



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 24TH, 2022
ASSEMBLY HALL
395 MAGNOLIA ROAD
PINEHURST, NORTH CAROLINA
4:00 PM**

Members Present:

Eric Von Salzen, Chair
Tom Schroeder, Vice-Chair
Anne Lucey
John Taylor
David Herring
Terry Lurtz

Members Absent:

Richard Vincent

Staff Present:

Alex Cameron, Planning Supervisor
Shannon Konstantinou, Clerk to the Board

Approximately 17 members of the public in attendance.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Von Salzen called the Regular Meeting to order at 04:00 PM, explained the purpose of the meeting, each Commission member introduce themselves, and Mr. Von Salzen introduced Staff.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. 02-24-2022 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2022 Regular Meeting. Seconded by Mr. Schroeder. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Herring moved to recess the Regular Meeting and open the Public Hearing. Seconded by Mr. Taylor. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

All Commission members stated they had visited all sites with the exception of Mr. Von Salzen, who did not visit any sites, and did not have any ex parte communication.

Mr. Von Salzen explained the procedures of a quasi-judicial public hearing.

III. Public Hearing

Mr. Cameron, Planning Supervisor, was sworn into the public hearing and testified as follows.

A. COA-2022-00039 (15 FIELDS RD.) CONTINUATION

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for construction of a new single family dwelling at 15 Fields Rd. The construction will consist of a single story, 3,276 square foot dwelling located at the corner of Fields and Cherokee Rds. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00029479. The property owner is Joseph Patrick Iverson and applicant is James Secky.

Mr. James Secky was sworn into the public hearing.

Mr. Von Salzen asked Mr. Cameron if the Applicant, Mr. Secky, provided an updated color palette selection. Mr. Cameron confirmed Mr. Secky did provide an updated color palette selection (Exhibit A-4.1).

Mr. Cameron discussed the proposed work and submitted into evidence the Staff Report, the Staff Presentation, Staff Memo provided via NovusAgenda with attachments / exhibits, and Applicant's revised material / exhibits. Mr. Von Salzen accepted the material submitted by Mr. Cameron into evidence.

Mr. Herring verified with Mr. Cameron the fact that the discussion regarding this COA from the February 24, 2022 meeting is included as part of the record for this case and meeting.

The Board and Mr. Secky discussed the new color palette selections being from the approved Historic District Standards color palette.

Mr. Cameron asked the Board to review a color rendering of the proposed property Mr. Secky provided during the meeting, which depicts the new color palette selections. (Exhibit A-4.2).

Mr. Herring clarified with Mr. Secky the style of soffit being open, not closed, above the front gable of the proposed dwelling to expose a wooden vaulted ceiling (as is shown in the original documents submitted).

Mr. Von Salzen asked whether there was any member of the audience wishing to present testimony either in favor or against the proposed Major Work. None came forward.

Mr. Taylor clarified with Mr. Cameron the approval would be for an open soffit as testified by Mr. Secky during the Public Hearing.

Ms. Lucey moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA-2022-00039) and find the proposed Major Work at 15 Fields Rd. is consistent with Historic District Standards and is deemed congruous with the Pinehurst Historic District based on the testimony given, the material submitted and the findings of fact. Seconded by Mr. Herring. Approved by a vote of 5-1 (abstention). Mr. Lurtz abstained from voting.

B. COA-2022-00063 (70 CAROLINA VISTA)

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for exterior modifications to 70 Carolina Vista. The modifications will consist of an addition to the primary dwelling, a new garage with living quarters, a covered breezeway, and an in-ground swimming pool with required pool fencing. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00016488. The property owners and the applicants are Kirk and Victoria Adkins.

Mr. Kirk Adkins and Mr. Tyler Cook were sworn into the public hearing.

Mr. Cameron discussed the proposed work and submitted into evidence the Staff Report, the Staff Presentation, Application, Applicant's Material, Photos / Site Plans, and Findings of Fact. Mr. Von Salzen accepted the material submitted by Mr. Cameron into evidence.

Ms. Lucey verified with Mr. Cameron the breakdown of the number of trees 12" or greater to be removed in relation to the Historic District Standards Section VII.C.4 (not unreasonably compromise the existing tree canopy and the historic appearance of the landscape). Mr. Adkins stated the tree survey document submitted was not accurate and asked to present a new document showing the correct tree removal information. Mr. Von Salzen stated Mr. Adkins would have an opportunity to submit additional documentation later in the hearing. Ms. Lucey asked Mr. Cameron to clarify the number of trees to be removed that measure 12" or greater in diameter. Mr. Cameron stated the number of 12" or greater trees to be removed would be looked at later in the hearing after Mr. Adkins had an opportunity to respond.

Mr. Taylor verified with Mr. Cameron the Historic District Standards state any additions should be located as inconspicuously as possible and that the proposed work would almost double the size of the existing dwelling. Mr. Adkins stated the proposed additions would equal 81% of the size of the existing heated square footage. Mr. Cameron stated each case that comes before the Commission is based on its own circumstances, there are certain facts the Commission would have to consider, then the Commission would have to apply and exercise discretion based on evidence submitted and testimony given.

Mr. Cameron stated clear facts are the lot is a 23,000 square foot lot in an R-10 district (minimum lot size being 10,000 square feet in this district), the rear of the dwelling is just over 13' setback from the rear property line while the minimum required setback for the lot is 25' (different setbacks were applied at the time the dwelling was built), and the square footage of the proposed additions (not including the proposed breezeway, courtyard or landscape features and scaled based on documents submitted) is 2,300 (the Applicant indicates 1,800 heated square feet) making the proposal just over the existing square footage.

Mr. Taylor stated, if the existing dwelling were located closer to the center of the property, the proposed additions would then be able to be placed at the rear of the property but the non-conforming position of the existing dwelling necessitates the proposed additions being done at the front of the property, and this is one of the factors that can be considered in determining whether to approve the COA. Mr. Cameron stated the Commission could consider any facts that are competent, material, and relevant to the case and the Standards.

Mr. Adkins thanked the Commission for their service to the community, reviewed a PowerPoint presentation with the Commission outlining the proposed work to be done at the property and the intentions behind the proposed work (Exhibit A-5.1), and presented a tree analysis outlining the differences between the tree survey that was submitted in support of the application and the trees that will actually be removed (Exhibit A-5.2).

Mr. Adkins stated he had made an incorrect submission and reviewed Exhibit A-5.2, which is the accurate document relating to the tree removal proposed, all trees marked for removal in this exhibit are 8" or more, there are 44 total trees above 8" in diameter on the property with 11 marked for removal (10 within the building envelope and 1 diseased located in the perimeter of the property), and there are 5 large Live Oak and 4 large Magnolia trees to remain, which dominate the tree canopy of the property.

Mr. Cameron stated the count of trees to be removed is 19 of 12" or greater diameter according to the originally submitted documents, and several trees of 12" or greater diameter are not marked on Exhibit A-5.2 submitted by the Applicant during the Public Hearing. Mr. Cameron stated there are concerns over the accuracy of the documents submitted and would welcome the opportunity to further review the evidence prior to COA approval.

Ms. Lucey verified with Mr. Cameron there are inconsistencies between the submitted documents relating to the number of trees to be removed.

Mr. Taylor clarified with Mr. Cameron that Exhibit A-5.2 should be considered as evidence due to the Applicant requesting the document be admitted to the record.

Mr. Adkins stated the accuracy of the locator dots in Exhibit A-5.2 cannot be attested to, however, the survey originally submitted is from 2012 (when the property was purchased) and is no longer an accurate depiction of where trees are located on the property.

Mr. Von Salzen stated the materials submitted by the Applicant during the Public Hearing have been admitted to the record.

Ms. Lucey clarified with Mr. Cameron what materials submitted are part of the record. Mr. Cameron stated all materials submitted prior to and during the hearing have been admitted to the record as evidence, and when considering the evidence the Commission should take into consideration the applicable Standards and the inconsistencies in the evidence submitted and the statement by Mr. Adkins that the survey submitted is out-of-date.

Mr. Taylor clarified, should a COA be approved, the approval would be based on removal of only 12 trees. Mr. Adkins stated removal of 12 trees is all that is needed.

Ms. Lucey asked for further clarification from Mr. Cameron as to whether the record is complete based on the evidence submitted and testimony given by Mr. Adkins. Mr. Cameron stated the testimony was given, however, it is difficult to verify the authenticity of the material presented due to no one on the Staff or Commission being a qualified, licensed professional surveyor. Mr. Cameron stated the concern from Staff's perspective would be if 12 trees are approved to be removed, what is the consequence should more trees be removed and how would the additional tree removals even be determined. Mr. Adkins stated the commitment would be made not to remove more than the 12 trees as submitted on Exhibit A-5.2.

Ms. Lucey clarified with Mr. Cameron how Staff would verify the tree removal. Mr. Cameron stated verification of the tree removal would be difficult due to the removal document being overlaid on an inaccurate survey.

Mr. Herring stated, whether approved or not approved, the Applicant has stated what was submitted is accurate and is under the obligation, should the submission be found inaccurate, to appear before the Commission to correct the error. Mr. Adkins stated he is in agreement.

Mr. Schroeder stated the legal question is whether the Commission believes the testimony is accurate. If the Commission believes the testimony is accurate that is one issue, if the Commission believes the testimony is inaccurate due to information provided by Mr. Cameron that is another issue. The only thing the Commission can

approve on is accurate and complete testimony. The Commission has to vote on what the Commission believes to be true.

Mr. Taylor verified with Mr. Schroeder the Commission could vote should the Commission members believe the testimony is accurate and complete.

Ms. Lucey stated, if Staff believed the record to be sufficient for Staff to carry out Staff's obligations, she was fine with the record as submitted.

Mr. Von Salzen stated, if the Commission approved the application, the approval would be based on the tree removal as shown in Exhibit A-5.2 submitted by the Applicant during the Public Hearing; if Mr. Adkins removes any additional trees, he would be acting in violation of the Commission's order; if Mr. Adkins finds he needs to remove additional trees that are not on Exhibit A-5.2, he would need to appear before the Commission to get approval for the additional tree removal because Mr. Adkins would not legally be allowed to remove the additional trees without the Commission's permission. Mr. Adkins stated he was in agreement.

Mr. Herring clarified with Mr. Adkins the discrepancy in the proposed wall / fence depictions surrounding the proposed pool as seen in Exhibit A-3.4 to Exhibit A-3.1. Mr. Adkins stated the elevation as depicted in Exhibit A-3.1 is incorrect and the proposed wall at the end of the street facing side of the proposed pool would be solid as depicted in Exhibit A-3.4.

Mr. Herring thanked Mr. Adkins for his presentation and stated he had come to the same conclusions as Mr. Adkins prior to Mr. Adkins making his presentation.

Mr. Lurtz verified with Mr. Adkins the proposed new garage would be a functioning garage, and clarified access to the existing garage is no longer needed as the garage would no longer be used as such and the proposed garage / living quarters is the structure depicted in front of the existing garage.

Mr. Taylor verified with Mr. Adkins the location of the proposed garage doors could not be moved to a non-street facing side due to the 35' access requirement.

Ms. Lucey clarified with Mr. Adkins how the proposed Ritter Rd. elevation would not look like a "monolithic" structure. Mr. Adkins reviewed the proposed elevations showing rooflines, dormers, and other architectural features that mimic the architectural features of the existing structure and stated these features along with landscaping would "soften" the view of the proposed addition from the street.

Mr. Herring clarified with Mr. Adkins the center gable depicted in Exhibit A-3.1 does protrude towards Ritter Rd. as depicted in Exhibit A-2.2 making the elevation different depths and not one long, straight wall.

Mr. Von Salzen asked whether there was any member of the audience wishing to present testimony either in favor or against the proposed Major Work. None came forward.

Mr. Herring stated Mr. Adkins made a great presentation on how all objective Standards were met.

Mr. Von Salzen stated, having lived in Pinehurst over a decade, he has driven by the subject property many times, understands the desire to have a larger house on a lot that will accommodate one (as this lot clearly would) and is, therefore, not concerned that the problem additions sometimes present by dominating the existing building will be a problem in this case, the proposed dwelling very well could have been built in exactly the same form and would have complied with zoning without any objections, the existing historic house is quite small for the lot means that building up to the capacity of the lot is going to change the quantity of house, a very good job has been done in designing the house in such a way that it is not going to stick out like a “sore thumb”, looks so it would all fit.

Ms. Lucey stated she appreciated the time taken by Mr. Adkins working to try to meet the Standards.

Mr. Taylor stated, having himself done a renovation project on an addition that was incongruous to try to make it look as though it was original, someone who has never been to Pinehurst and drives by the house a year from now would think it is original, Mr. Adkins has gone to great lengths to make sure that is the case. Mr. Taylor state a concern, which echoes one of Ms. Lucey, is if someone has been to Pinehurst before it will look dramatically changed and this is an issue in relation to the application of the Standards. The Commission is allowed to deviate from the Standards based on the presentation given by Mr. Adkins being the exactly the intent the Commission is responsible for promoting (making the addition look as though it were original and had been built in 1909 so, therefore, it is congruous, which is the ultimate goal of the Commission).

Mr. Herring moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA-2022-00063) and find the proposed Major Work at 70 Carolina Vista is not consistent with Historic District Standards due to the prominence of the additions but is deemed congruous with the Pinehurst Historic District based on the testimony given, the material submitted and the findings of fact. Conditions applied: Tree removal is to be done in

accordance with Exhibit A-5.2 submitted by the Applicant during the Public Hearing. Seconded by Mr. Lurtz. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

C. COA-2022-00072 (3 CAROLINA VISTA)

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for modifications to COA-2021-00052 at 3 Carolina Vista (USGA Golf House Pinehurst). The modifications will consist of revisions to the tree impact plan, changes to door / window / louver locations, and changes to exterior material selections. The property is identified as Moore County PID Numbers 00025800 and 00024972. The property owner is U.S. Golf Association and applicant is Clearscapes Architecture + Art.

Ms. Brandy Thompson, Ms. Amy Bullington, Mr. Michael Lee, Mr. Bob Koontz, and Ms. Janine Driscoll were sworn into the public hearing.

Mr. Cameron discussed the proposed work and submitted into evidence the Staff Report, the Staff Presentation, Application, Applicant's Material, Photos / Site Plans, and Findings of Fact. Mr. Von Salzen accepted the material submitted by Mr. Cameron into evidence.

Mr. Herring asked Mr. Cameron to point out the pine grove being preserved. Mr. Cameron stated the Applicants will be able to better address this question and the proposal relating to the pine grove is more in line with restoration than preservation, which was part of the original COA and Conditional Zoning Request approvals. Mr. Herring further asked whether drawings of the original COA approval were available to use for comparison as certain items seemed to be missing from the current submission, particularly relating to the enclosure around the mechanical equipment. Mr. Cameron stated access to all submitted documents from April of 2021 was available.

Mr. Taylor clarified the removal of the connector between the two buildings was not part of the proposal. Mr. Cameron stated the connector was part of the original approval, not part of the current proposal, which is why the connector may appear in some of the proposed elevations (carry over elevations from the prior approval). Mr. Herring stated the connector in question by Mr. Taylor may be seen in Exhibit A-3.4. Mr. Taylor stated elements of the connector may, also, be seen in Exhibits A-2.1 to A-2.3. Ms. Thompson asked for permission to speak. Mr. Von Salzen asked the Commission whether there were any further questions for Mr. Cameron. None were asked. Mr. Von Salzen then allowed discussion with the Applicants.

Ms. Thompson thanked the Commission. Ms. Thompson and Mr. Koontz reviewed a PowerPoint presentation with the Commission outlining the proposed changes to COA-2021-00052 and the intentions behind seeking the proposed changes.

Ms. Thompson verified for the Commission the location of the pine grove to be restored. Mr. Taylor stated the pine grove was referenced in many of the Olmsted drawings and the intended proposed work to the pine grove is more restorative in nature. Mr. Koontz verified Mr. Taylor's statement, stated the intention of the USGA is to restore the pine grove to the tradition nature of a Sandhills pine grove and to use the pine grove as an educational area / opportunity, and the restoration would involve planting different ages of trees all the way down to seedlings, the USGA engaged Dr. Jay Carter (a well-respected, local environmental consultant) to do a full evaluation of the site and is working with the USGA to restore the pine grove to a healthy state, the proposed additional tree removal is part of an effort to increase the number of native longleaf pine trees within the pine grove and to help meet the 25 year storm water runoff requirements, and there will be a greater number of trees planted than are being removed.

Mr. Schroeder verified the trees indicated in green are to be planted and the trees indicated in red are to be removed.

Ms. Thompson stated in an effort to reduce the ecological impact of the tree removal, the USGA is working with a local furniture maker to utilize the trees removed in future furniture projects instead of simply discarding the trees.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification on the walkway depicted in Exhibit A-2.3. Ms. Thompson stated the original proposal for the walkway was a trellis structure with an upper and lower walking path, the proposed change to the walkway is to keep the trellis structure and lower walking path but remove the upper walking path and replace it with a standard roof structure.

Mr. Schroeder asked for clarification on the changes in elevation to the right side of the structure as depicted in Exhibit A-3.1. Ms. Thompson stated the building size did increase slightly in this area, resulting in the elevation change Mr. Schroeder was referencing. Ms. Bullington stated original elements of the elevation are still there the proportions have changes slightly to help minimize the impact of the changes needed for the mechanical area.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on the length of the proposed mechanical screening as depicted in Exhibit A-3.6 in relation to the original proposal. Ms. Bullington stated Mr. Cameron would need to pull up the exact dimensions and the elevation was simply cropped in the original submittal.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on where metal roofing occurs. Ms. Thompson stated anywhere there is a low roof or porch roof (essentially the first floor level), the metal roofing would be used.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification that there will be illustrated muntins on the proposed fixed louvre areas of the building. Ms. Thompson stated there will be illustrated muntins on the proposed fixed louvres as illustrated on the right hand side of Exhibit A-2.16.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on a change in the slope of the main roof of the Visitors' Center. Ms. Thompson deferred to Ms. Bullington. Ms. Bullington stated there is a change in pitch with a flared eve on both buildings, and there will be a break.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on the appearance of a loss of detail and concern over window proportions as seen in Exhibits A-3.1, A-3.2 and A-2.12. Ms. Thompson stated the appeared differences are due to the original proposal materials being rendered and the current proposal materials being line drawings only.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification regarding the connecting trellis structure approval. Mr. Cameron, Mr. Thompson, and Ms. Bullington verified the connecting trellis structure was already approved as part of the original COA and was not part of the current proposal.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on the "green wall" proposed for the Testing Center. Mr. Koontz stated the "green wall" would consist of wire trellis work run against the wall to act as a structure for espalier camellias to grow along eventually filling in the wall with blooms and greenery.

Ms. Lucey asked for verification on the square footage for each building and whether that square footage has increased. Ms. Thompson stated the square footage has increased. Ms. Bullington stated the total square footage for the Visitors' Center is now 18,165 and for the Testing Center is now 28,295. Previously, the Visitors' Center had been 15,400 and the Testing Center had been 25,100. Both increases are due to changes that occurred from mechanical services requirements for both buildings.

Mr. Von Salzen asked whether there was any member of the audience wishing to present testimony either in favor or against the proposed Major Work. None came forward.

Mr. Taylor moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA-2022-00072) and find the proposed Major Work at 3 Carolina Vista is consistent with Historic District Standards and is deemed congruous with the Pinehurst Historic District based on the testimony given, the

material submitted and the findings of fact. Seconded by Mr. Lurtz. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Von Salzen recessed the Public Hearing at 06:05 PM for a 10 minute break.

Mr. Von Salzen called the Public Hearing to order at 06:15 PM.

D. COA-2022-00073 (30 MEDLIN RD.)

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for modifications to COA-2021-00051 at 30 Medlin Rd. The modifications will consist of a change to the driveway, changes to the front door and windows, and changes to the mutton bars on windows. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00023802. The property owners are William M. and Nelda C. Huffstetler, and the applicant is Step One Design.

Mr. Dan Degre was sworn into the public hearing.

Mr. Cameron discussed the proposed work and submitted into evidence the Staff Report, the Staff Presentation, Application, Applicant's Material, Photos / Site Plans, and Findings of Fact. Mr. Von Salzen accepted the material submitted by Mr. Cameron into evidence.

Ms. Lucey asked for clarification on whether the color of the door had been approved as part of the prior COA. Mr. Degre stated he did not have that information as the prior COA was applied for by the Owners and preceded his involvement with the project, after taking over the project and redlining the plans he realized there were some major issues with the project that required the project to be re-drawn in order to make it buildable, this re-draw resulted in subtle changes to the design (not meant to be a re-design just to fix issues and make the project buildable), and anything that was approved prior to Mr. Degre taking over the project he was not involved with. Mr. Degre verified the only color change to the project is involving the front door, which has been proposed to be a blue color selected from the Historic District Standards approved color palette. Mr. Cameron stated the color selections for the prior COA were an approved version of white for the main elevations of the dwelling and either natural or an approved dark blue for the front door, so the current proposal finalized the prior COA color selection for the front door.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on whether the design of the garage door had changed. Mr. Cameron stated the design of the garage door did change.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification on whether the circular portion of the driveway was an addition to the previously approved driveway. Mr. Cameron stated the circular portion was an addition.

Mr. Degre stated all of the proposed changes started with the re-design, during that re-design questions arose, and changes were proposed (partially due to the Owners' personal preferences, partially due to material availability, and partially due to functionality of the structure).

Mr. Von Salzen asked whether there was any member of the audience wishing to present testimony either in favor or against the proposed Major Work. None came forward.

Mr. Lurtz moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA-2022-00073) and find the proposed Major Work at 30 Medlin Rd. is consistent with Historic District Standards and is deemed congruous with the Pinehurst Historic District based on the testimony given, the material submitted and the findings of fact. Seconded by Mr. Herring. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

E. COA-2022-00074 (30 MCDONALD RD. W)

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for exterior modifications to 30 McDonald Rd W. The modifications will consist of an addition to the primary dwelling, replacement of the roof, painting of the exterior, and refurbishment of the existing windows. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00018847. The property owners are John Roger Gerold and Elise Anne Bryie, and the applicant is Todd Wilson of Blue Fin Construction Services, LLC.

Mr. Todd Wilson was sworn into the public hearing.

Mr. Cameron discussed the proposed work and submitted into evidence the Staff Report, the Staff Presentation, Application, Applicant's Material, Photos / Site Plans, and Findings of Fact. Mr. Von Salzen accepted the material submitted by Mr. Cameron into evidence.

Ms. Lucey asked for clarification on whether there was a color selection in the approved color palette close to the chosen color of "Storm" gray. Mr. Cameron stated there was a color selection in the approved color palette close to the chosen color of "Storm" gray and the Applicant was prepared to address that question.

Mr. Wilson displayed backer boards showing the similarity of "Storm" gray to the approved color palette color of "Platinum" gray. Mr. Wilson stated the Owners were

prepared to change the color selection to “Platinum” gray should the Commission deem it necessary for approval of the COA. Mr. Von Salzen stated the change in color from “Storm” gray to “Platinum” gray would be required. Mr. Wilson requested the application be amended to reflect the color selection change from “Storm” gray to “Platinum” gray.

Mr. Wilson stated due to material shortages, the manufacturer of the proposed new windows changed from Marvin to Pella with no change in material or style. Mr. Von Salzen stated a change in manufacturer would not affect the COA approval provided no changes in material or design were made and explained the requirements of the Historic Preservation Commission regarding materials, design, and final approval.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on shutters not being placed on the new windows despite shutters being present on existing windows. Mr. Wilson stated the Owners’ did not want to install shutters on the new windows. Mr. Herring stated not putting shutters on the new windows was a good design decision.

Mr. Cameron clarified with the Commission the amendment to the application regarding the main elevation color selection changing from “Storm” gray to “Platinum” gray.

Mr. Von Salzen asked whether there was any member of the audience wishing to present testimony either in favor or against the proposed Major Work. None came forward.

Mr. Herring moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA-2022-00074) and find the proposed Major Work at 30 McDonald Rd W is not consistent with Historic District Standards but is deemed congruous with the Pinehurst Historic District based on the testimony given, the material submitted and the findings of fact. Conditions applied: The application be amended to reflect the color selection change from “Storm” gray to “Platinum” gray (an approved color in the Historic District Standards approved color palette). Seconded by Mr. Taylor. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Cameron for clarification on the status of “Contributing” to the Historic District for 30 McDonald Rd. W and explained the meaning of the status to Mr. Wilson.

F. COA-2022-00075 (8 VILLAGE LN.)

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for exterior modifications to 8 Village Ln. The modifications will consist of the enclosure of an existing basement

patio area at the rear of the property, and the addition of steps to the left side of the property. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00015879. The property owner is Sharon B. Day and the applicant is Pinehurst Homes, Inc.

Ms. Courtney Emch and Mr. Wayne Haddock were sworn into the public hearing.

Mr. Cameron discussed the proposed work and submitted into evidence the Staff Report, the Staff Presentation, Application, Applicant's Material, Photos / Site Plans, and Findings of Fact. Mr. Von Salzen accepted the material submitted by Mr. Cameron into evidence.

Ms. Emch stated the intention behind closing in the existing back patio area was to provide the Owner with a pantry space, and the intention behind the installation of the stairs along the left side of the dwelling is to provide access to the drainage system located in the center of the patio area.

Ms. Lucey asked for clarification on whether the proposed work required demolition. Ms. Emch stated the proposed work does require demolition of an interior wall to the existing back patio to be enclosed and part of the brick wall to the existing patio to install stairs.

Mr. Von Salzen asked whether there was any member of the audience wishing to present testimony either in favor or against the proposed Major Work. None came forward.

Mr. Taylor moved that the Historic Preservation Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA-2022-00075) and find the proposed Major Work at 8 Village Ln. is consistent with Historic District Standards and is deemed congruous with the Pinehurst Historic District based on the testimony given, the material submitted and the findings of fact. Seconded by Mr. Herring. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Lurtz moved to adjourn the Public Hearing and re-enter the Regular Meeting. Seconded by Mr. Taylor. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

IV. Review of Normal Maintenance and Minor Work Items

A. Minor Work COA's Issued 02/18/2022 – 03/15/2022.

V. Next Meeting Date

A. Regular Meeting April 28th, 2022

The Board and Mr. Cameron discussed scheduling additional Work Session meetings and tentatively decided on a Work Session meeting proceeding the next scheduled Regular Meeting on April 28th, 2022 from 02:00 PM – 04:00 PM, which would be verified by Mr. Cameron at a

later date. Mr. Von Salzen asked the Commission to, also, provide Mr. Cameron with a few additional dates of availability for Work Session meetings.

VI. 2022 Volunteer Luncheon Group Photo

VII. Motion to Adjourn

Mr. Schroeder moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Taylor. Approved by a vote of 6-0 at 07:03 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,



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

A videotape of this meeting is available on the Village website at www.vopnc.org.

Vision: The Village of Pinehurst is a charming, vibrant community, which reflects our rich history and traditions. Mission: Promote, enhance, and sustain the quality of life for residents, businesses, and visitors. Values: Service, Initiative, Teamwork, and Improvement.