

Lynn Richardson

From: Cynthia Rylander Crossen [crossen@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2007 11:21 AM
To: Sally Kost Planning Board; Jim Hinkley Planning Board; Karl Ernst Planning Board; Evelyn Cross Planning Board; Judy Sharman Planning Board; Lynn Richardson Planning Board; Keith Megginson Planning Board; Clyde Harris Planning Board; Delcenia Turner Planning Board; Barbara Ford Planning Board
Cc: Carl Thompson BOC; George Lucier BOC; Patrick Barnes BOC; Mike Cross BOC; Tom Vanderbeck BOC; County Manager Office; HRA
Subject: Crossen Comments on The Glens (formerly McBane) development
Attachments: Crossen Comments to PB & BOC about The Glens (McBane Dev).doc; HRA Comments on McBane and Woodlands Developments.doc

To: Chatham County Planning Board; Keith Megginson; Lynn Richardson
Cc: Chatham County Board of Commissioners; Haw River Assembly
From: Cynthia and Ken Crossen, 1116 Marshall Road, Pittsboro, NC 27312
Date: February 27, 2007
Re: Comments on The Glens (McBane Development)

We are adjacent landowners to the proposed development The Glens (former McBane property), and have lived on our land since October 1975. We have felt very blessed to have enjoyed so many years in rural Chatham County.

We made the following comments in July 2006, to the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners, before Sketch Approval of The Glens, which is now before you for Preliminary Approval. To those comments, we have added digital photographs and additional comments about the streams on the proposed The Glens development, which flow onto our property.

We are not happy about the McBane development proposed for our north border, which joins all the other development planned all around us. We now face—without going anywhere—living in a built-up, Cary-like area with more residents than Pittsboro, and none of the amenities. Instead, all the “amenities” we currently treasure—and why we moved here 31 years ago-- will be in jeopardy.

Some of the things we have loved most about being here are: its rural pastoral character, the quiet peace and serenity of it, beautiful healthy creeks, dark nights for star watching, relaxed driving, fresh air. All of these things which have made up the fabric of our life here are now threatened by this and other proposed growth in our area. We don't want the light pollution, water pollution, noise, and traffic that another development will bring.

We are concerned not only with the proposed development on our border, but the cumulative effect of all of the development already approved, and planned, for the area within the several miles surrounding us. Here are the major points of our concern:

Environmental Impact. In July of 2006, we requested that an Environmental Impact Statement be required of The Glens developers, as per Chatham County Subdivision Regulations 5.2. The Board of Commissioners at that time approved the development without requiring such a statement. We renew our request that an EIS be required of the developers before preliminary approval of The Glens is considered.

Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams Need Protection: Most of the water that flows across our property originates on The Glens development, in the form of several ephemeral, possibly intermittent, streams. (Ephemeral streams flow in times of rainfall, but are dry once the rain has drained from the area. Intermittent streams have running water in them for much of the year, but dry up in the driest summer months.) Once on our land, these ephemeral streams form an intermittent stream of 6 to 10 feet wide and 1 to 3 feet deep, and is indicated as an intermittent stream on our topographic map. In fact, the streams on The Glens land may be intermittent before they flow onto our land (see photos). Our intermittent stream flows into Dry Creek just slightly downstream of the tributary that drains into Dry Creek from Chapel Ridge.

On The Glens development, these streams are not designated as such, but simply a "drainage area". No setbacks from this "drainage area" have been added within the development.

As you can see from the photos below, a significant amount of water drains from The Glens development through these ephemeral/intermittent streams. I took these photos this January 9, 2007, within a few days after a rain. Each photo shows a different stream. The vantage points look from the north border of our property toward The Glens property (the development's south border with us), upstream of three streams originating on The Glens property. My concern is that these ephemeral/intermittent streams, of which there are several, be adequately protected from non-point source pollution.







An inspection of The Glens property for stream and wetlands delineation was done in June 2006 by S&EC and an Army Corps evaluator, and no streams were designated at that time. We are concerned that a full assessment cannot be done during a dry period. Before The Glens development plan is approved, a thorough wetlands delineation should be made after a rain event. Stream locations should be noted at this time, and these stream courses should be taken into account when roads and houses are sited. Due to the considerable water these streams carry, setbacks from these ephemeral and intermittent streams should be required, in order to protect them from non-point source pollution. In addition, the development's sediment erosion control plan should take these streams into account, and provide the proper controls during construction, such that these streams are protected. Keeping our streams healthy and unpolluted should be of the highest priority.

In summary: these ephemeral and intermittent streams carry a lot of water, and need to be protected from non-point source pollution from the development--both in the building of it, and in its ongoing residential use.

Impact to Dry Creek: Some of you have seen me (Cynthia Crossen) come before this board to advocate for clean creeks and rivers. With HRA director Elaine Chiosso, I monitored Dry Creek for nearly 10 years, finding it to have, except in times of severe drought, good to excellent water quality. Since the building of Chapel Ridge, our monitoring shows poor water quality in Dry Creek. In fact, despite being

assured that the building of Chapel Ridge would not significantly impact the creek, we have seen sediment violations and fines issued to Chapel Ridge for major sedimentation erosion pollution. The proposed The Glens development would further threaten the water quality of Dry Creek, already listed as impaired by the North Carolina Division of Water Quality.

One of the feeder streams that up to now has brought clean water into Dry Creek is the intermittent/perennial stream that drain The Glens, our land, and the Cheek land (closest to Dry Creek). During times of rainfall, our stream carries a lot of water into Dry Creek. Our concern is (1) the additional sediment from The Glens development construction, and (2) pollution runoff from homes and yards after buildout. With the impervious surfaces that The Glens development will bring, I believe that its ephemeral streams, if not already intermittent streams, will become intermittent streams—we should require setbacks now to protect their water.

The dramatic increase in impervious surfaces will cause increased stormwater runoff, increasing the likelihood of flooding. An additional estimated 27,500 gallons of waste water per day from The Glens Development will go into the spraywater system at Chapel Ridge, increasing potential nutrient runoff into Dry Creek.

Please refer to the letter from the Haw River Assembly about the McBane (attached) and the Woodlands developments, which provides detailed information about impacts to Dry Creek, and which supports our request for an environmental impact statement.

Traffic: Old Graham Road is curvy and not wide, and numerous fatalities have occurred on it. The McBane development will add to the traffic load on Old Graham Road. Taking into account all of the currently proposed development, Ramey Kemp & Associates estimate that the current traffic of 510 vehicles per day will increase to 6,000 vehicles per day. We do not believe that the designation of Old Graham Road as safe for 8,000 to 9,000 vehicle trips per day is correct. Few of us who routinely drive this road would agree with this assurance of safety.

Schools: High school students would be going to Northwood High School, which is already overcrowded.

We want growth to be slow and consistent with the current rural character of this place, rather than coming in the form of a town larger than Pittsboro. We want to protect surface and ground water quality from pollution in the form of sediment, fertilizer and pesticide runoff, improper functioning of the waste water system, and storm water runoff from impermeable surfaces. We want Old Graham Road to remain a safe place to drive, even to walk and bicycle. We want Chatham's schools to be adequate for its population. We want to keep light and noise pollution in this country setting to a minimum. We are very concerned about the cumulative effect of all the rapid development planned for our home.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns with this board.

Cynthia and Ken Crossen
1116 Marshall Road, Pittsboro, NC 27312
542-3827 (h); 967-2500 (w); crossen@mindspring.com