

## Jason Sullivan

---

**From:** Lynn Richardson  
**Sent:** Friday, December 05, 2008 11:59 AM  
**To:** Jason Sullivan  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on The Glens' Request for Timetable Extension  
**Attachments:** Crossen Comments to BOC about McBane Dev\_july 2006.pdf; Crossen Comments to PB & BOC about The Glens \_Feb\_2007.pdf; Stream Delineation April 3 2007 John Dorney DWQ.pdf

Jason, please post to The Glens, extension request.

---

**From:** Cynthia Crossen [mailto:crossen@mindspring.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 02, 2008 12:33 PM  
**To:** Keith Megginson; Lynn Richardson; Carl Thompson BOC; Liz Marcum; Karl Ernst Planning Board  
**Subject:** Comments on The Glens' Request for Timetable Extension

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: December 1, 2008  
Re: Comments on The Glens' Request for Timetable Extension

We are adjacent landowners to the proposed development The Glens, and have lived on our land since October 1975. We have made comments on this development to the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners, in July 2006 before Sketch Approval of The Glens; and on February 27, 2007 and April 16, 2007 before Preliminary Approval. (I have attached these comments to this email.)

A significant amount of water flows from the Glens onto our property, in the form of several ephemeral streams (creating some wetlands areas) and an intermittent stream. This water eventually reaches Dry Creek, which is listed on the State's Impaired Waters 303-d list. Dry Creek flows into the Haw River several miles upstream of the Pittsboro drinking water intake near Bynum. Our goal is to keep the currently clean water carried by these creeks as clean as possible during and after development.

**We believe that the developers of the Glens should *not* be granted an extension of the currently approved development plan.** We were not in favor of the original development design, as we did not feel it adequately protected its creeks. I have talked with Nick Robinson, and he has told me that the developers intend to add 50' of buffering on the currently unbuffered ephemeral creek that flows onto our land. This redesign is appreciated. However, it still does not make the design plan a suitable one for this site in the Dry Creek watershed.

**We are in favor of a *redesign* that would protect the creeks better than the current plan does.** Such a redesign, however, should go through the current subdivision requirements. Given that this subdivision is part of an already threatened watershed, an Environmental Impact Assessment should be required. In addition, the subdivision should comply with the new Watershed Protection Ordinance's stream and wetlands buffering requirements, the new stormwater ordinance, and the revised soil erosion and sedimentation control ordinance.

This development was approved at a time when there were much less protective ordinances, and no Environmental Review Board to look closely at the impacts of a development like this one on the environment. It is in the best interests of the environment, as well as the health of streams flowing onto the Crossen land, for

this development to be redesigned, and to be resubmitted for approval under the county's current environmental protections and resources.

Thank you for your consideration.