

March 10, 2023 via email

The Honorable Senator Tom McInnis 300 N. Salisbury Street, Rm. 314 Raleigh, NC 27603-5925

The Honorable Representative Neal Jackson 300 N. Salisbury Street, Rm. 603 Raleigh, NC 27603-5925

Subject: SB143

Dear Tom and Neal,

Thank you for meeting with Mayor John Strickland, Councilmember Lydia Boesch, and Village Manager Jeff Sanborn on February 27<sup>th</sup> at Village Hall. We are writing to follow-up with you on some of the points discussed in that meeting.

You mentioned that you had been contacted by individuals or groups who felt their property rights had been abused during the commercial building moratoriums which are in effect for our Village Place and Pinehurst South districts. We feel we have followed all requirements of state statutes regarding hearings, notices, and extensions of the moratoriums. As we mentioned, we have no record of any person(s) objecting to the moratoriums during the public hearings, or in other contacts with Village staff. We have provided a list of all comments from the public hearings with this letter. We welcome the opportunity to meet with any individuals or groups that have contacted you with grievances so that we can work with them to resolve their concerns. Please encourage them contact to us immediately or supply their information to us and we will take the initiative to contact them.

The Pilot on-line newspaper dated, March 1, reports that Paula Nash, with the Moore County Homebuilders Association, complained about our moratorium via email with the Pinehurst Planning Department in December 2022. After comparing the email that was provided to The Pilot with our non-alterable archived email records, we have concluded that the email provided to The Pilot was intentionally altered. The actual, original email only contained a question regarding whether the moratorium was still in place or not. The copy provided to The Pilot added a fabricated complaint about the moratorium.

We understand the key issue for you is the length of time our moratoriums have been in place. There are valid reasons for that, and there is no limit in the statute as to duration of moratoriums so long as progress is being made on the underlying cause. The expiry dates for the two moratoriums are May 5<sup>th</sup> and June 4, 2023. We do not intend to extend these moratorium dates. Tom made it clear to us that he believes 24 months is too long for any moratorium, and Neal expressed similar concerns. We are wondering if a prudent, and more comprehensive way to address your concern would be to add a 24-month limit to the existing general statute language regarding moratoria. We would not object to this kind of approach.

If agreeable to you, we look forward to the opportunity to meet with you again to discuss resolution. We will be in touch soon, or you can certainly feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Jeff Sanborn

Manager, Village of Pinehurst

John C. Thickland

John Strickland

Mayor, Village of Pinehurst

**Enclosure: Moratorium Public Hearing Data** 

# Moratorium Public Hearing Data:

# Public Hearing 2/9/2021

- Kaye Pierson:(via email) "I wish to give my full support of the proposed temporary moratorium for development in the two identified focus areas of the present Long Range Comprehensive Plan and applaud your efforts going forward.
- No comments during meeting

# **Public Hearing 10/26/2021**

- Kaye Pierson: Addressed Council and inquired about how many plans were on hold because of the moratorium and encouraged staff and Village Council to take their time and ensure this process is done right.
- Jeanne Casinella: Addressed Council and suggested Council and staff reach out to the community residents who live in the proposed areas to ask for their input before making decisions.
- Jack Farrell: Addressed the Council in support of the moratorium extension, but recommended Council consider extending the moratorium to 120 days to allow ample time for staff to complete the process.

# Public Hearing 2/8/2022

- Debbie Lalor: Addressed the Council and asked for clarification on the what the process will be
  over the next 120 days following the passage of the plan adoption. She asked what the process
  is by which changes get adopted into the zoning code and into the PDO. She voiced her concern
  that there will be a window of opportunity between the adoption of the plan and the zoning
  ordinance approval, during which time develops could slide proposals in and get themselves on
  the books somehow.
- Jack Farrell: Addressed Council and stated he feels it is optimistic to complete this in the proposed extension time and feels the real work will be in developing the form-based codes and the changes to the PDO. He stated he has spent the last few months learning about form-based codes and notes it is a very complex subject. He stated it took over 2 years to develop the new HPC guidelines a few years ago and it had a lot of characteristics of form-based coding, visual representation of what you want it to look like, and so forth. So, unlike that effort, he stated maybe a nine-month effort would be more realistic. He stated we need to get the process right going forward and is concerned the process in the past has given less attention to the citizens and their requirements then it should. Thus, going forward, he stated, the Village needs to make sure they are including the citizens in the process.
- John Webster: Addressed Council, stating the basis of this plan is not agreeable to the residents. He stated he would like to see the Village look at spending a year on this and take their time.

### Public Hearing 5/24/2022

No comments during meeting

# Public Hearing 9/27/2022

No comments during meeting

# Public Hearing 1/24/2023

• No comments during meeting