

Alice Lloyd

From: Amanda Robertson [amandarob@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Stuart Bass
Cc: Tony Robertson; Karl Blackley; aflloyd@pittsboronc.gov; bgruesbeck@pittsboronc.gov
Subject: Chatham Park Development - More Information

Dear Mr. Bass,

I received a letter informing my husband and I of a town meeting regarding a development project that has been submitted by Preston Development for property that is adjacent to our property in Prince Creek. I attended this meeting last night with several of my neighbors. I had hoped to learn more details about this development project. Instead, it quickly became apparent that several meetings had already taken place where Preston Development has presented their project plans. The meeting last night was simply affording the public a forum to share concerns about this development.

I regret that my husband and I were not informed about the earlier meetings held by Preston for the community. As I stated, my husband and I own a home in Prince Creek, and our property is adjacent to this development property on two sides. We purchased our home on 11 acres just over two years ago.

I have gone to the town website, and also to Preston's site, to view maps and further details about roads and specific information on development that is planned around our property. I cannot find maps or specifics regarding plans for the property adjacent to ours, and there are also several bad links to information on this project on the town's website.

I know that several of my neighbors, also in attendance at last night's meeting, had also not previously known about these earlier meetings.

I'd like to understand why we would receive a formal notice from the town in the U.S. mail about an opportunity to share concerns with town commissioners about this project, but would not be similarly informed about earlier meetings where Preston would share their plans? How could we be expected to form an opinion on the matter, positive or negative, without also having the opportunity to learn the specifics about the project? I spoke with one neighbor who did attend a previous meeting and he said he saw information on the "Chatham Chat". Apparently, a website where citizens share information and opinions with each other. My husband and I do not feel the "Chatham Chat" is a sufficient way to inform the Pittsboro community about development that will directly impact the value of our property.

I formally request that a meeting be held to inform residents, particularly those adjacent to this "proposed" development project, of the specifics of the project and that we be given an opportunity to ask questions of the developers and city leaders before moving forward.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Amanda and Tony Robertson
244 Prince Creek
Pittsboro, NC 27312
919/542-3525

cc: Karl Blackley, President, Preston Development Alice Lloyd, Town Clerk, Town of Pittsboro
Bryan Gruesbeck, Town Manager, Town of Pittsboro

Alice Lloyd

From: Barbara Lorie [BBL@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2013 2:03 PM
To: Alice Lloyd
Subject: addendum to my remarks last night

I also deeply concerned about the waste that is incurred with any type of building. We all know the waste stream is overtaxed with detritus from building materials unused. Preston has made no mention of what they plan to do with building material waste once construction begins.

Also, what does Preston intend to do with all waste once their entire project is finished. Our county cannot begin to handle the waste from something so vast. We are at odds now with just the 56,000 population that live in Chatham now? Barbara Lorie

Alice Lloyd

From: John Alderman [aldermanjm@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Alice Lloyd
Cc: Pamela Hawe; John Bonitz; Peter Theye; Judith Ferster; Jeffrey Starkweather; Vincent Hutchinson; Allison Weakley; Martha Girolami; Colleen Kendrick; Rita Spina; Lyle Estill; Deepa Sanyal; Judy Butt; Sammy Slade; Diana Hales; Kate Dunlap; Sonny Keisler; Tara Disy Allden; Elaine Chiosso; Caroline Siverson; Janet Abreu; Bill Causey; Karen Wakefield; Sharon Day; Nick Davis; Roland McReynolds; Gary Simpson; Paul Konove; Tabitha Roberson; Jan Nichols; Evelyn Barrow; Tim Keim; Kathleen Hundley; Raj Butalia; George Lucier; Catherine Deininger; John Alderman
Subject: Chatham Park Comments

Dear Ms. Lloyd:

During the past 30 years, I have worked in the public and private sector as an environmental scientist. Currently, my work area extends over the eastern half of the United States. My clients include some of the largest utility companies in America, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, various state wildlife agencies, NCDOT, SCDOT, universities, local governments, conservation organizations, and numerous others.

I have only one recommendation for Pittsboro concerning the proposed Chatham Park Development: If completed as planned, this development will permanently and significantly alter Pittsboro, its ETJ, Jordan Lake, and other areas within Chatham County. There will be numerous direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts from the proposed development. Pittsboro needs to hire independent environmental scientists to 1) critically review all development related documents, 2) provide a report listing all instances within the documents needing additional explanations, justifications, and references, and 3) provide recommendations for the documents to better address direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.

If Pittsboro follows this recommendation, to ensure no conflict of interest, I will not be involved in the environmental scientist review process.

Sincerely,

John M. Alderman, President
Alderman Environmental Services, Inc.
244 Redgate Road
Pittsboro, NC 27312
919-542-5331 (O)
919-444-9576 (M)

July 10, 2013
Dear Mayor & Board Members,

My name is Blanche Hamlet.
I have lived in Pittsboro
since 1930.

My family has been involved
in the community as my father,
husband, and brother all
served as mayor.

I cannot be at the public
hearing so I am writing you this
letter in support of Chatham Park
because we need the jobs.

Sincerely,
Blanche J. Hamlet

Citations for Oral Comments at Chatham Park rezoning hearing 6/24/13
Liz Cullington 390 Rocky Hills Road, Pittsboro 27312 ETJ Resident

Abbreviated references: Chatham Park Master Plan (CPMP) Pittsboro Zoning Ordinance (PZO)

1) **Timeline/Phasing**: Huge scale up requires a timeline, PDD appears to require timeline because changes require approval (5.8.10), and the zoning ordinance at 5.8.3(16) specifically requires that the Master Plan include "a plan for development phasing within the PDD."

2) Numerous references in the Chatham Park Master Plan effectively removing compliance with **overlay district watershed** requirements. CPMP p.32 at #5 & 6. On the same page references to amending Sections 4, 5 and 6, Section 5 includes the watershed overlay districts.

3) Master Plan exempts Chatham Park from the density, setbacks, building height etc. limits in the town's **major highway corridors** rules (CPMP p. 32, Section VII at (8)).

4) Claim for high density option p. 32 CPMP, re 5.5.10 of PZO (p.82)

5) **Avoiding retention ponds etc.** Automatic approval by their terms under 5.5.10 of PZO without meeting it's requirements; one of those requirements is compliance with 5.5.11 (PZO pp.83-84) regarding stormwater structure and system construction including retention ponds.

Supplemental comments on Chatham Park rezoning

Liz Cullington, 390 Rocky Hills Road, Pittsboro 27312 ETJ resident

1. Timeline for approval

At the 6/24/13 hearing Mr. Culpepper stated "The clock is ticking." However, Section 10.4.3 of the PZO which also applies to PDD rezoning, states that "The Board of Commissioners is not required to take final action on a proposed amendment within any specific period of time...." and the Board is mandated to consider the impact on the public at large and not advantages or disadvantages to the applicant. The applicant can't complain about costs as they've been sitting on the land for years. Most importantly however, that pressure on the Town and Planning boards for such a massive development shouldn't become a ticking clock until the application is complete.

Mr. Culpepper also claimed that the rezoning and the Master Plan were different issues, but the PZO states "The PDD and the PDD Master Plan shall be treated as a single item when acted on by the Board of Commissioners." (PZO 5.8.3 p. 95)

2. Incomplete application

The Pittsboro Zoning Ordinance (PZO) at 5.8.3 (p.95) lays out the elements of a PDD rezoning submission via a Master Plan. Many crucial required elements are lacking in the submission.

- a) The PZO requires a "plan for development phasing within the PDD" (PZO 5.8.3(16), and also 5.8.5 The developers have a route for the flexibility they are asking for in the ordinance, for both major and minor changes.
- b) The "general plan addressing stormwater" required by PZO 5.8.3(9) is just a vague description, claim for exemption from standards and the watershed restrictions, and no map (re-use water map is not for stormwater but for treated wastewater).
- c) There is no boundary buffer plan as required by PZO 5.8.3(14) "showing transition treatments between the proposed PDD and adjacent properties" other than statements in the plan to the effect that buffers will be minimal or not provided, nor will setbacks.
- d) The Chatham Park Master Plan doesn't fulfill 5.8.3.(13). While several public parks and a conservation area are identified, all are at the outermost edges, and one is essentially separate, but the remaining vast areas within both halves of the lobster shaped PDD have zero recreation area identified. The PZO requires that recreation areas inside the PDD be provided and their locations identified. The plan also lacks standards for these open spaces as required by the PZO. These areas are to include both active and passive uses (PZO 5.8.7.A)
- e) The "summary of gross density" of proposed uses required by PZO 5.8.3(5) (also Note 11. p.33) is missing and has to be calculated using what information has been provided. I am submitting tables to indicate the relatively high and very high densities that are proposed for the residential areas. See pages 7 and 8 of this submission. (The applicant has reserved 10% of the residential acreage for non-residential land uses, which I deducted, but the ordinance allots 10% to roads and infrastructure and I used a smaller adjustment.)

3. Proposal fails to meet the requirements for a Planned Development District (PDD)

The total acreage of the PDD submission is not a single discrete unit and in a number of aspects fails to meet the goals and requirements for a PDD rezoning in the Pittsboro ordinance.

a) Planning area 7.1 north of the bypass is not contiguous with the rest of the development, area 5.3 north of Thompson Street is totally separate. The remainder of the proposed PDD areas don't comprise a single integrated planning unit. Of the whole requested allocation for dwelling units by area, barely a third are in the northern half, with about two thirds in the southern half.

b) The Chatham Park Master Plan (CPMP) does not meet the requirements of 5.8.8.B for "Perimeter Boundary Transitions" as "dissimilar land uses" are proposed with no transitional uses or guaranteed significant buffers.

c) Where is the quality urban design the PDD district was created for, and which the developers have hinted at they would provide? The land use map indicates a number of scattered activity sites that appear to be shopping centers, not little faux village centers with small stores, park or square, and residential units. These A through E areas have zero residential units assigned.

d) The PDD zoning is also supposed to allow higher densities but only "when such increases are supported by superior design or the provision of additional amenities." The Plan not only doesn't have standards, it specifically says there will be none, and there are no amenities featured. The ordinance lays out the requirement for overall PDD development standards at note 15 p. 79. The ordinance has no provision for a PDD with no standards.

e) The PDD zoning was designed for projects that couldn't be developed under other zoning categories (p.16) , however, many areas of the PDD appear to have uses compatible with other zoning categories, MUPD, Office/Institutional, Light Industrial, Neighborhood or Highway Commercial or the higher density Residential zoning.

4. Density, watersheds, underlying zoning

a) Chatham Park wants to replace lot coverage limits with an overall build/paved over 70%, which means large areas of the project could be 100% impermeable, regardless of the underlying watershed district (according to the many exemptions they have claimed). Extending the "only 70%" to the entire assemblage of discrete tracts is no protection at all.

b) In fact it's hard to see how even that could be achieved since only 667 acres of open space is identified in the plan (a mere 9.3%*), with the remainder densely developed. That open space is less when the 10% acreage of non-residential uses are considered.

c) Many areas have such high density of development it's hard to see where the rest of the impermeable area is to come from, as it would require 2,130 acres even if 70% overall is to be permitted. (See my calculated density tables, pp. 7-8 here.)

- d) Scaling up any percentage of coverage limits from lot size to a development or even part of a development doesn't have the same effect on how water behaves because the water molecules don't conveniently scale up in parallel. Lot limits assume a lot is all within the same drainage.
- e) Even residential areas closest to the Haw and Jordan Lake have extraordinarily high density compared to their current zoning. (See Cullington submitted density tables) There are no one acre lots anywhere in the PDD, let alone larger ones, not even any half acre lots. Not far from the lake is an "Activity (Commercial?) Center" with a surrounding high density area with 8.91 homes per acre.
- f) Whatever lower limits and changes the Town requires in the Master Plan must also address whether such limits apply to the section being developed. It is pretty clear that many of the proposed areas would have a higher than 70% built upon area and are not surrounded by adjacent less built/paved over area of the PDD, such as 7.1, and all of the 4, 5 and 6 areas.
- g) As currently written, p.32 of the plan exempts Chatham Park from the requirement that "No main building and permitted accessory building shall occupy more than forty (40%) of the lot area in any zoning district, with the exception of the C-4 district." (PZO Section 3.2 p. 8).
- h) That 70% maximum coverage for the entire PDD would replace not only other zoning densities, but also the overlay watershed district density if the language on CPMP p. 32 is approved.
- i) Regardless of claiming exemption from the watershed overlay district, the developers still want to claim "The High Density Option" for the entire development, though without meeting it's requirements. That option is not available for the critical area of the watershed (WSIV-CA). In the WSIV-PA area high density development still has to conform to overall underlying (low) density restrictions. As Ms. Deininger stated at the 6/24/13 hearing, allowed density for new developments also depends on existing development and lot coverage. The watershed districts apply coverage limits at the lot level, not at the overall PDD level nor at the planning area level.
- j) Excess lot coverage within the PDD that is also within the watershed overlay districts could thus deprive other property owners of their ability to build or expand.

5. Weak buffers from water and none from neighboring properties

- a) Stream buffer provisions in the CPMP don't ensure that the minimal stream buffers identified will be the area that is not disturbed by construction, but merely the area that is not build or paved over. (Developers have stated that some greenways may be paved where they substitute for sidewalks.)
- b) Greenways identified are minimal for the massive acreage. There isn't a single greenway in the entire northern half. Some greenways in the southern half appear to parallel streams identified on the water bodies map for part (or even most) of their length.
- c) The plan proposes either distance buffers or planted screening where dissimilar uses are proposed next to adjoining property owners, not both, with no minimum standard, but

only considers distance from any building on the adjacent property, not distance from the property line (CPMP p.10). This is particularly of concern where very tall buildings (no height limit!) could be constructed in Mixed Use, R&D, or Res-Mixed Use areas. With no setbacks these buildings could block light (and destroy privacy) in established residential neighborhoods (and areas zoned residential). There is no mention of buffering by distance or vegetation or both for particular uses that would spill light pollution, noise, or dust/fumes etc. onto neighboring properties.

6. Serious stormwater problems

a) The Master Plan doesn't commit Chatham Park to current "Best Management Practices" regarding stormwater control, systems and treatment, since the plan says these will be "subject to and/or utilizing variances and/or lesser standards and/or offset payments that may be granted, adopted or accepted by the Town or other applicable governmental entity..." (CPMP p.17).

b) As noted in my oral comments, the Plan exempts Chatham Park for standards of design for stormwater systems, and the use of retention ponds.

c) Under the plan and its claimed exemptions, "regional stormwater systems" would have to be in place before development, but complete stormwater systems wouldn't have to be completed until lots are sold (or "ownership is transferred"). (CPMP p. 19)

d) The repair and maintenance fund for stormwater systems held by the Property Owners Association need not be funded up to 15% until 5 years after the first certificate of occupancy is issued. The developers should be required to fully fund for each section and be rebated as dues accrue.

e) If stormwater only has to be designed to "control and treat" 1" of rainfall there will most certainly be flooding and excess runoff from and within the PDD.

7. Transportation

a) Access to and from the development depends on road construction, widening or extension including some on the Town's (TIP) plan but many more not even on the drawing board, but all of which appear to be not yet funded. In addition, potentially affected landowners and residents may be totally unaware of these impacts of the development.

b) However, the Pittsboro Zoning Ordinance appears to expect that interconnectivity and access be provided by the developers, not the taxpayers: "In general, the proposed development shall provide for connectivity of land uses through a network of roadway improvements and pedestrian sidewalks and/or trails and/or bicycle facilities." It does not say someone else has to do that from the outside. Usually owners of landlocked properties have to purchase easements from willing sellers, not have their friends at DOT condemn the land for it, and the taxpayers to pay for it. One reason is that a PDD is designed to be a more contiguous and coherent area than Chatham Park.

c) There is no commitment for sidewalks except along "public streets" (p.24) which raises the question of whether some interior roads in the residential areas are to be both private roads and lacking sidewalks.

8. Drinking water/sewage capacity

- a) The plan states that "utility infrastructure shall not be required before it is needed to service property subject to the PDD master plan" but advance planning and funding for treatment capacity (and major distribution lines) surely is. The plan only identifies average demand at build out, not peaking demand.
- b) Because currently the plan only anticipates reuse water from wastewater in non-residential construction, the excess over re-use would be greatest from early residential construction, which is why the phasing of the project and the lack of committed timeline in the plan is such a critical deficiency.
- c) The developers aren't even committing to pay for construction and maintenance of the reuse water system (CPMP p.17)

9. Additional open space and parks deficiencies

- a) Public park areas identified in the Plan can have 10% of their acreage for non-residential use (way more than required for parking lots etc.).
- b) The language in the plan regarding the allocation of open space states "The total amount of land area provided for park/open space shall be based upon the number of actual building permits for all residential dwelling units." (CPMP p. 28) The town has to insist on this language being changed. Firstly, replace the word "all" with "each" as we cannot depend on all 22,000 units being constructed and cannot wait up to 30 years for the developers to set aside some land that won't be paved or built over.
- c) The plan suggests payment in lieu of open space or parks, but this provision was not designed for such a large project that would be expected to use open space as part of it's marketing appeal, rather for extremely small housing developments.
- d) The plan allots up to 10% of park acreage for non-residential uses, not just to allow parking lots, swimming pools and athletic fields, but also fire/EMS stations and even a library. (See CPMP Land Use Summary Table, and the CPMP Table of Permitted Uses)
- e) The plan proposes that private recreational facilities count toward open space, but don't specify whether or how much vegetated, or paved, or that it be open air.
- f) The plan on p.31 suggests that maintenance of such open space may be handed over to the Town but if this is desired it should not occur until there is adequate road access for maintenance and supervision, for access by the public, access for fire, police and EMS vehicles, and assurance that increased revenues will cover costs. If greenways or parks are deeded to the Town that acreage would be removed from all tax base. Much of the southern part of the PDD is outside the Town tax base and not presently liable to Town taxes.
- g) All the public parks identified are too remote to be considered town facilities for town residents. Unfortunately those areas closest to central Pittsboro appear the least likely to have even a pocket park but that remains to be seen in more detailed plans.

10. Other problems in the details

- a) In the permitted land uses table for Chatham Park, quarries "and other extractive industries" are permitted in every single planning area, and type of area, even public parks and the stinking creek conservation area, with the exception of the three residential areas (Residential-East classification) closest to the Haw or Jordan Lake. (And, in spite of the developer's claims that "fracking won't be allowed, this extraordinary permitted use "by right" is going to make that feeble promise worse than useless.)
- b) Although there is no requirement to submit a power supply plan, the power needs of the scattered areas of the proposed PDD would require some additional power lines, some of which could require either condemnation or forced easements on property owners outside the PDD. Since power supply has to come from existing infrastructure, and also be looped, only neighborhood distribution lines would possibly parallel existing or proposed roads (whether internal or external).
- c) The plan on p. 22 suggests some of the new required schools could be built within the PDD but is not committing to donate land (unlike what other Chatham developments have proposed or done). Equal important, however, is the fact that school siting within a development is a marketing plus for developers, and ensures that future school districts could give that development's residents priority in attending those schools.
- d) There seems little difference between the "Residential-Mixed Use" and "Residential" areas, since both can have up to 10% of their acreage in non-residential use. However Residential-Mixed Use areas can have a broader range of business and other uses, and appear designed for rental apartments, condos and dense townhouses, as do the "Parkway" areas.
- e) Walkability: The developers have made a point of some sort of medical center in Planning Area 7.1, and how people working there could walk to work. However there's no guarantee from the developers that any housing there could be affordable for lower paid workers, and there is no housing provided for better paid employees who would prefer and could afford a family home with a yard. Much of the residential area in the southern portion is too remote for walking to anywhere, although biking might be very possible. Work in the scattered commercial sites in the southern area is unlikely to pay enough to support purchase of a new home.

TABLE 1. PLANNING AREAS DENSITY, CHATHAM PARK

RESIDENTIAL

Area	Dwelling Units	Gross Max Density units per acre*	Lot size acre*	Max acres Non-res
1.1	1575	4.45	0.2	
1.2	1565	4.45	0.2	
1.3	275	2.23	0.4	
1.4	670	8.86	0.1	
2.1	1780	3.33	0.2+	
2.3	570	2.79	0.3	
2.4	1675	8.89	0.1	
3.1	820	2.77	0.3	
3.3	750	4.46	0.2	
3.4	1280	2.6	0.3	
3.5	530	2.78	0.3	
3.6	820	8.91	0.1	
3.7	630	2.79	0.3	
4.4	2815	11.2	0.07	

RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE

4.2	1315	11.1	0.09	
5.1	2985	11.13	0.08	
6.2	1475	8.34	0.1	

* *Gross Max Density calculated by taking total acreage less the maximum of 10% acreage for non-residential use, divided by maximum Dwelling Units (DUs). The gross maximum density implies an overstated lot size because that acreage would also have to include acreage for internal roads, ROW including sidewalks if any, stream buffers, and easements for any and all sewer lines, wastewater reuse lines, and any higher voltage power lines.*

TABLE 2. GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE IN WALMARTS* (Non-Res areas)

Area	Type	GSF as Walmarts
3.2	R&D	3.2
4.1	R&D	39.7
4.3	R&D	39
5.2	R&D	10
5.3	R&D	72
6.1	R&D	17.5
7.1	Mixed Use	26

"Activity Centers" **

A	13.5
B	10
C	8
D	3
E	3

**North Chatham Walmart is 148,400 square feet*

*** Use not stated but appears likely to be commercial*



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WILMINGTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE
POST OFFICE BOX 144
MONCURE, NORTH CAROLINA 27559

July 18, 2013

Mayor Voller and Board of Commissioners
Town of Pittsboro
PO Box 759 - 635 East St.
Pittsboro, NC 27312

Dear Mr. Voller and Board of Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Chatham Park Planned Development District Master Plan. Portions of the project adjoin Federal property under the stewardship of the US Army Corps of Engineers at Jordan Lake along Stinking and Robeson Creeks.

Federal property in this area is leased to the State of North Carolina and is managed by the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC) as game lands. Game lands are open to public hunting and fishing by licensed individuals in accordance with all NCWRC fishing, hunting, and trapping regulations.

On residential buildings adjacent to Federal property we request that the residents be notified of activities that may occur on game lands such as hunting, forest management activities, and other recreational activities. One suggestion is to post signs adjacent to the game lands that notify potential occupants that hunting is allowed on game lands. Another way to protect the natural area and permanent wildlife lands is through the use of buffers.

Typically when development occurs adjacent to natural areas and permanent wildlife management lands we recommend that a buffer of at least 100 feet of undisturbed vegetation be left along the boundary whenever possible. Buffers provide aesthetic benefits to adjacent private landowners and screen their property from changes on public lands that may result from forestry practices such as prescribed burns or timber harvests, and from public recreational activities. Additionally, buffers increase safety for landowners adjacent to public hunting areas as well as help protect water quality and minimize runoff from adjacent properties.

The waters of Jordan Lake and surrounding Federal Lands are managed for public drinking water supply, fish and wildlife habitat, natural resource based public recreation, and flood storage. Development of adjacent property can adversely impact these project purposes by decreasing the minimum flow from any streams on the property, increasing the volume or rate of storm water discharge from the property, increasing the sediment or nutrient loads leaving the property, and adversely impacting wetlands. Again, we recommend that a 100-foot buffer of undisturbed vegetation be left adjacent to the boundary to help protect water quality. Other steps should also be taken to avoid adverse water quality impacts including the incorporation of storm water retention/detention structures into storm water planning and by avoiding or minimizing impacts to wetland areas on the property.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposed development adjacent to public lands. If we can provide any additional information, please contact Francis Ferrell at the Jordan Lake Visitor Assistance Center (919) 542-4501 extension 28.

Sincerely,

**BANAITIS.CAROL.M.12
30402937**

Digitally signed by BANAITIS.CAROL.M.1230402937
DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI,
ou=USA, cn=BANAITIS.CAROL.M.1230402937
Date: 2013.07.18 14:47:02 -04'00'

Carol M. Banaitis, R.F.
Operations Project Manager



P.O. Box 883
Pittsboro, NC 27312
(919) 542-0794
fax (919) 542-0340
www.chathamhabitat.org

Open Letter to the Town of Pittsboro Commissioners
July 17th 2013

Mr. Mayor and Commissioners

As advocates for and builders of affordable housing in Chatham County, Chatham Habitat for Humanity believes that Chatham Park represents a unique opportunity to further address the issue of affordable housing in the Pittsboro area.

Given that the Master Plan submitted by the developer is the legal basis for the PDD rezoning request, we are surprised and disappointed that it makes no mention of affordable housing.

With the tremendous size of this project and the anticipated thirty year build out, a Chatham Park development without significant affordable housing would be a tremendous blow to the future of affordable housing in Chatham County. In addition, Chatham Park is certain to drive up property values in the eastern half of the county and thus will lower the availability of affordable housing in the Pittsboro area.

We strongly support the mixed use aspect of Chatham Park that will bring new jobs to the Pittsboro area. However, without affordable housing in the mix, it will only be the affluent newcomers who will benefit from shorter commuting times, while those in lower paying jobs would likely be commuting from western Chatham to jobs in Chatham Park.

Therefore we request the following:

1. That the Town of Pittsboro follows its Land Use Plan adopted in October 2012, specifically Section 5:9 which stresses the importance of affordable housing.
2. That the Town Board include a provision for affordable housing in Chatham Park as a condition of the PDD rezoning approval, and such provision be part of the subsequent Development Agreement.
3. Specifically, we ask that 15% of all living units, or their equivalent, in Chatham Park be affordable housing units, with one third of those units (5%) designated for residents making under 50% of local median household income, and two thirds (10%) designated for residents making under 80% of local median household income. Other specifics can be worked out as part of the Development Agreement, and we believe there are creative ways to meet these goals, including public/private/non-profit partnerships. Our proposal is based on what other North Carolina municipalities have required of large developments in regards to affordable housing.



P.O. Box 883
Pittsboro, NC 27312
(919) 542-0794
fax (919) 542-0340
www.chathamhabitat.org

Open Letter to the Town of Pittsboro Commissioners
July 17th 2013

We appreciate the fact that the developer, or their representative, has stated that they are committed to developing a project where people can live close to where they work, and that the project will provide living spaces affordable to the people who have the jobs being created by the commercial and institutional sectors of the project. We are asking that this assurance be made specific as part of the PDD rezoning approval and as part of the subsequent Development Agreement.

We thank the Pittsboro Town Board for their thoughtful attention to this very important matter.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Scott".

David Scott
President of the Board of Directors
Chatham Habitat for Humanity
Pittsboro NC.

7/19/2013

Hello Good Commissioners and Mayor

I am writing in regards to the proposed designation of Chatham Park as a PDD. While this makes sense in that it may be very difficult for any development of this size to proceed without granted freedom from zoning restrictions it does bring up the question of what the town will receive from this bargain and how it will affect the existing commercial well being of 'Old Pittsboro'.

Also there are questions of fairness and commercial advantage this acquiescence will grant Chatham Park over existing property and any new development outside of their zone. As a local developer, business owner, and resident I would like to see a fair reciprocal commitment from Chatham Park to the town and its existing commerce.

Chatham Park should buy the town downtown land for a parking garage and pay to have it built with the proceeds from parking going to the town. Like the municipal parking garages you see in Chapel Hill and Ashville (those come to mind).

Also it would be nice for some type of fees that could go in to a general town fund for landscaping and beautification of all existing commercial areas. (sidewalks, lighting, plants, mini gardens, etc.- thus making our existing commercial areas more attractive)

Zero setback and the provision for Chatham Park, in time, to deviate from the current zoning parking requirements we must meet will be significant advantages.

For example I have a building in a C-2 zone and recently wanted to expand it by 1200 sq feet for a small bicycle shop. I could not act on this due to parking requirements. It may be worth reevaluating all existing commercial zonings and adopting flexibility within the parking requirements to give existing commercial property an equal chance. I do not mean have no oversight or expectation of quality development but a very clear zoning double standard will be a tough burden and demoralizing to the commercial pioneers whom you currently represent. I realize this may not be technically a zoning double standard but it will effectively be one if Chatham Park can hand out C-4 zoning at will (no parking requirement and zero setback).

I am not apposed to Chatham Park being granted PDD status if we ensure there is fairness to the existing town and we receive a great deal from them. We are in the driver's seat as they have bought the land and need us (the town) to grant them access to develop it. Please be cautious, smart, and do not be afraid to ask for a good deal.

Best and thanks
Steve Carr

433 W Salisbury St
23 Rectory St
89 Hillsboro St
The City Tap, Carr Amplifiers, General Boy Real Estate

Alice Lloyd

From: Stuart Bass [swbass@pittsboronc.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2013 2:31 PM
To: 'Alice Lloyd'
Subject: FW: Letter from a concerned citizen

From: Tracy Lynn [mailto:tracylynnconsulting@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 9:31 AM
To: swbass@pittsboronc.gov
Subject: Letter from a concerned citizen

Dear Mr. Bass,

I am writing you today as concerned citizen. The Commissioners are being asked to approve a joint document (Monday) for the Chatham Park rezoning that includes the Master Plan and PDD. The documents that were made available to the public in May did not disclose a process for public review and to date, only one public input session has taken place. The Planning Board refused to accept public comments at their last meeting and has recommended that the rezoning be passed up to the Commissioners to vote on. Updated comments from that board, or from the Planning Department, have not been published to my knowledge.

The documents (Master Plan and PDD) fail to include a number of important measures that protect Pittsboro's best interests. If the Commissioners approve this document, they are committing to a vague understanding of the impacts that the new development will impose upon our community. One issue is that of affordable housing. I understand that a Development Agreement will outline how that might be phased in, but the Master Plan and PDD make absolutely no mention of it, thereby absolving Chatham Park from implementing housing that meets our current and future demand for it.

Inclusionary zoning is practically illegal. The Master Plan and PDD *must* address this important issue. If we do not make demands for all levels of workforce, middle, and low income affordable housing in the new Pittsboro ETJ, we are doing a disservice to the community, and our future.

I ask that the Town slow the process down and consider hiring an outside consultant who can help us establish procedures for input that is fair and reasonable, without preventing Chatham Park from moving forward with some of their projects.

A task force of experienced professionals in the housing and services industry has assembled to review Development Agreement language specific to affordable housing and has consulted with the UNC School of Government on these issues. We would enjoy the opportunity to support the Planning Department in a way that you deem fit, so that we may all engage in the discussion about the critical need for housing as the Town of Pittsboro grows, exponentially.

Housing must be clearly described in the Master Plan/PDD with specifics outlined in the Development Agreement. Thank you for your attention to this very critical matter.

Sincerely,

Tracy Lynn

57 Thelma Sugg Lane

Pittsboro, NC 27312

919-533-6704

tracylynnconsulting@nc.rr.com

Alice Lloyd

From: Stuart Bass [swbass@pittsboronc.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2013 2:31 PM
To: 'Alice Lloyd'
Subject: FW: Letter from a concerned citizen

From: Tracy Lynn [mailto:tracylynnconsulting@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 9:31 AM
To: swbass@pittsboronc.gov
Subject: Letter from a concerned citizen

Dear Mr. Bass,

I am writing you today as concerned citizen. The Commissioners are being asked to approve a joint document (Monday) for the Chatham Park rezoning that includes the Master Plan and PDD. The documents that were made available to the public in May did not disclose a process for public review and to date, only one public input session has taken place. The Planning Board refused to accept public comments at their last meeting and has recommended that the rezoning be passed up to the Commissioners to vote on. Updated comments from that board, or from the Planning Department, have not been published to my knowledge.

The documents (Master Plan and PDD) fail to include a number of important measures that protect Pittsboro's best interests. If the Commissioners approve this document, they are committing to a vague understanding of the impacts that the new development will impose upon our community. One issue is that of affordable housing. I understand that a Development Agreement will outline how that might be phased in, but the Master Plan and PDD make absolutely no mention of it, thereby absolving Chatham Park from implementing housing that meets our current and future demand for it.

Inclusionary zoning is practically illegal. The Master Plan and PDD *must* address this important issue. If we do not make demands for all levels of workforce, middle, and low income affordable housing in the new Pittsboro ETJ, we are doing a disservice to the community, and our future.

I ask that the Town slow the process down and consider hiring an outside consultant who can help us establish procedures for input that is fair and reasonable, without preventing Chatham Park from moving forward with some of their projects.

A task force of experienced professionals in the housing and services industry has assembled to review Development Agreement language specific to affordable housing and has consulted with the UNC School of Government on these issues. We would enjoy the opportunity to support the Planning Department in a way that you deem fit, so that we may all engage in the discussion about the critical need for housing as the Town of Pittsboro grows, exponentially.

7/19/2013

Hello Good Commissioners and Mayor

I am writing in regards to the proposed designation of Chatham Park as a PDD. While this makes sense in that it may be very difficult for any development of this size to proceed without granted freedom from zoning restrictions it does bring up the question of what the town will receive from this bargain and how it will affect the existing commercial well being of 'Old Pittsboro'.

Also there are questions of fairness and commercial advantage this acquiescence will grant Chatham Park over existing property and any new development outside of their zone. As a local developer, business owner, and resident I would like to see a fair reciprocal commitment from Chatham Park to the town and its existing commerce.

Chatham Park should buy the town downtown land for a parking garage and pay to have it built with the proceeds from parking going to the town. Like the municipal parking garages you see in Chapel Hill and Ashville (those come to mind).

Also it would be nice for some type of fees that could go in to a general town fund for landscaping and beautification of all existing commercial areas. (sidewalks, lighting, plants, mini gardens, etc.- thus making our existing commercial areas more attractive)

Zero setback and the provision for Chatham Park, in time, to deviate from the current zoning parking requirements we must meet will be significant advantages.

For example I have a building in a C-2 zone and recently wanted to expand it by 1200 sq feet for a small bicycle shop. I could not act on this due to parking requirements. It may be worth reevaluating all existing commercial zonings and adopting flexibility within the parking requirements to give existing commercial property an equal chance. I do not mean have no oversight or expectation of quality development but a very clear zoning double standard will be a tough burden and demoralizing to the commercial pioneers whom you currently represent. I realize this may not be technically a zoning double standard but it will effectively be one if Chatham Park can hand out C-4 zoning at will (no parking requirement and zero setback).

I am not apposed to Chatham Park being granted PDD status if we ensure there is fairness to the existing town and we receive a great deal from them. We are in the driver's seat as they have bought the land and need us (the town) to grant them access to develop it. Please be cautious, smart, and do not be afraid to ask for a good deal.

Best and thanks
Steve Carr

433 W Salisbury St
23 Rectory St
89 Hillsboro St
The City Tap, Carr Amplifiers, General Boy Real Estate



July 18, 2013

Dear Mayor Voller and the Pittsboro Commissioners:

I am writing you today as President of the Chatham County Community Development Corporation, a non-profit organization focused on building a prosperous and sustainable future for all people in Chatham County, including those typically underserved and overlooked. Affordable housing is a key strategy for our organization and we believe that the proposed Chatham Park presents both a critical opportunity and a huge responsibility for the Town of Pittsboro – to ensure that this development provides significant housing for low- and moderate-income families. Consequently, the CCDC is very concerned that there is no mention of affordable housing in the project's Master Plan and proposed Planning Development District (PDD).

We urge the Pittsboro Board of Commissioners to take the following actions:

1. Ensure that effective plans for affordable housing have been addressed in the developer's Master Plan before approving their rezoning request. A minimum requirement should be that 15% of all residential units in Chatham Park are affordable to people earning 80% of median income or less and that at least a quarter of those units are affordable to those who earn 50% of median or below. Both resident-owned and rental housing should be included.
2. Negotiate a Development Agreement with the developer that clearly spells out their responsibilities for complying with affordable housing requirements and that reflects both best practices in the affordable housing field as well as a deep understanding of the needs and challenges of Chatham County.
3. Slow down this approval process to ensure that the town is fully considering the implications of Chatham Park for all citizens, has adequate expertise and fully gives the public opportunities to participate in these very important decisions.

The Chatham CDC would be happy to help the Town develop appropriate affordable housing language for both the Master Plan and Development Agreement. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Carl Thompson, Sr.

Carl Thompson, Sr.
President