

Chatham-Cary Joint Land Use Plan – Comments from Public Meeting (10-17-06)

1. Do you prefer Plan Option 1 or Plan Option 2? Why?

- Neither, both options stuff in more living quarters. This would not be a “rural setting.” Traffic is already a nightmare.
- Plan 1, less development, more woodland.
- Option 1. More protection for lakes.
- No particular preference.
- Plan Option 1 is a good attempt, but in my opinion, not enough. Plan option 1 is an attempt to lower density within “Rural Chatham County” but it definitely needs more work.
- Plan Option 1, lower density, better for lake and wildlife. Less traffic, no difference in roads between plans.
- Option 1 because it is less densely populated. I moved to Cary to get more land and less build up and now Cary is threatening to encroach upon my backyard. We do not want to be in Cary!
- Neither, but 2 is better than 1.
- Neither one effects me directly, except for the increase in traffic over time due to the increase in population on the Chatham County border with Cary. I prefer Plan 1 to keep the density down.
- Plan 1, less dense.
- Do not prefer either, stay out! Need to stay as we are! Do not need to have any more traffic on our roads.
- No to both plans!
- Plan 1, It keeps the density as it is on my street (Wake Rd.) In general the densities are lower which: Preserve the rural culture of the area and protects Jordan Lake which is already suffering (considered a deteriorating lake).
- Do not like either.
- My husband and I prefer option 1 because it is lower density than 2.
- Plan Option 1 because it is more reflective of what the residents of Chatham want. We love our natural, country environment and value open spaces.
- Both plans appear premature: There is a real need for infrastructure (sewer, water, roads, power). Plan 1 is most conservative (lower residential densities); it fits best with my concern.
- Plan Option 2.
- Plan Option 1. Less density, would prefer no more than 10% be more dense than 1DU/2acre with increase of 1DU/5acre.
- Option 1. Less houses. However, I would prefer to see a more scaled back version than option 1. It seems that either plan so far will doom any agriculture and the even higher taxes will run the larger landowners off their land. The temptation will be to sell once a neighbor sells. It will be a domino effect. That’s the way it’s moving toward 751 now.

- Neither. Densities are too high to protect rural character. If you want to use incentive zoning to encourage conservation subdivisions, PUD, you need lower density zones. Where is the greenbelt around Cary?
- Prefer Option 1. I like the feel of all the large lots with horse farms and the country feel. Would be disappointed to see dense subdivisions invade the area.
- Option 1. The 1DU/5 acre seems very appropriate for protecting water supply. It has a more simplistic zoning plan allowing consistency and clearer direction than Option 2.
- Neither but Option 1 is more desirable with the following change: 1 dwelling unit per acre becomes 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres at least. If you have any VISION for the future it would be 1 unit per 5 acres, with an urban growth boundary.
- I like the lower density of Plan 1 vs. Plan 2. It is more in keeping with the rural character of the land. I am opposed to any development such as Amberly or the one at the end of Old Green Hope school. You get houses stuck right together, it looks like New Jersey!
- Neither.
- Option 1 preferred cause it gives least population and hopefully more trees planted, space.
- Option 1, less dense.
- Neither. Option 2 waters down what I was told 20 years ago by Keith Megginson (we want it to remain rural around the lake). Both options show parks on government land. I am bitterly opposed to this since the Corps of Engineers took the land for wildlife. It should remain for the wildlife. Recreation areas are already in place. Such density of housing would not be a desirable place to live. Why not 5 acres for everyone? Traffic is already a nightmare. Infrastructure is not in place. Drivers seem to think that Highway 751 is a super highway rather than a country road.
- Neither. What happened to the old 5 acres per unit anywhere around the lake?
- Plan Option 1, because it shows improvement and growth but still not disturbing much of what exists. Most of the growth is disturbing farm land not an existing family dwelling.
- Neither.
- I strongly oppose Option 1. I have owned my property for over 10 years and with the projects underway (Amberly, Weldon Ridge, etc.) Option 2, at 3 units per acre is a logical blend. I support a minimum of Option 2. Option 2 is a compromise to the Land Use Plan adopted by the Cary Town Council on November 14, 1996 (revised September 24, 2003)
- Of the two plans proposed, I find Option 1 to be the lesser of the two evils. I consider even it to be too high a burden on infrastructure and destroys the rural quality that is the reason most residents choose to live here.
- Neither –After attending the joint meeting last evening – trying to educate myself in a 3-hour time period on future plans of the surrounding area of Jordan Lake – I do not feel comfortable with either plan.
- The plan I prefer is Plan Option 1 because it would allow less growth by allowing more acreage per house.

- Of the two plans presented, I feel that Option 1 is the better choice. The reason for my choice is that it allows for a lower density of population.
- Option 1. Option 1 is going in the right direction. Less density, larger lots.
- We prefer Plan Option 1 because it is less dense.
- Option 1 because there are less houses per acre.
- Option 1 because the attractiveness of our area is based on the low density population and natural setting. These features are being destroyed every day all around us. We need to preserve some of our land!
- Plan 1 is preferred. Less density requested to maintain the rural character – 1 dwelling per 5 acres. This will help preserve Jordan Lake, but still to dense for preservation of Lake Jordan and rural character of area.
- Option 2. Allows for gradual reduction in density west towards Jordan Lake (as opposed to dramatic reduction) (i.e. Amberly is 6 units per acre). All the surrounding property on Pittard Sears Rd. is 3 units per acre.
- Option 2. Permits gradual reduction in density west towards Jordan Lake. Property is 1000 west of Wake County. It is approximately 2.5 miles from Jordan Lake. 2 units per acre is a reasonable density.
- Definitely Plan Option 1. Plan 1 is the only plan that would be realistic because I will never sell my land to a developer. Commissioners and planners need to realize that less is better and it's better not to clog up all of the land with rows of homes with no trees. Look at what has already happened to the end of Carpenter Fire Station Rd. and Yates Store Rd. intersection!
- Plan Option 1. There shouldn't be any more than 1 dwelling per acre around Wendy Hill subdivision on Barbee Rd.
- I prefer Plan Option 1 because it calls for less density and larger lots. Greater density in this area would be a direct threat to water quality in Jordan Lake.
- Plan Option 1 with the lower density proposal is preferred.
- Option 1 – Most people who live in Hwy 751 vicinity either grew up there or moved to the area because they like the rural character. While the rural character cannot last because of the influx of new residents, keeping density as low as possible would preserve the features that attracted the present residents to this area.
- Neither.
- Option 1 is the lesser of two evils. It provides a better buffer for the lake via the 1 dwelling per 5 acres. The protection zone should be more than ½ mile as well. Although we are in that buffer it allows us a perspective than most do not see. How much water runs directly into the lake from the surface.
- We are in favor of some kind of plan for the development of this area. We would like to see all of our land with 1 house per acre and mixed use. We did not select one plan or the other because there did not seem to be much difference between the two in our case. Chatham needs to wake-up! We need the tax base in this county. We need more schools and the ones we have need to be updated.
- I would approve of my property being included in the area of 2 dwellings per 1 acre or 3 dwelling units per acre. With the proposed mixed use area adjacent to this property it would only make sense to zone this area on both sides of 751 as

such. What a great place for moderate density residential and a badly needed school site in the future! I am a supporter of this land use plan.

- We like Option 2, which calls for 3 units per acre on our property.
- I support the planning effort for ½ acre residential lots or larger and a commercial activity node on my property.
- I prefer Option 1. Option 1 allows for more open space. There currently is a lot of wildlife in this area, turkey, fox, deer. Option 2 would deny the wildlife access to this land. Chatham County should preserve as much open space as possible. This area should be subject to the dense development outlined in Option 2.
- Throw Option 2 in the trash. It isn't even worth commenting on.

Option 1 is slightly better, but you are just going to create sprawl with one acre lots.

The critical area for the lake should be ONE MILE – not ½ mile. I just talked to a planner from the Division of Water Quality who is very concerned about Jordan Lake and not just because of the issues while land is being cleared, but the issue of nitrogen flowing into the lake from highly fertilized lawns.

- Option 2 is awful. Specifically:

In the northeast corner you have 3 du/acre. This area is isolated from Chatham because of the Corps land, that the proximity to schools is problematic. Density there drives up the cost of providing transportation to school children and other services the county provides.

3 du/acre New Hope Church Road. This density is totally inappropriate because of established neighborhoods. Chatham Woods and Markham Plantation both are large lot subdivisions with lots of 5 to 15 acres. Plopping in a density of 3 du/acre in this area is totally inappropriate. I could support clustering here, if adjacent property owners are protected with huge buffers (300 feet or more) and the development can not be seen from the road. I would like to see a 500 foot road buffer which could serve as a linear park, connecting the ATT.

Off Ernest Jones Road there is another large lot established subdivision, Turtle Creek and off Barbee Road, Windy Hill, another established large lot subdivision. Density of 3 du/acre is not compatible with either of these subdivisions.

Option 1 is preferred over Option 2, but I believe we need to lessen the density closer to Jordan Lake and increase the boundary from 1 mile to 1 ½ miles.

All the area between the ½ mile to 1 mile radius should be 1 du per 5 acres. Anything less is sprawl and anything more is not good for the lake and there's no place to put the necessary roads.

The area between 1 mile and 1 1/2 miles from the lake should be 1 du per 2 acres. After 1 1/2 miles, the density could increase. In the last two years there is more than enough evidence to show that we need to increase the buffer zone around Jordan and the CREEKS that flow into it.

I want to see specific standards for the mixed use area that lessens the impact on existing neighbors. This could include strict lighting restrictions, increased buffers etc. My thoughts is that this be done **not** in a typical grocery store, box style but in a village fashion. I know the concept of walkability is important, but the very nature of the location, this will be a typical drive to shop location.

2. Are there any specific changes you'd recommend for either Plan Option 1 or Plan Option 2? Please describe:

- The Martha's Chapel boat storage recently approved by the Chatham Commissioners is inconsistent with both plans.
- Leave Chatham County to be planned for by county and residents. Take care of your own business/problems in Wake County. Cary isn't adequately handling run off from Amberly project now! Jordan Lake off 751 is a mud pit!
- Do not ruin Chatham County woodland.
- To Option 1 I would change the density to no more than 1DU/3acres. I would trash option 2. I would get rid of all commercial in both plans.
- The "mixed use area" noted on the plan that is in the area of SR 751/Hollands Chapel Rd/Lewter Shop Rd. is currently where a large part of Apex Nursery property is. I assume that the current situation will remain unless the property owners (Ron Copeland) decides to market/sell some of the property. I hope it will remain as is!
- Throw out Option 2 completely. Option 1, Increase the 1DU/5 acres to 1DU/10 acres. Increase the 1DU/2 acres to 1DU/5-10 acres. Increase the 1DU/1acre to 1DU/5 acres. Maintain the rural character and quality of life that the citizens of Chatham County enjoy, respect, and desire.
- I would prefer areas near Jordan Lake and tributaries be low impact developments.
- Where Cary has already annexed, let them make it crowded as they want. Keep the rest of Chatham County to 1-5 acres per dwelling so that Cary has no interest in further annexation. Get a 20 year commitment on the plan that cannot be overturned by the next Cary Board. Keep Cary out of Chatham.
- No park on Horton Pond Rd. Leave natural.
- Plan 2 – reduce the density in the S.E. area a little more, find a middle between the two.
- As a senior citizen I want to live my life in a place without all of the increased headache busy development would bring.
- The land was taken for wildlife, not a Cary park.
- 1 house per 5 acres is all that the land can support.

- When we moved to Chatham County 12 years ago the density was 1DU/5 acres. There is a lot of wildlife, dense woods and relatively little pollution at present and that has a lot of non-dollar value.
- A) Mixed use area – (751 & Holland’s Chapel Rd) Right now it is Apex Nurseries, a business that has been a great neighbor and cares about Chatham County. If this becomes a Food Lion, it will be ugly and out-of-place in terms of the big box being detached from the community. We do not need shopping here. We have it close enough. This is not a “walk to Food Lion” type community. Many of us have large gardens or farms and require such places only monthly. Plus it would increase traffic on 751 which is already occurring from commuting from Apex to the Triangle. B) Less density around Amberly. I am worried about the noise level, traffic, and destruction of farms.
- Both plans assign areas of Chatham County to Cary. Alternate options need to be considered. Such discussions will take time. I recommend that at least an extra year be added to this planning process.
- Allow 3DU/acre for my property (1167 Mt. Pisgah Church Rd.) since the proposed plan allows for 3DU/1 acre across the street. There is a natural point to end 3DU/acre, Corps Property. Property on both sides of Mt. Pisgah Church should be 3DU/acre with the boundary being Corps property.
- Decrease the density by 50%. I dread the loss of view of the starlight because of street lights and the loss of wildlife, the sound of the whippoorwill at night.
- Reduce density around Jordan Lake even further. Low density should mean 1 house on at least 5 acres all the way around and up 751. Keep Cary in Wake (what hasn’t already crossed into Chatham).
- I would eliminate under 2 acre (per unit) zoning. Most of it should be 5 acre (per unit) zoning, with provisions for lowering densities if the development met specific design, environmental, mixed use and transportation standards.
- Option 1 has 1DU/acre for much of the mid and eastern sections of this study area. Option 2 mixed in 2DU/acre in the middle of the 1DU/acre area. Consider extending the 2DU/acre density further eastward as begun in option 2 for greater protection of water and “rural character”. Very important. (This would shift 1DU/acre boundary further east. Consider having this 1DU/acre be fully 2DU/acre.
- Option 2 is insane! Place an urban growth boundary on the American Tobacco Trail and resolve to keep urban services east of the boundary. Please keep Chatham County rural.
- 1DU/acre.
- Only for Cary to stay in Wake County! Chatham keep its character of country life.
- If by the circumstance (ill conceived) we’d be forced to sell (leaving a lifetime behind) money would likely be provide on the 2 unit per acre. This would be a last resort because of our age and the ensuing problems.
- Keep out of our private property and stop robbing us of our constitutional rights!
- Housing is a vital income for our community. However, I believe that the joint plan should consider creating a soccer complex with 10 or more fields. Currently, two such complexes exist in Wake County and are over utilized. The number of children being introduced to the communities and to soccer is growing daily.

There are multiple soccer clubs in the Chatham and Western Wake counties that could utilize the facility nearly year round. Due to the location, access via US 64 and Interstate 40 via NC 751 or other roads is very possible.

- If this has to be done – low density housing – 5 acre minimum per dwelling within a 2-3 mile radius of Jordan Lake. No commercial site or business on Route 751.
- The density limit needs to be no less than 2 acres or more because of the water (wells) supply and the septic system problems. Also the greater volume building causes greater flooding when heavy rains occur, this has happened in Amberly area since it has started and with more runoff of ground soil into streams and lakes.
- Even lower housing densities than suggested since there are already difficulties in finding sites for septic systems, and wells.
- Option 1 – would prefer even less density than shown. I would also prefer larger lot sizes closer to the Wake/Chatham line which would fit better with the already developed area. Option 2 can be tossed.
- 1 and 2 houses per acre is too high of a housing density for this area. It should stay at 1 house per 5 to 10 acres. We do not want a commercial area in our neighborhood.
- Markham Plantation was designated very low land use on Chatham County/Cary land use map and we would like to preserve the look as opposed to higher density. I suggest one home per 5 acres from Jordan Lake to at least the Tobacco Trail to preserve run off into the Lake. I would also like to see an ordinance about wiping out all trees and an Adequate Facilities Ordinance.
- Prefer Option 2 with property identified above with 3 units per acre proposed density. This would be consistent with all other vacant properties on Pittard Sears Rd., except Amberly which is 6 units per acre.
- Use Option 2.
- Plan Option 1 in the far Northeast would make sense to remain close to the Wake County border land plan use. Ideally I would want the same plan as Wake County has for Wake Rd. of 1 dwelling per 2 acres. Wouldn't that make more sense? Why would you want separate land uses for one little road that's only one mile long?
- I don't mind option 2 except for there being 2 dwellings/acre around Wendy Hill.
- Whichever plan, Cary and Chatham County should enact and tighten erosion control ordinances. Development activity in Amberly has already resulted in turbidity increases in an arm of Jordan Lake. Trucks carrying excavated dirt from Amberly are unloading in Chatham County, causing erosion into Jordan Lake from the unloaded fill that continues unchecked. Heavily loaded trucks carrying this dirt tear up the roads in the area, making driving rough and hazardous and damaging vehicles.
- The area identified as a "Mixed Use Area" is grossly misplaced and should be removed from any and all current and future "plans." According to your Q&A sheet it states "It was agreed that in the long term there would be a need for at least some neighborhood services within the study area"... frankly I don't know who 'agreed' to this, it most certainly was not the existing residents of NE

Chatham County! There is NO need for any mixed use area within the area under review...if you are not aware there are already many "mixed use areas" located a very short distance from any location on the map (Apex – Hwy 55/64, Durham-Southpoint, Cary –Hwy55/High House).. Development of a mixed use area in the middle of wonderful rural NE Chatham is contrary to the residents wishes and would devastate our area. We don't want it, don't need it and any reference to a "mixed use area" should be removed from discussion.

- For Option 1, increase the area allocated to one dwelling unit per two acres.
- Exclude Cary from any plan.
- The protection zone should be more than ½ mile. We do not need a shopping center at the intersection of High House and 751 (Apex Nursery). Overall, the density is too great. The lake is already on the stressed list.
- Adding the intersection of Hwy 751 and Martha's Chapel Rd. into the mixed use area.

3. Do you have any concerns about the specific land use recommendations shown for your property in Plan Option 1? In Plan Option 2? If yes, please explain. If you would prefer a different land use designation, what would that be?

- Crime, higher taxes, water lines, sewage treatment, law enforcement, schools?? As a taxpayer I do not want Cary problems.
- Plan option 2 all about increased density and tax base. Not about good preservation.
- Lower density near lake in plan is preferred. Current Amerbly development has lead to soil sediment in Jordan Lake.
- 1DU/5AC through out. The land cannot support the density proposed – water and septic. Jordan Lake cannot support this either and the school systems will be overrun before they can build them. Keep Cary's problems in Cary.
- Grandfather in families who lost farms to Corps of Engineers for lake construction.
- Both plans have the same land use for my property, which is the same that it is now.
- Sewage – water treatment – law enforcement – schools, crime, higher taxes.
- Cary staying out of Chatham.
- I do not like the 3 houses per acre of Wake Rd (plan 2) concept. Increasing dwellings will increase traffic, which may lead to safety concerns for pets and children.
- Keep rural, no traffic, no pollution, no more water use, no shopping centers.
- In plan 1 & 2 there are large enough tracts where 20-30 houses could be built right in our backyard with the 1DU/AC and we are all for joint county planning – at present there is no predictable plan.
- In both plans there is no clear indication of what happens to existing development within the critical area around Jordan Lake (areas that meet state rules but not the

residential densities in either plan). If these existing developments are not grandfathered in what happens? This subject appears to need further discussion; further planning.

- Loathe to see 1DU/AC development around Hollands Chapel. Will lose the rural character I value.
- Lower the density all around.
- Option 2 shows the existing Turtle Creek Farm subdivision as 3DU/AC. In reality, every property is 5 acres or more. Show it as it is, 1DU/5AC.
- Yes, both options show a park on Horton Pond Rd. Traffic is already horrendous. How can you plan for land that is government owned?
- Leave our property alone.
- My address is 2002 New Hope Church Road (45 acres)...Option 2, 3 units per acre for my location, is a logical blend, I support a minimum of Option 2.
- I disagree with the “Swiss Cheese” reasoning described in one of your FAQs. The Turtle Creek Farm Protective Covenants that require building lots in this subdivision to be at least 5 acres (ref: Book 1176 Page 314) are just as legally binding as any ordinances that Chatham County or Cary might impose, and I think it’s misleading to not show this information on the maps.
- According to the latest plan all properties on Pittard Sears Road (other than owner-occupied single family homes) have been designated as low density residential (1-3 units per acre) with the exception of our property (45 acres) which is designated 1 unit per acre. We feel that this is inconsistent with the proposed adjoining land uses and respectfully request the proposed land use plan be changed to reflect (1-3 units per acre) for our property.
- We moved to Apex, Chatham County, for a reason – peace, quiet and the great rural area it is. Not to be in the middle of another Cary “Amberly.” They raped the land and the future of that area is uncertain – flooding, pollution of Lake Jordan – they had their eyes closed and their wallets open. Don’t ruin this area around the lake.
- The ‘Mixed Use Area’ on the corner of Hwy 751 and Lewter Shop Rd. will create more traffic problems in this area than it can handle, the volume of traffic in this area during ‘work travel time’ now is huge.
- Yes, there is too high a population density for the area because the land does not perk well.
- Would anything in these plans limit or affect any current or future agricultural use of our land? If so this should be changed/reconsidered!
- Option 1 – Yes I do. In my area and surrounding area the lot sizes are restricted areas. For Option 1, make the lot sizes large and eliminate setbacks which allows for denser development than the surrounding areas are already.
- I have concerns that the increased residences will exhaust the existing ground water supply, and that the already deteriorating roads will get even worse. Also, I have concerns for people, dogs, cats, horses, peacocks and wildlife that frequently cross the road in front of my house will be in danger with this increase in traffic, there is already a big problem with people exceeding the speed limit during rush hour and other times during the day and night.

- Yes, because now we have 1 house on 10 acres vs. 1 house per 1 acre which would destroy our habitat! The traffic is already dangerous on Green Level Rd. and will increase exponentially!
- Loss of rural nature of area. Much lower priced development directly across from my property. 1DU/5AC. Tree buffer between road and homes whenever possible instead of wiping out entire woods.
- Yes, Option 2 and Option 1 identify our property as 1 unit per acre. This is not consistent with adjoining properties (i.e. properties on Pittard Sears Rd. at least 3 units per acre and Amberly at 6 units per acre.
- Please use Option 2 at 2 units per acre. Again, this is reasonable density and allows for gradual reduction in density west to Jordan Lake.
- Definitely low density as promised by Scott Ramage when we first started talking about this ideal land use plan visionary of Cary.
- No.
- Cary will come into areas that have always been associated with other towns. The community preference and association should not be ignored.
- Further, for my property (47 acres and a home at the south east intersection of New Hope Church and Mt Pisgah Church Roads), I do not agree with strict adherence to the arbitrary 1 mile radius lake boundary separation of land uses as shown on the option maps. Rather, the 1 mile should be a rough guide, with more weight given to established boundaries such as existing roadways. As such, the 3 house per acre use plan should extend to the entirety of my land. In addition, I see no basis for exceeding North Carolina's established ½ mile radius area of sensitivity. Lastly, in checking the location of the 1 mile radius line on the option maps, it appears the line is wrongly located, too far from the lake. If this is correct, all of my property should be outside of the 1 mile boundary. In addition to the residential designation, I would like to have the option for institutional and low impact commercial use on a 20 acre portion of my land fronting New Hope Church Road. Examples of such uses I have considered include senior housing, school, church, landscape & garden supply, and other low impact uses. For decades New Hope Church Road, having no posted weight restriction, has been used as the locally designated commercial thoroughfare between Western Wake County and Chatham County. As such, an institutional or low-impact commercial use would not be an increased impact.
- I support the planning effort for ½ acre residential lots or larger and a commercial activity node on my property (2882 Martha's Chapel Rd.)
- Plan Option 2 shows 1 dwelling per acre. That is unacceptable so close to the lake.
- Would like to see our total land area zoned for 1 house per acre – I have traced my husbands family back to the early 1700's and since that time our family has been paying taxes and we are tired of people who move here, buy an acre of land and then try to tell everyone else what they can or cannot do to their land.
- We have the type of development that should be encouraged near the streams that feed into Jordan. We have two intermittent streams and one blue line stream on our 15 acres with one dwelling on the property.

- Our property is within 1 mile of the lake, and therefore, the density within this zone should be 1 du per 5 acres. In both options 1 and 2 the designated density is 1 du/2ac.

4. If you did not like any aspects of either of the Plan Options, please describe the types and arrangements of land uses within the study area that you would have recommended:

- The less density the better. 5 acres as a minimum. Protect Jordan Lake and the creeks that drain into it.
- Just say “NO” to annexation! Let us have some farm land outside of box housing. Let us be granted peace – from development and traffic.
- You are developing on Cary corridor which will promote unwanted Cary expansion – shame on Chatham County.
- More parks/green areas overall. Park or parks near/adjacent to American Tobacco Trail. Improve North/South roads sooner.
- 1DU/5AC.
- I would reduce the area in plan 2 that is planned to change to 3DU/AC to 2-2.5DU/AC. 3DU/AC is too dense for Chatham County. This is the area south of Amerbly.
- Please keep higher population to east of county line, tobacco trail.
- I would like to see the area left as a rural area! Look up the definition of rural! It is not box top housing.
- Money makes money. Politicians lie and we vote. Keep out growth. Keep out Cary.
- We would prefer to have 1DU/5AC west of 751 and 1DU/2AC east of 751 to preserve at least some of the ruralness of the area. The Chatham County government made a huge error in judgment in allowing the high density housing on Big Woods Rd. Parkers Creek has become a huge sewage basin for the developments.
- Slow development. Protect and value the essence of Chatham County – the farms and natural environments. No chain stores in this area – only unique, local businesses. Keep lots above 2 acres.
- An aspect of both plans is the implied time-frame. At least one additional year is needed to fill out necessary discussions on infrastructure and development.
- Keep area around Holland’s Chapel/751 no denser than 1DU/2AC with about 50% no denser than 1DU/5AC for a 2 mile radius.
- All said and done, I’d like to see Cary stay in Wake please and leave us the hell alone.
- Show existing subdivisions with the proper land use (1DU/5AC). Replace 1DU/AC with at least 1DU/2AC preferably 1DU/5AC in everything west of the American Tobacco Trail. Please don’t destroy the rural character of Chatham.
- I do not like the plans. Please leave Chatham County the way it is.

- How about some farm areas, horse farms, cattle farms, etc.
- We are not in accord with any more government land taken from Jordan Lake for more parks period. Then there's the issue of why Cary needs to grow. We'd be good neighbors in selling our land if and when we prefer – thereby taking up some of Cary's overspill.
- In general – I am concerned that the options proposed are going to further impair Jordan Lake. There have been too many accidents recently, concerning the Town of Cary (sewage spills), blown-up sewage pipes, construction run off into Jordan Lake – I can only imagine once more homes are built at the density suggested how much/many chemicals would seep or be washed into Jordan Lake – who knows how many more “sewage” accidents will occur. With either plan, what do you offer the citizens of Chatham. Can you afford the water and sewage along with the spills. Has either side considered the impact on schools in Chatham County. There is no high school in the Northeast and no plans. The only high school (Northwood) is already over capacity – Wake County already has an issue with overcrowded schools. Why should Cary bring that problem to Chatham County also. As with any “plan” it is only an idea or suggestion, until someone (mainly developers) wants it to be changed. What measures will be put in place to keep the “integrity of the plan” maintained? I feel that regardless of how the area is zoned, all it will take is a developer, his slick lawyer, a few “experts” and voila, you have a high density track with it's own spray fields – a great source of pollution for Jordan Lake. Amberly (in Chatham, but “Cary”) has been clear cut and the run off into Jordan Lake has been documented by the Haw River Assembly and Jordan Lake Watch. I as a property owner am concerned about increased taxes, increased crime, increased traffic – on roads that were not built for the population, overcrowded schools, the loss of quality of life that I have worked hard to maintain. I enjoy seeing the stars at night, hearing the birds at night and morning – running the deer out of my yard when I grow tired of watching them. I grow vegetables, raise chickens and do not want those aspects of my lifestyle to change.
- Fire Department, ambulances, police, schools, buses, roads, traffic.
- Since the Tobacco Trail is located nearby why are the greenways proposed? Would the proposed higher densities increase runoff during heavy rains?
- Option 1 – I do not like the disconnect in density between the already developed areas and the density that the plan shows. Need to be more adaptable. After polling many neighbors – we would not be opposed to a density of 2-to-4 acres starting at the American Tobacco Trail extending our to the lake. Lots sizes approaching the lake can be five acres if needed, but your plan is much too dense at the county line.
- Both plans will adversely affect the beauty and quality of life in our area. The commercial zone that is slated for around the corner from my house is a very frightening though.
- No sewer and city water. Only development that can be accommodated by septic and well. Keeping integrity and beauty of land in our area. They have Cary's poor example to look at. No infrastructure was or is yet to be in place for all their developing!

- Very low density to maintain some of the rural features of Wake Rd. and not to separate the Chatham County side of Wake Rd. from the Wake County side of Wake Rd. Chatham County schools have always been a distance for children on Wake Rd. to get to. Even if an elementary school is built the lower end of 751 Hwy. it would still be a long distance for an elementary school age child to travel from home. Where do you plan for a high school to be built along with this elementary school? Less is better for our Lost Corners community. I've lived on or near Wake Rd. all of my life. My first memory of life was on Wake Rd. I will not move off of Wake Rd.
- Any plan that includes Cary should not be considered. Cary should keep its out of control growth in Wake County, preferably east of 55, and not mess up our county. We do not need Cary's "Stepford" mentality, higher taxes and congestion in Chatham County.
- Lower densities. Also nowhere was it specified what the total dwellings could be under either plan. Why can't Cary stay in Wake. We moved here as most folks did to get away from them.
- I live in the "study area" in Chatham County in Northeast Chatham. I have lived here for 21.5 years. I moved from the city of Durham to get into the country. Since I have moved here, the growth has already become more than I care to live in and around. It deeply saddens me to see your plan A and plan B "proposed" for my county. I do not want Cary as close as it is, much less close enough to burden me with their ridiculous rules and regulations, overcrowded streets, unnecessary shopping centers, pollution, and subdivisions.
- I think you should zone EVERYTHING in Chatham east of the lake as 5 acre lots and then let developers come in with a specific plan that shows how the character of the land will be protected. A very strict overlay that protects the lake, the environment and existing large lot subdivisions could guide this development. This would be a win-win for everyone.
- Again, given the soils in the area, the number of blue line creeks flowing into the lake, and given the concerns that Jordan is a very sick lake, I think we need to err on the side of caution and back off to 1 ½ miles from the lake. I have spoken at length with folks who are monitoring this situation, and they have raised some very strong concerns about the impact of development on the drinking water supply.

Additionally, any development within 1 mile of the lake should be 5 acre lots.

Additional Comments/Letters/Feedback

Suggested Changes to the Joint Plan

Thank you for all of the work that has gone into the two proposals. As a resident of Chatham County it is nice to be heard. Having been a local resident for more than 40 years, I understand that growth and change are coming. I also understand that as we create this plan, we need to take a look at the past and how guidelines and loop holes were used by developers that may not have been the best for our environment nor our community as a whole.

Our community has gotten together to express our desires, and it was unfortunate that during that time at the South/West Area Plan (SWAP) meetings that some residents were verbally abusive and so negative. Fortunately there is documentation on the expectations of how Chatham County residences would like to see our community preserved. Please take the time to review the SWAP Special Public Input Meeting Held September 25, 2003; "The Desired Future and the Unwanted Future" Identification of Concerns, Ideas, and Interests.

If I understand the process, as explained at the 17October meeting, the zoning plan will be agreed to by Wake and Chatham County, and then the Implementation Plan will be developed and agreed to. I have included feedback for both in this document. I would also like to suggest that this plan be voted on by the Commissioner elects, NOT the existing Commissioners. Any feedback on the plan for additional meetings and approval of the plan would be appreciated.

Plan Option 1

This plan is a very good start. I have included some suggestions below.

Legend

- 1 Dwelling Unit per 5 acres – no lot less than **4** acres, average lot 5 acres, based on all lots <= 10 acres
- 1 Dwelling Unit per 2 acres - 1 dwelling per 2 acres, with a minimum lot size of 2 acre
- 1 Dwelling Unit per 1 acre – 1 dwelling per 1 acre, with a minimum lot size of 1 acre
- 2.5 Dwelling Units per 1 acre - 5 dwelling per 2 acre, with a minimum lot size of 2 acre
- 6 Dwelling Units per 1 acre - 6 dwellings per 1 acre, with a minimum lot size of 1 acre

Chatham County has a rolling topography, which adds to its beauty and challenges for development. Each track of property in Chatham County typically has some unusable portion due to low lying areas that ultimately feed into Jordan Lake. Given the natural beauty and topography of Chatham County, each

legend for the Plan should explicitly state what is allowed. The average person reading the legend will assume 1 dwelling per 1 acre means, lots will be an acre. If your intent is to have lots sizes as your legend is indicating, then please be explicit as I have above.

People do want lots with acreage, they just can't find them!

1/2 mile and 1 mile Bands around Jordan Lake

This 1 mile band is infiltrated with creeks, streams, and low lying areas. I would like to suggest that the entire 1 mile band around Jordan Lake be modified to 1 Dwelling Unit per 5 acres.

The reduction of dwellings per acre in this area will add some natural filtration of run off water prior to it entering the creeks, streams and low lying areas and ultimately Jordan Lake. During existing construction of neighborhoods, we have also called Tim Bailey's office on several occasions to report abuse of our natural resources and we are miles from the lake. How muddy does Jordan Lake need to become?

Extreme Northeast and Northwest

The property at the intersection of 751 and O'Kelly and the track on Wake Road are currently both proposed zoning of 1 Dwelling Unit per 1 acre. Due to the proximity to the Corps property and a direct feed into Jordan Lake, I would like to suggest that both of these areas be modified to 1 Dwelling Unit per 2 acres.

Transition from Wake County to Chatham County

Unfortunately the Legend for the existing Wake Land Use does not provide the details of Dwelling Unit per acre. The existing Wake Land Use south and west of Yates Store is zoned Low and Very Low Density. When crossing into Chatham County the density should decrease again to very very low density. I would like to suggest the major area that is currently 1 Dwelling Unit per 1 acre, be reduced to 1 Dwelling Unit per 2 acres.

Greenways

The proposed greenways should be reviewed as they are dissecting existing neighborhoods that should not be impacted by this new zoning. Examples include: Section between Tobacco Trail and Mt Pisgah Road, Section between Green Level and Wake County Line.

The proposed greenways are fine, if you erase all the property lines, and get rid of all existing residents. I understand as you create these lines on a map, you have no way of knowing if a track of land has a pending contract or if the residences are planning on staying. Please keep in mind, as a general statement; the residences of Chatham County enjoy our quiet existence. The

thought of strangers walking, riding, jogging, biking or even talking in my back yard appalls me!

The majority of the proposed greenways are in the creek, stream and low lying areas which could be negatively impacted during construction and during general use. In 1996 there was an impact assessment completed for Indian Creek. Are there other impact assessments for any other creeks in Chatham County? Were these taken into consideration? What would the impact to endangered plants and wildlife be if the greenways are constructed as designed?

Who are all these greenways being developed for? In reviewing the maps provided, there is one small section on the Wake County side.

I would like to propose that the greenways be revisited, reduced significantly, kept on the boundaries of the existing property lines and out of the creek, stream and low lying areas.

Schools

Where on this zoning plan, would schools be considered? In 2006 North Chatham Elementary (K-8) is instructing approximately 200 more students than its maximum capacity. Where would all of these additional childrens go to school?

Plan Option 2

My interpretation of Plan 2 is the density is higher than Plan 1, but all other factors are the same. I would like Plan 2 to be removed from consideration.

Viewpoint about Chatham/Cary Planning Process

I submitted these comments at the June meeting, but they did not appear on the website. To be sure they are read, I am resubmitting this slightly updated version.

1. Roads
2. Taxes/Values are driving people off their land
3. Schools
4. Sense of Community
5. Design Standards
6. Quality of Life, (including traffic, eye pollution, light pollution, air pollution, noise, crime, crowded schools, sense of community)
7. Compatibility
8. Forced Annexation

9. Service concerns – who do you call for public safety concerns if we are a maze of Cary.
10. Too much too fast – Chatham already has more than 10,000 houses coming - we have outpaced our ability to provide infrastructure, including schools and services such as tax appraisal and collection; elections; libraries, register of deeds – those services that a town doesn't have to worry with.
11. Joint Planning Process
12. Administering the Plan and Future Annexations
13. General

Roads

- Dump trucks and heavy equipment are destroying our rural roads. Require developers to keep most dirt on job site. The transporting of large amounts of dirt by dump truck destroys the low weight rural roads. Develop the land with respect for the natural topography.
- Require heavy equipment trucks such as logging trucks and cement trucks to use highways as much as possible.
- Enforce the speed limits.
- Enforce the weight limits on the roads.
- Require developers to pick up trash on major roads within one mile of their job sites. Since the construction of Amberly has started, trash on our rural roads has increased more than five fold.
- Do not allow existing roads to be closed for the convenience of the developer.

Taxes/Values

- On average, residential development does not generate sufficient revenue to pay for services required, especially true when the development is geographically far from existing county service centers (Pittsboro). Additionally, all residential development, with no commercial development, only worsens this deficiency.
- Developers need to pay the cost of the impact new residents have on the cost of government services. The cost of growth should not be the burden of existing taxpayers.
- Chatham County and the Town of Cary should advocate for increases in property tax exemptions for the elderly and the poor. Furthermore, both governments should explore incentives to help citizens keep their land, and not be pushed off it because they can't afford the taxes. This could mean the purchase of development rights, farmland preservation programs, or other programs to address this problem.

Schools

- Northwood High School is the nearest high school to eastern Chatham's located in Pittsboro. There is no funding in place for a high school in eastern Chatham. The commissioners funded other school improvements and new schools through alternative financing leaving just the high school for a bond referendum. When this referendum will occur is unknown.
- The County already has more than 10,000 new residential units approved but not yet built. School crowding and property taxes are major community concerns.
- Additionally, there are no schools nearby to the planning area. Travel time from the Wake Road area of North Chatham to Northwood High School is 40 minutes by car (27.4 miles)

Sense of Community

- If Cary incorporates portions of eastern Chatham, it is feared that citizens in this area will not feel as though they are part of the Chatham community. As an example, Cary used age restricted housing in the Del Webb community to ease the impact of new residential development on our schools. But in return, this action has the potential of raising resistance to increases in taxes to provide services and facilities for our children. Additionally, every effort needs to be made by Cary, Chatham and the developers to make it clear what it means to live in Cary/Chatham vs. Cary/Wake. This includes schools, taxes, voting, vital records, register of deeds, appraisal schedules (Wake is still on 8 yr revaluation; Chatham is on 4 yr cycle).

Design Standards

- The joint plan should not be Cary's design standards; it should not be Chatham's design standards. An overlay district should be created with unique design standards. Many Chatham residents feel Cary is too beige – everything looks uniformed. A trip down Yates Store Road to see the new developments of Amberly and Weldon Ridge will confirm this fear. Chatham residents feel that Cary's design standards are too rigid – as an example, Cary's "sign police" has indicated that the Mt. Pisgah church sign at the corner of New Hope Church Road and Yates Store Road is too tall. It has been there for at least ten years, and although it might need a coat of paint, it looks fine.
- There is nothing wrong with color.
- Design standards need to protect the rural character of the community.
- Street lights need to be minimal and shielded. Any community park lighting, such as ball fields, must have shields to reduce light pollution.
- Same ol' same ol' is not good enough. We do not want anything in Chatham that looks like Amberly. It is ugly.
- Lot sizes need to increase significantly as you move closer to Jordan Lake. No lot size should be less than one half acre, even if clustering is allowed.
- Clustering should not be allowed unless it is done with a strict overlay that buffers it from sight. If it is allowed, then street buffering of major roads, should

be a minimum of 400 feet of undisturbed vegetation, supplemented by native plant materials, including evergreens.

- Concrete dividers that prohibit turns in both directions should be banned.
- Many of the residents here have small “hobby” farms. This type of development should be encouraged.
- New development adjacent (or close) to established subdivisions needs to be compatible, or extremely well buffered.
- No gated communities.

Quality of Life

- **Listen to why people live in Chatham County and then build a plan that preserves this. It can be done!**

Compatibility

- Build a plan that protects nearby property owners. This can be done through increasing buffering and streetscaping.

Forced Annexation

- The current Town Council has repeatedly said that all annexation requests have been voluntary/ or developer initiated. The point that seems to be missing is - no matter who initiated the annexation, the end result is the same. Satellite annexations will eventually necessitate the filling in of the Cary corporate limits – it is a matter of economy and efficient service delivery. To avoid forced annexation, this joint plan should adopt standards limiting (abolishing?) satellite annexation. Without it, those between “main body” Cary and the satellite annexation are in the path of being forced into the Cary limits. It is inevitable. (Updated NOTE: At the open house, I learned that density needs to be 60 percent of the residential units on lots of three acres for forcibly annex. Which leads me to wonder why Cary would ever want to consider satellite annexations from a service cost perspective.)

Service Concerns

- Automatic locator for E911 distinguishes between Cary and Chatham, but to a third party caller to E911, that distinction isn’t clear. A service plan must be developed, and perhaps interlocal agreements for providing police and fire protection, need to be considered.

Too much too fast

- Chatham County has over 10,000 new homes approved but not yet built. Chatham’s debt load is staggering and at it’s ceiling. Residents are already looking at tax increases in future years to open new schools. Chatham does not

want our schools to be in the critical mess that Wake County is in. We see Wake municipalities throwing up their hands and saying, “it isn’t our fault, we don’t provide the schools.” The blame is to be shared by the County, the School system and the Wake municipalities. All governments must coordinate and work together to ensure that the pace of growth does not strain services and over-crowd our schools.

Joint Planning Process

- This two open houses and a proposed public hearing to react to the plan are not sufficient. We want more citizen involvement in this process as specifics are discussed and the plan is developed
- Both the Cary and Chatham governments must approve this plan. Both governments must approve amendments to the plan.

Administering the Plan and Future Annexations

- Create Chatham/Cary Overlay district with mutually agreed to design standards.
- All subdivisions (of a certain TBA size) in this overlay district must be jointly approved by Cary and Chatham. It may be that quarterly joint meetings will be necessary. **DO NOT DISCOUNT THIS AS UNWORKABLE.** If you want to do it, it can be done.
- Chatham County must approve all annexations by the Town of Cary. It only seems logical that if the law requires county approval to extend a municipality’s ETJ that the county should also approve the annexation.
- Future pending annexations must be posted. Why not? It looks sneaky otherwise as was the case with the three satellite annexations considered since early December.
- Create a public safety special district. If Cary builds fire stations in Chatham County, then a special district should be created that allows Chatham residents to pay property taxes to this special district for fire protection. If this isn’t done, county services will be tripping over municipality services – just take a look at the fire stations on 10-10 road for a perfect example!
- Citizens should be fairly compensated if any portion of their land is taken for road improvements caused by the development (as an example, the current situation on Pittard Sears Rd).
- If utilities are extended past already developed residents, they should be allowed to tap on **WITHOUT** being annexed by Cary.
- Developers should have some incentive to create something unique, not uniformed, beige and everything looking the same.

General

- Protect rural character (which means no clear cutting, and having large buffering and open space). Instead of requiring **SIDEWALKS**, require developers to build

- walking and bike paths that may follow the road but are not traditional city looking sidewalks. Consider strip parks along our corridors.
- Consider eliminating curb and guttering.
 - Protect our rural cemeteries.
 - The plan needs to include commercial centers, which should include office parks, or other employment centers. No strip malls along our major corridors.
 - Protect the environment – density should DECREASE near and around Jordan Lake.
 - Protect wildlife.
-

Comments:

General Comment: I think we are being asked to comment on an incomplete picture. We need to know the proposed roads. We need to know what the design standards are going to be.

Other comments:

The roads are a mess and the State tells me they don't have the \$300K to rebuild New Hope Church Road. This road has been pounded by construction traffic. You can't allow high density development without the roads being planned for first. High density to us is more than 2 units on an acre. Traffic is already a problem – look at Hwy 751 in the peak rush hours.

Implementation of the Joint Plan

The implementation input is being provided, so as you finalize the zoning plan, you can understand some of the concerns that exist for the development of Chatham County east of Jordan Lake.

Run off

Chatham County is primarily soggy white clay. This clay creates a layer that water runs on top of under the top soil. This clay type is what has created the topography that the residences enjoy. As development occurs in Chatham County, let's keep the run off contained, during construction and after. Suggested considerations:

- Low Impact Development techniques in the site and stormwater plans
- Reduce existing Peak Flows
- Increase 1 year events to 10 year events
- Monitor Turbidity
- Work jointly with Corps of Engineers

Site Preparation

Site construction in Amberly, Cary Park and Weldon Ridge have been challenging for current residences. Current site construction is commonly referred to as "raping" the land. The existing topography does not lend itself to the density of the current neighborhoods. To meet the needs the land is being clear cut, and mountains moved, gullies filled and retaining walls constructed. The implementation plan for this Joint Chatham County, Town of Cary plan should explicitly exclude clear cutting and excessive grade manipulation.

The Town of Cary allows pit burning, while other neighboring towns only allow shredding. The Town of Cary Fire Departments have spent several evenings and nights putting out fires due to violations for pit burning.

The Town of Cary requires a buffer of trees between the existing road and site construction. There is an unfortunate loop hole in this rule. The roads have to be widened and the utilities need to be run. When the project is completed, the existing trees have all been destroyed. Cary Park is a perfect example; there are TWO existing trees still standing on its entire road frontage.

Road Development, expansion, turn lanes should occur prior to any major developments obtaining their CO. The roads in the area can not handle the traffic that exists today. The current info structure of roads has been heavily damaged due to excessive usage and weight.

Developments that could contribute more than 'x' students should have to contribute to a new school fund. Building permits should be dependant on having schools constructed to accommodate the children.

Developments under construction should have to adhere to the Chatham County/Town of Cary plan if any zoning changes are requested.

The zoning plan does not include sewage lines as the developments are not defined. As the sewage lines are needed, the lines, pumping stations should be kept on the land under development. The impact to existing neighbors, to the development should be kept to a minimum.

Haw River Assembly

P.O. Box 187 Bynum, NC 27228

(919) 542-5790 hra@emji.net

Date: January 25, 2007

To: Chatham-Cary Joint Land Use Plan Committee

From: Elaine Chiosso, Executive Director

Judith Ferster, Jordan Lake Initiative

Re: Comments on Chatham-Cary Joint Land Use Plan

We wish to make additional comments in regards to the Chatham-Cary Joint Land Use Plan (JLUP). Our biggest concern continues to be that a plan is created which offers the greatest protection for both water quality and the environment at Jordan Lake

The maps that were presented to the public offered two planning options for the study area. We believe Option 1 offers more protection for Jordan Lake than the denser development proposed in Option 2. However, we do not believe that even Option 1 is sufficient to support the health of the lake, its wildlife, and plant communities.

We have read the comments submitted by the NC Wildlife Resources Commission (Jan. 4, 2007), and strongly agree with their recommendations. Specifically, we support the following items in their letter

- Protect the three Significant Natural Heritage sites and The Nature Conservancy's "Ecoregional Portfolio" site by zoning for 1 du/10 acres or by creating resource conservation overlay district.
- Protect 100 foot native forested stream buffers around all perennial and intermittent streams as are currently defined in The Town of Cary's riparian

buffer protection ordinance. This is in line with new ordinance language under review in Chatham County for 100' perennial streams and intermittent streams close to rivers. We believe streams flowing into Jordan Lake in the planning area need at least this amount of forested buffer.

We urge the JLUP committee to consider all the ideas brought up by the NC WRC including: a range of zoning that would allow for less fragmentation; promotion of “conservation subdivision design” principles; and added game land buffers to protect the public from smoke (during controlled burns) and hunting.

We would also like to call your attention to the continuing problems that sediment from new development is causing in this part of the lake. The aerial photos that Haw River Assembly took of muddy waters entering Jordan Lake through Northeast and Panther creeks in October showed run-off from multiple sites under construction at Amberly, being built on land that Cary annexed from Chatham.

You can look at the whole group of aerial shots on the website we made for showing these photos :<http://home.earthlink.net/~jordan.lake.watch/>



The areas affected are part of two Significant Natural Areas described by NC WRC – the Northeast Creek Floodplains Forest and the Northeast Creek/Panther Creek Diabase Dike.

We urge the Town of Cary and Chatham County to consider new regulations to reduce this pollution. We support the ordinances currently being discussed in Wake County to limit the amount of “open dirt” – the percentage of land laid bare during construction at any one time – as a good way to reduce sediment erosion leaving the construction site.

We look forward to continuing discussions with both local governments on the important issue of protecting Jordan Lake.