

## Summary Statistics for Citizen Comments

- Number of Responses Received: 89, containing a total of 104 names
- In Addition, 3 responses were submitted on behalf of organizations: *WakeUP Wake County*; attorneys for Hills of Rosemont Subdivision; and HOA President for The Hills of Rosemont.

### Requests to Change the Land Use Designation for a Respondent's Property

Summary:

Change Request	No. of Responses	No. of Names	No. of Properties	Acres <sup>1</sup>
<b>1. Requests to Decrease Density</b>	19	24	20	125
<b>2. Requests to Increase Density</b>	7	8	8	265
3. Opposed to having an ATT Buffer on their property. <sup>2</sup>	19	24	15	115
4. No concerns for property designation. Keep it as shown.	9	9	11	74
5. If you increase the density of a neighbors property, then increase mine as well	1	1	3	21

In addition both the Hills of Rosemont HOA and the attorneys for same submitted comments in opposition to the ATT Buffer on Hills of Rosemont properties.

Details:

Change Request	No. of Responses	No. of Names	No. of Properties	Acres
1. Opposed to having an ATT Buffer on their property. <sup>3</sup>	19	24	15	115
2. No concerns for property designation. Keep it as shown.	9	9	11	74
3. Make sure livestock operations, horse breeding, are allowed	1	1	1	36
<b>Requests to Decrease Density</b>				
4. Do not designate my property as <b>MXD</b> node <sup>4</sup>	12	13	13	80
5. Change from 2 du/1 ac to 1 du/5 ac.	6	10	6	41
6. Change from 1 du/1 ac to 1 du/5 ac.	1	1	1	4
<b>Requests to Increase Density</b>				
7. Change from 1 du/5 ac to 2 du/ac or higher	2	2	2	95
8. Change from 1 du/5 ac to a higher density	1	1	1	5
9. Do not split family farm with Urban Service Boundary. (Part is 2 du/1 ac or 1 du/1ac, rest is 1 du/5 ac.) Make all of our properties the higher density.	1	2	3	104
10. Change from 2 du/1 ac to a higher density	1	1	1	28
11. Change from 2 du/ac to 3-4 du/ac	2	2	1	33
12. If you increase the density of a neighbors property, then increase mine as well	1	1	3	21

<sup>1</sup> Self-reported; not yet verified by staff.

<sup>2</sup> One owner suggested reducing it to 50 ft.

<sup>3</sup> One owner suggested reducing it to 50 ft.

<sup>4</sup> Two owners suggested reducing density to 1 du/5 ac.

**Requests to Change the Land Use Designation for Someone Else's Property**  
**(not incl. MXD node)**

Change Request	No. of Comments From within Plan Area	No. of Comments From outside Plan Area
<b>Requests to Lower Densities</b>		
1. Lower the densities near my property; have a more gradual density transition	10	
2. Request to lower the density in a specific area; may include suggestions for alternate locations	12 <sup>5</sup>	1
3. Keep the area rural; lower all plan densities; keep [all] plan densities very low;	6	1
<b>Neutral or Supportive</b>		
4. No concerns for others' designations, or expressions of support; or support for specific parts of the plan area	2	
<b>Requests to Raise Densities</b>		
5. Increase the densities near my property, or in other areas specified in respondent's comments	2	
6. Make the plan overall more urban/suburban; raise overall densities.	3	
7. Provide more mixed use.	2	
<b>Other Requests</b>		
8. Put more designated preserved open space in the plan; establish large nature preserves.	1	2
9. Don't have land use categories split properties, and/or don't have different land use categories on opposite sides of roads (except for thoroughfares).	2	
10. Concerns about numbers of schools/parks, locations of schools/parks, or requests for more specificity regarding schools; may include suggestions for alternate locations.	3	
11. Avoid noise, lighting, impacts.	1	

The counts above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

**Other:**

- *WakeUP Wake County* submitted a comment that development should be focused where utilities already exist.

---

<sup>5</sup> Includes a request from the Hills of Rosemont Subdivision related to a part of a Cary PDD near Rosemont.

## Responses Concerning the Mixed Use Node

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area	No. of Comments From outside Plan Area
<b>Comments Opposed to MXD Node:</b>		
1. Opposed to the MXD node; opposed to having a MXD node anywhere in Plan area	31	2
2. Change the MXD node to rural densities (e.g., 3 to 5+ ac. lots)	5	
3. The MXD node is too big; reduce the size/intensity of the MXD node	2	
<b>Comments Supportive of MXD Node:</b>		
4. Supportive of the MXD node	1 <sup>6</sup>	1 <sup>7</sup>
5. Would like MXD node to be high-end development; not typical sprawl	1	

The counts in the table above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

### Other:

- *WakeUP Wake County* expressed concerns about the MXD node: Will it be connected to transit? Is it too isolated from other urban areas to be walkable?

---

<sup>6</sup> Support inferred from a respondent who preferred that the plan area be more urban, higher densities, more services.

<sup>7</sup> Letter received from Chatham County EDC Chair et al.

## Responses Concerning the ATT Buffer

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area
1. Opposed to ATT Buffer	23 <sup>8</sup>
2. ATT Buffer should not apply to platted subdivisions, existing lots, homes; unbuilt subdivision lots should be grandfathered; clarify which types of properties would be subject to buffer rules	20 <sup>9</sup>
3. Existing ROW and its buffer is sufficient and provides ample wildlife corridor; Corps property supports wildlife movement already; existing buffer rules are adequate	10 <sup>10</sup>
4. Reduce the buffer width	4
5. Purpose of Buffer is unclear or questioned (e.g., wildlife corridor?, etc.)	3
6. Safety concerns associated with lack of visibility for large buffers	2
7. Integrate the ATT into the community	1
8. Clarify point from which buffer starts; centerline?	1

In addition both the Hills of Rosemont HOA and the attorneys for same submitted comments in opposition to the ATT Buffer on Hills of Rosemont properties. The two parties both raised issues 1-3 in the above table.

The counts in the table above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

---

<sup>8</sup> Includes comment submitted by the Hills of Rosemont HOA.

<sup>9</sup> Includes comment submitted by the Hills of Rosemont HOA.

<sup>10</sup> Includes comment submitted by the Hills of Rosemont HOA.

## Transportation and Traffic Comments

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area	No. of Comments From Outside Plan Area
1. Concerned about traffic and congestion from proposed land uses, incl. MXD node; concerns about traffic on NC 751, Lewter Shop Rd.; Green Level West Rd.;	9	2
2. Speed limits are too high on O'Kelly Chapel Rd; Lewter Shop Rd.; unspecified other roads;	4	
3. ATT Crossing on O'Kelly Chapel Rd. is dangerous	3	
4. Concerned about effect of traffic on rural character (e.g., road widenings)	2	
5. Who pays for roadways? How funded?	2	
6. Encourage multimodal transportation options; add multimodal details; plan should address transit, bike routes, trails, etc.		2
7. Plan should include details about long-range transportation infrastructure needs		1
8. People are willing to commute long distances	1	

The counts above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

### Other:

- *WakeUP Wake County* expressed concerns about costs for roads due to sprawl.

### Character-of-the-Area Comments

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area	No. of Comments From Outside Plan Area
1. Concerned about maintaining rural character, incl. country atmosphere, farms, open spaces, horses, etc.	11	1
2. Concerned about development impacts of suburbanization: noise; light; traffic; loss of woodlands and rural areas	5	1
3. Avoid golf courses, cul-de-sacs, sprawl	1	
4. Provide ample open space, natural areas, parks, preserves		1
5. Concerns about suburban residents complaining in future about farm operations	1	
6. Avoid restrictive covenants, too many rules	1	

The counts above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

## Design-Related Comments

### **Comments from Within the Plan Area:**

- Preserve wooded areas and provide wildlife corridors, esp. to decrease wildlife collisions with cars.
- Wants freedom to use land w/o design guidelines, e.g., for fences, etc. How can design codes avoid suburban feel? How would they apply to existing owners?
- Suburban subdivisions wouldn't fit into the existing environment.
- Avoid noise and light pollution. "We don't like rules and regulations."
- If homes front upon the existing roads require a substantial setback of perhaps 60-65 feet and a "woodlands" strip (natural or planted) along the road. If homes access a new road and back up to an existing road require a woodlands strip of at least 35 feet in width along the existing road.
- Allow for individuality of design, rather than cookie-cutter design. "There are no cul-de-sac's in the country"
- Preserve wooded areas and provide wildlife corridors, esp. to decrease wildlife collisions with cars.
- Provide buffers around any commercial development. Restrict lighting after dark. Keep noise low. Restrict the size and hours of commercial development. Limit density, size of building, parking, paved parking, lighting at night.
- Guidelines need to address what could be placed in the MXD area.
- Protect rural character. No multistory buildings.
- Provide rural buffers between areas of significantly greater densities.
- No clearcutting and massive re-grading. Work with the trees and the lay of the land. Protect dark skies at night. Require natural areas (other than spray fields!).

### **Comments from Outside the Plan Area:**

- Integrate public spaces into proposed developments to reduce traffic on rural streets. Encourage developers to build walkable, sustainable communities that have meaningful/useful/multi-purpose open space. Use TDR to save open space.
- Specify what "MIXED USE" will look like. Have strict guidelines for green development, environment, erosion, impervious surface.

## Watershed and Environmental Comments

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area	No. of Comments From Outside Plan Area
1. Concerns about Jordan Lake: Stormwater runoff and protecting water quality of Jordan Lake. Impervious surface concerns; pesticides; need to manage development runoff impacts; grading and construction impacts;	13	4
2. Concerned about potential loss of woodlands, natural areas; Plan should [permanently] preserve natural areas and open space	6	1
3. Concerned about development impacts on wildlife and wildlife corridors/movement	5	
4. Use LID stormwater management techniques	1	1
5. Express environmental protection as a Plan goal/priority		2
6. Use clustering and conservation subdivisions (allow smaller lots in exchange for saving more open space)	1	
7. Concerned about addressing the environmental impacts of agriculture	1	
8. Concerns about ephemeral stream rules; how defined? Who makes stream calls?	1	
9. Do not allow crossings of stream buffers		1

The counts above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

### **Additional Miscellaneous Comments (one bullet per response form):**

- Permanently protect critical watershed areas using conservation easements. Require golf course to treat its stormwater, reduce nutrients. Focus on improving environmental ordinances; adopt Chatham's stormwater ordinances. Trees in wetlands and open space areas should be protected. How will sensitive areas be identified and preserved in the plan? How will BMP's be inspected to check for sedimentation and algae blooms in ponds? Will natural bmps be given incentives over structural bmps? Craft a joint watershed protection ordinance. Provide maps showing topo, steep slopes, streams, lakes, wetlands, other water features for the public. Develop plans to monitor watershed impacts.
- Would like the Plan to add specification of creek / drainage buffer zone area, design and maintenance.
- *WakeUP Wake County* submitted concerns and questions: Whose stormwater rules will apply? Cary's or Chatham's? Jordan Lake Rules should apply now. Will Low Impact Development practices be required? Concern about watershed impacts from MXD node. Concern that plan as a whole is not consistent with watershed protection. Water quality of Jordan Lake is top priority.



## Public Utility (Water and Sewer) Comments

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area
1. Requests to extend the Rural Buffer/Urban Services Boundary further westward	4 <sup>11</sup>
2. Requests to pull the Rural Buffer/Urban Services Boundary in more eastward	2 <sup>12</sup>
3. Allow utility extension beyond the Rural Buffer in case of well or septic failure, however provide more details about what qualifies as a "failure" (one lot? Entire subdivision? Cost? Feasibility?). Allow an owner or subdivision to connect if cost of private system repair exceeds public utility connection costs, if both Cary & Chatham agree.	13

In addition both the Hills of Rosemont HOA and the attorneys for same submitted comments matching those in the 3<sup>rd</sup> item in the above table, related to system failure and rescues.

The counts above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

### **Additional Miscellaneous Comments (one bullet per response form):**

- A statement of general support for public for utilities, for economic development.
- A respondent expressed concerns about the capacity of Jordan Lake, and impact of development on water demand during a drought.
- "Bury the power lines."
- "Many of us believe that our area is already out of water."
- "We will never get public sewer or water but will have all the effects of urban sprawl."
- *WakeUP Wake County* submitted concerns about costs of utility extensions due to the plan.

---

<sup>11</sup> Requests include: (a) A request to provide water and sewer the full length of Hollands Chapel Road from NC751 to Farrington Rd.”; (b) A request to generally increase the size of the served area; (c) A request to keep an entire property within the served area, rather than splitting it; and (d) A request to extend the Urban Services Area out along New Hope Church Road, to Pisgah Church Road;

<sup>12</sup> Requests include: (a) A request that the Urban Services Area not be extended west of NC 751; and (b) A request that the Rural Buffer/Urban Services line be moved back close to the Wake County Line.

**Comments About Government, Taxation, Regulation, Process**

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area	No. of Comments From Outside Plan Area
1. Comments generally opposed to joint planning with Cary; opposed to Cary's participation in planning for the area	6	1
2. Opposed to any extension of Cary's municipal limits within Chatham	4	
3. Opposed to government regulating what an owner can do with his/her property	2	
4. Generally concerned about municipally-initiated annexation	1	

The counts above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

**Additional Miscellaneous Comments (one bullet per response form):**

- A respondent had questions and concerns about whether the Plan will result in changes to his taxes, property valuation. Will he be rezoned? Will new development regulations be placed on his land?
- One respondent felt that the joint planning process is "a ruse to keep Cary out" [of Chatham].
- One respondent was concerned whether existing lots that are smaller than the plan's land use category will be grandfathered in? "Can they still get septic permits?"
- One respondent was concerned about taxes if annexed.
- One respondent does not like the idea of a binding interlocal agreement/state law governing changes and deviations from the plan. Wants Chatham to be able to change the plan for its jurisdiction w/o input from Cary.
- One respondent wants assurance that Plan will be enforced. "No exceptions."

**Comments About Greenways, Parks, Open Space, and Schools**

Comment	No. of Comments From within Plan Area	No. of Comments From Outside Plan Area
1. Opposed to having greenways and trails on Corps land; concerned that wildlife would be negatively affected by having greenways throughout; humans leave trash in the wilderness.	6	
2. Concerned about or opposed to greenways around their subdivision; concerns about privacy, access, safety	2	
3. Comments about schools: identify amount of land needed; the need for schools east of Jordan Lake (elementary, middle, high); target dates for schools	2	1

The counts above are a simple enumeration of points raised in the collected response forms. A single response form may have raised more than one point, and a single response form may represent more than one person (e.g., a married couple).

**Additional Miscellaneous Comments (one bullet per response form):**

- Clarify which parties will be responsible for greenway areas, esp. sections of greenways that won't be constructed by future development.
- “Our children aren't allowed to go to the better Wake Co. schools; can they be?”
- Wake County respondent: Additional active and recreational open space and multi-use trails should be designated on the plan. The map should distinguish between different types of open space (golf, parks, natural, public v. private, etc.). Identify the amount of land needed for parks and recreation facilities.
- Plus several requests to fix the legend symbol for greenways to match the map.

## Miscellaneous Comments

### **Comments from Within the Plan Area:**

- Chatham needs to take as much advantage as it can of the economic forces at RTP, RDU and surrounding areas.
- Concerned about compatibility of Joint Plan with nearby proposed densities in Cary's Southwest Area Plan. Will SW Plan be modified in future?
- Fix the Legend to specify the same ATT Buffer width as in the Plan Note.
- Confused about the utility service area and how it applies to Progress Energy.
- Will the Plan affect land we own now?
- What is an "individual development project"?
- Provide higher-paying jobs in existing centers -- RTP, Pittsboro.
- Provide information about the 8 du/ac density of the MXD node in the Legend at top left of map, and/or state in the text to see the Notes section for density information.
- Survey all residents within a 2 mile radius of any proposed change at least 6 months prior to deciding on change.
- The marking of the roads on the map is not clear to me.
- Need to address timing of growth.
- The proximity to RTP and the I-540 extension need to be considered very closely.

### **Comments from Outside the Plan Area:**

- Assess the pace of growth, availability of water supply.
- Identify the amount of land that land needed for civic uses such as libraries, schools, fire stations, recreational facilities, public works facilities and/or meeting spaces. Growth in housing will create demands for these public facilities. Place these facilities close to planned residential areas, to reduce traffic impacts.
- How will this plan affect Cary's Southwest Area Plan on the border areas? Will the SW Plan be changed?