



**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 27TH, 2022
ASSEMBLY HALL
395 MAGNOLIA ROAD
PINEHURST, NORTH CAROLINA
4:00 PM**

Members Present:

Eric Von Salzen, Chair
Tom Schroeder, Vice-Chair
Anne Lucey
Richard Vincent
John Taylor
David Herring

Members Absent:

Terry Lurtz

Staff Present:

Alex Cameron, Lead Planner
Shannon Konstantinou, Clerk to the Board

Approximately 10 members of the public in attendance.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Von Salzen called the Regular Meeting to order at 03:59 PM and explained the purpose of this meeting for the Historic Preservation Commission.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. 12-16-2021 Special Meeting Minutes

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the minutes of the December 16th, 2021 Special Meeting. Seconded by Mr. Schroeder. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

B. 12-16-2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the minutes of the December 16th, 2021 Regular Meeting. Seconded by Mr. Schroeder. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

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

III. Public Hearing

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

All Commission members stated they had visited all sites and did not have any ex parte communication.

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

A. COA-2021-00214 (5 CHINQUAPIN ROAD)

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 5 Chinquapin Road. Modifications include the replacement of existing siding, soffit, fascia and windows. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00024677. The property owner and applicant is Peyton Gentry of Gentry Holdings, LLC.

Mr. Peyton Gentry 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.

The Commission and Mr. Gentry reviewed a sample of the type of siding and soffit to be used in the proposed work. Mr. Gentry stated the same type of siding was used on the Pinehurst Resort Spa, which was built a few years ago. Mr. Gentry discussed his ownership history of the property, the original siding material of the building being wood, the intention behind the proposed work, and stated Mr. Jake Burns of Carolina Siding was going to attend but was unable due to possible COVID symptoms, however, Mr. Brian Bennett of Lansing Building Parts, who will be supplying the materials for the proposed work, was in attendance.

Mr. Vincent asked Mr. Gentry for clarification on the type of replacement windows to be used. Mr. Gentry referred to Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Brian Bennett was sworn into the public hearing.

Mr. Bennett verified the type of replacement windows to be used will be exactly the same as the existing windows (6 over 1 and white) with the only exception being the material will be vinyl instead of wood.

Mr. Herring asked Mr. Gentry and Mr. Bennet for clarification on the type of muntins to be used. Mr. Bennett verified the muntins will be contained between the pieces of glass. No muntins will be placed on the outside or inside of the glass.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Gentry and Mr. Bennett for clarification on whether the fire suppression system shown in Exhibits A-2.18 and A-2.19 will be changed. Mr.

Gentry stated the building has two fire suppression systems, one wet system inside and one wet system outside. Mr. Gentry stated the pipes will be painted to match the siding once all of the siding work was done to clean up the appearance of the pipes.

Mr. Gentry stated the front double doors will not be replace, rather cleaned up and painted as they are the original doors put in place in 1896. Mr. Gentry stated the existing windows are the original windows that the previous owner had put storm windows over making the windows virtually impossible to clean or open, and that the replacement windows will be the highest quality vinyl windows produced.

Mr. Herring suggested Mr. Gentry consider a simulated, divided light window instead of an in between the glass due to the simulated, divided light window being more historically accurate. Mr. Gentry stated he was interested in getting the best looking window possible to replace the existing windows. Mr. Von Salzen stated Mr. Gentry could take Mr. Herring's advice as a recommendation unless the Commission votes to make the style of divided light a Condition.

Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Gentry and Mr. Bennett for clarification on the style of replacement door and transom to be used to replace the door and transom shown in Exhibit A-2.11. Mr. Gentry verified the replacement door and transom would be the exact same style as the existing door and transom.

Mr. Schroeder asked for clarification on the configuration of the replacement lap siding. Mr. Bennett verified the configuration would have a bigger, 7 inch exposure but overlap in the same manner as the existing siding.

Mr. Schroeder asked for clarification on whether both the existing vinyl and original wood sidings would be removed or just the vinyl siding. Mr. Gentry stated the original wood siding underneath the vinyl siding has never been seen and the removal of the original wood siding would depend on the condition of the wood. Mr. Gentry stated the proposed replacement siding would cover or overlay the original wood siding even if it is not removed so that no existing siding will be visible. Mr. Bennett verified the type of replacement siding is referred to as a straight lap siding.

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** a Certificate of Appropriateness (**COA-2021-00214**) and find the proposed Major Work at **5 Chinquapin Rd.** 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. Seconded by Mr. Taylor. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Von Salzen clarified with Mr. Herring that the motion allows that the Applicant may choose to follow Mr. Herring's recommendation regarding the replacement windows, which was that the new windows be a six over six design with either grids between the glass or on the outside of the glass.

B. COA-2022-00002 (90 LINDEN ROAD)

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 at 90 Linden Road. Modifications include a rear kitchen addition, addition of vent-less fireplace, outdoor fireplace at pool house and detached garage addition. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00014733. The property owner and applicant is Katharine Pate.

Ms. Katherine Pate and Mr. William Huckabee 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. Taylor asked for clarification on the tree removal referenced on page 2 of 4 of the application. Ms. Pate stated a recommendation letter written by Mr. Kevin Hart of Southern Landscape Group had been submitted stating the reason why the two trees referenced for removal in the application and on the site survey need to be taken out. Mr. Cameron stated the tree removal information Ms. Pate referenced was not included as part of this submittal but that the tree removal would be able to be discussed at a later time.

Mr. Taylor asked whether tree removal is required for the proposed construction at the site. Mr. Cameron stated it appears all of the proposed construction would be done within the existing hard surface area of the site so no additional tree removal would be required. Ms. Pate stated one very large pine tree marked on the survey near the right front corner of the garage will need to be removed due to the tree obstructing the growth of a "Manning Era" hemlock, which is worth saving, and the large pine tree not remaining viable once the trimming of the root system for construction of the new driveway is done.

Mr. Cameron iterated the requirements any tree removal would have to meet in order for the Applicant to need a Major Work approval from the Commission.

Mr. Von Salzen stated the Commission is only able to consider material submitted as part of the application for the public hearing and Ms. Pate must decide whether to move forward with approval of the application for construction only or to recess the public hearing to a later time in order to receive approval for both the construction and tree removal. Ms. Pate stated she wished to move forward with approval for the application as submitted, which will be limited to construction only, as the tree removal would not be happening anytime soon and she would be willing to come before the Commission again at a later date to seek approval for tree removal should the Commission's approval be required.

Mr. Taylor verified with Mr. Cameron that approval of the material submitted, excluding tree removal, is permissible.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification on how the proposed kitchen addition shown in Exhibit A-2.1 and Exhibit A-2.2 will impact the rear elevation of the dwelling. Ms. Pate stated the proposed kitchen addition would stop short of the dining room and the dining room would remain as original. Mr. Cameron verified the proposed rear elevation of Exhibit A-2.2 is correct, the site plan drawing of Exhibit A-2.1 is not correct, and the proposed kitchen addition would extend 6 feet out from the existing dwelling and run 24 feet in length.

Ms. Lucey asked for clarification on how the proposed work complies with the Accessory Structure Standard in terms of height of the proposed garage addition versus the height of the primary dwelling. Mr. Cameron verified the proposed work complies with the Accessory Structure Standard and reviewed the additional requirements the Accessory Structure must meet according to the Pinehurst Development Ordinance.

Ms. Lucey asked for clarification on how the proposed work complies with the Accessory Structure Standard in terms of location of accessory structures being in an inconspicuous area of the side or rear yards. Mr. Cameron verified the proposed work complies with the Accessory Structure Standard and reviewed the site plans depicting the location of the proposed garage in relation to the primary dwelling.

Ms. Pate stated a neighbor expressed concern over the size of the garage doors to be installed on the rear of the garage as part of the proposed work. While the doors to be installed are the existing doors from the front of the garage, Ms. Pate stated she would be willing to reduce the size of the doors to be installed on the rear of the garage as these doors would only be used for golf carts. Ms. Lucey asked Mr. Cameron to clarify the Standard relating to garage door sizes. Mr. Cameron stated the Standard Ms. Lucey was referring to discussing multiple front facing garage doors would not be applicable to the proposed work as the garage doors would be rear facing, but, the Standard could be read or interpreted in a way that it potentially could be applicable.

Mr. Vincent asked for clarification regarding the foundation shown in the Exhibit depicting the Pool House fire place. Ms. Pate stated the Exhibit depicting the rear elevation of the Pool House where the fire place is to be installed is incorrect as the fire place will require a footing and cannot be placed directly on the existing surface. Mr. Huckabee stated the footing or foundation will not be visible as it will all be installed under the existing surface and below the proposed fire place.

Mr. Schroeder asked for further clarification on whether the Applicant would need to seek a Major Work approval from the Commission in order to do any tree removal work. Mr. Cameron reiterated the requirements any tree removal would have to meet in order for the Applicant to need a Major Work approval from the Commission. The Commission, Mr. Huckabee, and Mr. Cameron discussed the recommendation of Mr. Hart from Southern Landscape Group regarding the tree removal mentioned in the application and debated continuing the case or ruling on the case as presented. The Commission and Ms. Pate agreed to continue with a ruling on the case as presented.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on the proposed shutters. Ms. Pate stated the proposal is to change the shutters from a louvered to a board and batten, which will allow the shutters to operate and be the correct size of shutters. Ms. Pate stated the intention is to get the dwelling back to more of the original cottage style. Mr. Herring and Ms. Pate discussed the proposed shutters for the proposed windows on the rear of the garage addition.

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.

The Commission discussed the uniqueness of the type of windows on the dwelling and how the style and size of shutters required by the Standards would be applied to the type of windows particular to the dwelling. Ms. Pate stated the primary dwelling was built in 1917, the garage was built in the 1940's, and the windows must have been change to the existing style of windows sometime in the 1970's. Mr. Cameron reviewed the Standards applicable to shutters. Mr. Herring asked Ms. Pate what her intentions were for the dwelling. Ms. Pate stated her intentions were to make the dwelling more original or cottagey looking. The Commission, Ms. Pate, Mr. Huckabee, and Mr. Cameron agreed that proposed shutters for the proposed windows on the rear of the garage addition would be either two shutters ½ the size of the window, one shutter the full size of the window, or no shutters at all.

*Mr. Taylor moved that the Historic Preservation Commission **approve with conditions** a Certificate of Appropriateness (**COA-2022-00002**) and find the proposed Major Work at **90 Linden Rd.** 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. The following Conditions apply: No tree removal included with this request and shutters are not required to be installed but may be as indicated on the submitted material.

The Commission, Ms. Pate, and Mr. Huckabee discussed the proposed garage door size on the rear of the existing structure and clarified what is covered by the approval of the Major Work application.

Mr. Taylor amended the Conditions of the motion to read: No tree removal included with this request and shutters are not required to be installed but may be as indicated on the submitted material and the rear doors on the detached garage may not be larger than proposed and can be reduced in size. Seconded by Mr. Herring. Approved by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Von Salzen recessed the Public Hearing for a 10 minute break at 05:18 PM.

Mr. Von Salzen reconvened the Public Hearing at 05:28 PM.

C. COA-2022-00005 (125 KELLY ROAD)

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for the change of garage doors from two separate doors to one large door, screened porch at the front of the dwelling, and screened porch at the rear of the dwelling at 125 Kelly Road. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00014377. The property owner is Charles Anthony Mucciolo 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 screening porches as referenced in the Standards. Mr. Cameron reviewed the section of the Standards relating to screened porches. Ms. Lucey asked Mr. Degre what the screen would be made of. Mr. Degre stated fiberglass, black and barely visible.

Mr. Taylor asked whether there was any depiction of what the screening would look like. Mr. Cameron stated the screening would simply run from the previously approved porch columns and would not have any additional framing or columns.

Mr. Degre stated the intention behind changing from two single garage doors to one large, double door is due to the tight turning radius when entering the garage. Mr. Degre stated the intention behind screening the previously approved porches is to keep bugs out and make the porches more usable. Mr. Von Salzen asked if the doors to the breakfast nook off of the front porch would be opened. Mr. Degre said the doors would open if the screening of the porch was approved.

Mr. Taylor asked for clarification on the location of the front door to the house. Mr. Degre verified the front door is not located under the front porch proposed to be screened in but to the left of this porch.

Ms. Lucey asked if Mr. Degre had a sample of the screening material to be used. Mr. Degre stated the type of screening material is Screenies.

Mr. Schroeder asked for clarification regarding any change in size to the opening for the garage door when switching from two single to one double. Mr. Degre stated the opening will actually decrease from 20' to 18' due to double garage doors not being made in 20' widths.

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** a Certificate of Appropriateness (**COA-2022-00005**) and find the proposed Major Work at **125 Kelly 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. Schroeder. Approved by a vote of 6-0.*

D. COA-2022-00006 (35 ORANGE ROAD)

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider a request for a Major Certificate of Appropriateness within the Pinehurst Historic District for the demolition of an existing accessory structure and construction of a new detached garage at 35 Orange Road. The property is identified as Moore County PID Number 00028352. The property owner and applicant is Thomas O'Connor.

Mr. Thomas O'Connor 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.

Mr. Taylor verified with Mr. Cameron the required setback for the proposed new garage is 10'.

Mr. Schroeder verified two motions were needed, one for demolition and one for the proposed new garage structure.

Mr. O'Connor stated photographs of the primary structure are available should the Commission wish to view them to verify the design of the proposed new garage structure will be consistent with the primary structure.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on the difference of the windows depicted in the submitted sketch (3 high and 2 wide) and the windows on the existing primary structure (2 high and 3 wide). Mr. O'Connor stated he intended for the sketch provided to mirror the existing primary structure.

Mr. Herring asked for clarification on the second story opening for the proposed new garage structure. On the primary structure there are louvers but on the sketch of the proposed new garage structure there are windows. Mr. O'Connor stated he would change the windows to louvers to match the existing primary structure.

Mr. Herring clarified with Mr. O'Connor the second paragraph of page 2 of the letter submitted is superseded by the 10' setback. Mr. O'Connor verified the second paragraph should be removed from consideration.

Mr. Herring clarified with Mr. O'Connor the last paragraph of page 2 of the letter submitted references solar batteries yet no solar panels were listed in the application. Mr. O'Connor stated he was unsure of the power source at the time of application but asked this paragraph be removed from consideration as drawing power from the box will be the easiest route to pursue.

Mr. Herring clarified with Mr. O'Connor the listing of proposed exterior materials stated the windows will be "composite" but should read "vinyl". Mr. O'Connor verified the application should be amended to read "vinyl".

Mr. Herring verified with Mr. O'Connor the side door to the garage will be a solid wood door.

Mr. Vincent asked for clarification on what the garage doors will look like. Mr. O'Connor stated pairs of carriage doors will be used. Mr. Vincent asked for further clarification on the situation and type of material being used for a driveway. Mr. O'Connor stated there is gravel running up to the side of the primary structure but not back to the proposed new garage area, which is earth. Mr. O'Connor stated the driveway will remain in this state for now, however, should any need for changes to

the driveway arise in the future, Mr. O'Connor will apply for approval from the Commission.

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 verified with Mr. Cameron that two motions will be needed, one for demolition of the existing structure and one for the proposed new garage structure.

The following amendments to the application apply: Change the proposed window material referenced in Exhibit A-1.3 from "composite" to "vinyl", remove reference to "solar batteries" from the end of the first paragraph of Exhibit A-5.2, remove the second paragraph referencing the proposed building footprint of Exhibit A-5.2, and the renderings submitted as Exhibits A-3.5 and A-3.6 be amended to reflect a louver and not a window in the second story to match that of the existing cottage.

*Mr. Taylor moved that the Historic Preservation Commission **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness (**COA-2022-00006**) and find the proposed Demolition of the existing structure at **35 Orange 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. Schroeder. Approved by a vote of 6-0.*

*Mr. Taylor moved that the Historic Preservation Commission **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness (**COA-2022-00006**) and find the proposed Major Work at **35 Orange 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. Vincent. Approved by a vote of 6-0.*

Mr. Von Salzen reviewed the fact that there are certain requirements regarding coordination with Staff when demolishing a structure in the Historic District.

Mr. Schroeder moved to close the Public Hearing. 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 12-11-21 to 01-19-22

The Commission and Mr. Cameron discussed the need for another Work Session to continue work on the Standards revisions and what topics should be covered during the next Work Session. It was agreed to tentatively schedule a Work Session meeting for before the next Regular Meeting of 02-24-22 but not officially set until the case load for the next Regular Meeting was determined. The Commission and Mr. Cameron discussed the process for submitting Standards revisions to Council and possibly setting deadlines for Standards revisions sections.

V. Next Meeting Date

A. Regular Meeting February 24th, 2022

VI. Motion to Adjourn

Mr. Von Salzen made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Schroeder. Approved by a vote of 6-0 at 6:14 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.