

Lynn Richardson

From: Angela Darrow Flynn [aflynn1@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 12:10 PM
To: Lynn.richardson@ncmail.net
Subject: Possibly spam: proposed Parkers Springs
Importance: High

To: Chatham County Planning Board
Subject: proposed Parkers Springs development

October 27, 2006

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to address some concerns that our family has regarding the proposed Parkers Springs development off of Hatley Road. Our property is immediately adjacent to this development and we are very concerned about the impact that such a high density sub-division would have on our quality of life and the woodland environment we live within.

- 1) Our first concern is privacy. The proposed development has no buffer between the proposed development and adjacent properties. This means that it is theoretically possible for the developer to clear to the property line, thus destroying our sense of privacy and rural tranquility. Of particular note would be the buffers that are required around the entire perimeter of each lot in Monteranne and the buffers around the entire perimeter of the development going in on the Cooper property east of the proposed Parkers Springs that have been voluntarily adopted. How ironic that our neighborhoods could provide buffers to protect privacy and provide visual screening and then have our solitude punctuated by a high-density development dropped between us.
- 2) Our second concern is the environmental impact on Parkers Creek. This area of the county is classified as PSW-IV. In addition to the protected watershed status, Parker's Creek has been identified as an impaired waterway and is a major feeder into Jordan Lake, likewise impaired. Parkers Springs development intends to place 7 homes directly on Parkers Creek with only the minimum 50' buffer. That would seem unwise, irresponsible and not consistent with the 100' buffers that exist in Monteranne and will also exist in the new development to the east.
- 3) Our third concern is related to the proposed septic fields in the development. The developer's sketch shows 15 lots with off-site septic fields, suggesting poor soil quality. In conversation with me, Mr. Ammons asserts that no lots will have off-site fields, contradicting the plan he has filed with the county. This does call into question exactly what the intention is in this regard. To propose a development with more than 25% of the homes having off-site fields suggests that the density of the development is clearly over-reaching the soil's ability to support the waste removal needs. A personal concern generated by this issue is our own swimming pool which is approximately 100' from our property line and the proposed site of the off-site septic fields. While that distance greatly exceeds the code minimums for distance between pool and septic field, can anyone really address what the appropriate distance should be between a pool and MULTIPLE septic fields, as Parkers Springs would be? We are incredibly concerned about our pool being downhill from up to 15 off-site septic fields and possible contamination with human waste. In the event of failure of any one of those fields, what would one serious rain mean to our family's health and well-being? What does this mean to Parkers Creek, also in close proximity and downhill from these proposed fields?
- 4) Our final concern is density. The zoning of RA-40 for that property has remained unchanged for over 30 years and would seem grossly out of date with the environmental concerns that currently exist and the nature of the surrounding properties. The environmental concern is highlighted by the RA-5 zoning for most of Monteranne and the RA-90 zoning for the Cooper property. The density of the development is out of sync with the other properties around it and detracts from their privacy and sense of rural tranquility. This rural lifestyle is what draw families to Chatham County and should be

Lynn Richardson

From: Laura Chism [chism1@madisonriver.net]
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2006 3:34 PM
To: 'lynn.richardson@ncmail.net'
Subject: Proposed development - Parkers Springs

To Whom it May Concern,

We wish to express our concern about the proposed development, Parker Springs, off Mt Gilead Church Road. We live in Monteranne and our property is immediately adjacent to this development. We are very concerned about the loss of privacy that could result in this high density proposal. The developer has no plans for buffer between the development and adjacent property. The possibility that he could clear cut is very disturbing, to say the least.

In addition to privacy concerns, we are concerned about the environmental impact on Parkers Creek. I believe the proposed map indicates 7 lots on Parkers Creek, which as you know, has been identified as an impaired waterway. The proposed buffer of 50' is half of what the Monteranne buffer is at 100'. With the additional developments along Big Woods, such as Homestead and Legacy, Parkers Creek is becoming more and more vulnerable to pollution, run off etc....all of which is pouring into our water source at Jordan Lake.

Another major concern we have is the density of this proposal. What are the requirements surrounding RA-40 zoning with regard to perk testing? Is this property currently zoned as RA-40 and have perk tests already been done to show the soil could support this number of homes? Are there requirements as to each lot having to "perk" in order to build? The lot outline we received from the Planning Department shows 19 lots that would have off site septic and yet the developer told my neighbor that there would be no off site septic. Which is true? And if there is off site septic, where will that field(s) be? We have not worked as hard as we have to have our little slice of tranquility and peace in the forest only to have a mini waste removal plant in our backyard. If the proposed map is correct at 19 out of 50 lots, is that to say that 38% of the homes are on lots that won't perk? How can that be acceptable?

I understand that Mr. Ammons has won awards by the Home Builders Association of Raleigh Wake County (HBARWC). The 2005 president of HBARWC was quoted as saying "Rusty was very instrumental in working on the City of Raleigh tree ordinance, the impervious soil regulations with Wake County, and many other issues....". How ironic that this same developer is proposing a development in which there are no buffers between adjacent properties and in which the septic requirements are unclear at best. I'm sure that the developments Mr. Ammons won his awards for in Wake County are lovely, however, this is not Wake County, nor do we aspire for it to become Wake County. We are in Chatham county for a reason and part of that reason is the quality of life that comes with living in a low density, rural area. Mr. Ammons needs to be respectful of the concerns of the land owners he is affecting with this development.

We respectfully request that an independent environmental impact study be done prior to any approvals on this development. The development's potential impact to Parkers Creek certainly warrants this impact study. We also request that the Planning Board demand from this developer reconsideration on the number of lots in the development, the addition of buffers, and a clearer picture of the septic plan.

Thank you,

Tim & Laura Davis
213 Foxglove Drive
Pittsboro, NC 27312