommendation to Council. Should any member of the Board have any reservations regarding the recommendation to Council, Mr. Hooper wishes to discuss those reservations and provide an alternate motion. As a Board, need to keep the decision to the basics of zoning and not involve politics.

***Mr. Alzamora** moved that the Planning and Zoning Board recommend the **Village Place** Small Area Plan to the Pinehurst Village Council for adoption **with revision(s) based on the following option: (Option 4) Support non-residential or single family attached or detached along the Magnolia Road frontage retaining the single family detached pattern to the west**. Seconded by **Ms. Mercuro**.*

***Mr. Farrell** moved to amend the motion to include the statement **the boundary of the Small Area Plan will revert to the initial boundary as designed in the Focus Area and original Plan as shown to the Public in 2021.** Seconded by **Mr. Jones**.*

Mr. Burich reviewed for the Board what the amendment would mean in terms of the plan boundaries.

Amendment: Approved by a vote of 5 to 1. Mr. Alzamora voted "nay".

Motion as Amended: Approved by a vote of 5 to 1. Mr. Alzamora voted "nay".

Mr. Hooper recessed the meeting at 05:35 PM and reconvened the meeting at 05:45 PM.

The Board, Mr. Burich, and Mr. Cameron discussed the Pinehurst South Small Area Plans. Mr. Burich reviewed the documents provided to the Board, gave an overview of the Pinehurst South area, and analyzed the Small Area Plans recommendations for this area.

Mr. Burich reviewed the two options for recommendations regarding Pinehurst South as provided in the Staff Report and provided details on how the recommendations of each option would influence the Small Area Plans. Mr. Burich further discussed the concerns of vested Property Owners shared with Staff and the Board regarding low density development, sidewalks cutting through properties, and Page Rd. becoming a public instead of private road (Mr. Burich stated from a circulation standpoint extending this road would be a good way to better connect this area, however, this doesn't have to happen to make the plan work, is not an official map of roads just shows the potential way this area could come together). Mr. Burich outlined the areas marked G and H of the plan stating these areas will be the primary focus of discussion in order to determine if the planned use remains the same or changes to a use similar to the areas marked B, C, D, and E of the plan.

Mr. Hooper opened discussion to Public Comments from attendees.

Ms. Lynn Goldhammer, 11 Salem Ln.: gave background as to why she almost always speaks against any kind of development at public meetings; cited her experience with overinflated housing markets in areas such as Seattle, Washington, which tend to create homelessness and tent cities, loss of business due to rent increases, development is an attempt to appeal to people from different parts of the country with much higher income levels, and stated the previous rendition of the Small Area Plans was marketed as being attractive to younger people who want a "walkable" downtown and older people who no longer drive as much, however, these types of developments are often very expensive and not affordable to these demographics; what does the Village want to be in the future; put commercial areas in but keep residential zoning the same; and once change is made cannot be changed back.

Mr. Blake Webb: work with landowner of the 27 acre tract within the Pinehurst South Small Area Plan area; has been involved in the process and watched the plans evolve; lives in Pinehurst ETJ, travels HWY 5 multiple times a day and is an area native; with regard to the 27 acre tract of land, Mr. Webb appreciates the two options presented, however, the landowners have been trying to sell the property since 2014, if greenspace is what the community wants the landowners are in favor of this option and would like to see the Village buy the property, if not, mixed use would best suit the property for both office / retail and residential alike, office use only would restrict the property and limit what the landowners could do with the property; asks that the Board consider the landowners' opinion.

Ms. Amy Damone, 25 Page Rd.: Vice President of Community Association Services (CAS) voiced concern over the plans showing inaccurate information regarding Page Street. Ms. Damone believes the area on the plans indicating Page Street as a Right-of-Way is a parking lot deeded to Courtyard Office Park Townhome Association and has concerns with the Small Area Plan showing the extension of Page Street to Olivia Lane. Ms. Damone stated copies of the documents reference are available for the Board and relayed information on previous conversations had with Staff during Public Workshop #4.

Mr. Drum was listed to speak next but was no longer present.

Mr. Kendall Squires, 8 Royal Dornoch Ln.: gave background on his personal experiences with Pinehurst and reasons for relocating to the area; stated he understand fully the desire of property owners to maximize their investments, however, the push for density may prove to be unfortunate; there is no question traffic will be worse than it is now; concerned more with infrastructure (for example, what is the depth of the water deposit for Pinehurst and what will Pinehurst do when there is a drought); has thought been given, in terms of density, to the impact of increased population on schools and other ancillary services, such as medical services; and recognizes the entire area is changing.

Mr. John Webster, 140 McKenzie Rd. W: stated looking at traffic numbers this is going to precipitate, given we are not making any new roads, this is going to fill HWY 5 with 15,000 trips a day; the area cannot afford this additional traffic; when considering options look to options that limit the additional trips.

Mr. Lorenzo Blackmon, 175 Olivia Ln.: gave background on his and his family's personal history with Pinehurst, stated not much has changed in the area where his family has lived despite the area now being part of the Pinehurst ETJ; owns four properties in the Jackson Hamlet area, which is an area that is very rundown, and nothing much is being done to improve the area; receives conflicting information on how to go about getting help for the area and to make improvements to dilapidated properties; would like to learn what is going on in his area and to know how business is done in the Village; mistakes of the past have not been corrected and need to start being corrected; residents of the area feel neglected, confused, and left out of the process; questioned annexation of the area; regulation requirements are a tax to lower income people of the area; want to come together to do something for everyone, to have the process be inclusive of everyone; the area needs amenities for the children and families; and action needs to be taken to help the people of the community and to improve the area for everyone.

Mr. Hooper thanked the audience members for their comments and moved the meeting forward to Board discussion.

Mr. Shumaker noted items mentioned by attendees, such as the connection of Page St. to Olivia Ln. and verified, should the Village be interested in this project, the Village would have to purchase the property (the property could not be taken involuntarily); that infrastructure is a valid concern; traffic is a concern and most of the traffic is local traffic; relayed the fact that annexation of ETJ areas is voluntary and must be applied for; stated it was good to hear from a longtime resident, especially from Olivia Ln., which is an important part of the discussion; stated he is in favor of low density and of non-residential development in areas G & H of the plan (just north of the proposed park area); and verified by low density means non-residential.

Ms. Rothstein stated non-residential development in areas G & H of the plan.

Mr. Alzamora verified the current plan is commercial, mixed use (allows for residential but must be stacked); stated commercial, mixed use would be favorable for the area, office use mixed in with restaurant / retail and open space would give people working and living in the area an outlet and variety of uses for the area, concern is always affordable housing and don't want to force people out of their homes or force migration out of the area, investment in the area should provide more opportunities and jobs, and no single family residential, like the idea of mixed use plan as it is currently.

Mr. Farrell stated extensive discussion has been done regarding the railroad crossing at Olivia Ln. and sooner or later the details of the crossing will need to be squared away, hopes the potential additional residential and / or commercial development in the area will help spur improvement of existing dwellings in the area, plans for a shared use trail are interesting but a lot of negotiations still need to be done, most of the public is happy to see open space in the plans as there has been a lot of demand for a park or some type of open space whether that be commercial open space or residential open space, the appropriateness of moving the Public Services department and facilities to the area need not be a part of this discussion of the plans as that move is a long time coming with much discussion and planning still to be done before could happen; questioned the application of the plans and Form Based Code at the Trotter Hills office park due to that area largely being built out, however, the increased interest to buy and build in that area by local businesses shows some commercial interest for the area; main focus of discussion is whether residential development (of some type) should be allowed in the area previously designated as a commercial area; and is still of the opinion this area (G & H of the plan) is best left commercial for business to locate or relocate to the Pinehurst area and for the potential to have a golf hub (for companies like Golf Pride).

Mr. Shumaker added to Mr. Farrell's statement regarding business looking for commercial areas to relocate to within Pinehurst relaying information about a business that wanted commercial property in Pinehurst but ended up looking outside of the Village instead (a business that would have provided 100 jobs for the area).

Mr. Mercuro stated agreement with Mr. Farrell, believes there is opportunity for office in the area, there could be very nice office parks that join in some way, not for really high density residential development in the area (which doesn't seem likely to happen), believes the focus should be on office and service industry with some commercial should the area support it, and infrastructure is really horrible in the area and must be addressed before anything happens.

Mr. Jones asked for clarification on zoning uses proposed for the area, specifically the 27 acre property discussed by Mr. Webb, and the location of the proposed park / open space in relation to this property. Mr. Burich verified the current zoning for the area in question is neighborhood commercial / commercial / flex office, the location of the proposed park is mostly off the property in question, and stated there is an additional 8 acre property for sale (where the park is proposed), which is zoned OP. Mr. Jones proposed making a change to the Page St. extension depiction in the plan from a solid line to dotted line due to the extension being a proposal only. Mr. Burich stated a better solution might be labeling Page St. as private to cut down on confusion, and the rational for depicting the Page St. extension is the property having been originally designed to be a right of way through the area. The Board came to a consensus to make the change to the depiction of Page St. Mr. Jones proposed. Mr. Jones stated Moore County purchases water from Harnett County and various other municipalities in the area, growth will definitely tax utilities, however, the community is not isolated to our benefit. The Board and Mr. Burich reviewed zoning options for this area. Mr. Jones further stated, regarding the development of areas G & H of the plan, he is in favor of non-residential and sees the benefit of the plan in managing growth by affecting the density as much as possible.

Mr. Alzamora stated the plan for the space is what it is, referred to the "Cottages" (a high density development) being part of the plan area that had to be approved under the current zoning, and the Board needs to recommend a plan that will eliminate these types of incongruous development from happening in the area.

Mr. Hooper asked for information on the HWY 5 DOT timeline from Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones reviewed plans Mr. Farrell provided from the DOT regarding HWY 5, which outline the proposed work / widening of HWY 5 that will stop just short of Blake Blvd. and illustrate very little change to what already exists in the Pinehurst South area.

Mr. Hooper asked the Board to review the procedures and motion template provided by Staff in order to work towards formulating a motion on the Pinehurst South plan.

Mr. Hooper stated there will always be demand for multi-family development, especially in this area, which is something for the Board to take into consideration, a lot of reasoning and debate around multi-family development, and the pressure for this type of development will continue.

The Board and Mr. Burich reviewed the process moving forward regarding zoning and implementation of Form Based Code for the Pinehurst South area, and how much of the process for this area will overlap with the process for the Village Place area.

The Board and Mr. Burich discussed eliminating the innovation hub recommendation mentioned in the Comp. Plan in favor of a golf cluster recommendation based on lack of innovation interest and increased golf cluster interest resulting from the USGA opening Golf House Pinehurst.

Mr. Hooper stated support for connectivity in the area is needed in order promote movement within and outside of the communities in the area. The Board and Mr. Burich reviewed connectivity illustrations of the plan.

Mr. Shumaker recommended the Village discuss incorporating multi-functionality into the green / open space proposed in the plan as discussed in previous meetings (storm water retention ponds that serve as water features within the green space, etc.).

***Mr. Alzamora* moved that the Planning and Zoning Board recommend the *Village Place* Small Area Plan to the Pinehurst Village Council for adoption *with revision(s) based on the following option: (Option 2) Recommend changing the proposed residential land use pattern south of Blake Boulevard as identified on pages 72 and 73 of the Plan to non-residential land use pattern*. Seconded by *Ms. Rothstein*. Approved by a vote of 6-0.**

IV. Comments from Attendees
None

V. General Business

Mr. Cameron relayed there will be a Board of Adjustment in June and will share information on the meeting with the Chair and the Vice Chair.

Mr. Shumaker thanked the Board for sharing resources to help with the decision making process.

Mr. Hooper re-iterated the Village's Communication Policy regarding Board e-mails being a part of public record, even if sent / received on personal devices or in personal accounts, when those e-mails relate to Village business and the importance of the Board not crossing the line into conducting Board business in those communications.

Mr. Hooper recognized Mr. Burich's birthday today, 05-05-2022.

VI. Next Meeting Date

A. 06-02-2022 Regular Meeting

VII. Motion to Adjourn

Ms. Rothstein moved to adjourn the Regular Meeting. Seconded by Mr. Alzamora. Approved by a vote of 6-0 at 07:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Konstantinou
Clerk to the Board &
Planning Administrative Specialist
Village of Pinehurst

A videotape of this meeting is located on the Village website: www.vopnc.org.