

# ATTACHMENT 1

*“Supplemental Discussion Document”*

**For Feedback From the Board of Commissioners at the  
Tuesday, February 25, 2003 Joint Discussion with LUPIC**

## LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

### SUPPLEMENTAL DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

In early February, the Land Use Plan Implementation Committee (LUPIC) published a series of 92 items for consideration and recommendation in its *Compact Community Considerations / Recommendations* document. More critical, and potentially controversial recommendations were summarized on pages 8 and 9 of the document, under the title Primary Recommendations.

The purpose of the document was to instill public dialog, debate, and feedback on compact community issues and directives noted in the adopted Land Conservation and Development Plan. To this end, the document and ensuing public feedback forums and opportunities have been successful.

As expected, several of the more critical considerations/recommendations garnered the most diverse comment. LUPIC continues to encourage detailed public comment that seeks workable alternatives to the objectives set out in the list of initial ideas presented on pages 8 and 9 of the *Compact Community Considerations / Recommendations* document. From the public comment and individual feedback, LUPIC identified the most critical issues (Tier I issues) in need of further discussion. On February 21, LUPIC spent extensive time reviewing the comments and determining, by majority, its consensus position on these issues. LUPIC expects individual members to have opinions that differ from the consensus position and has encouraged members to express minority viewpoints at the upcoming meeting with the Board of Commissioners. As has been the practice open debate and diverse opinions are considered valuable in developing the final ordinance. Any reference to consensus in the comments on Attachment 1 is defined as a consensus position of the majority.

Issues are grouped into two categories, Tier I and Tier II. Tier I is viewed by LUPIC as the most critical and as having garnered the most diverse comment. With these items, LUPIC revisited its position to clearly determine its justification for the preferred considerations / recommendations and whether or not these items fall within the defined objectives of the adopted Land Conservation and Development Plan. Tier II issues are considered important as well, but with limited discussion time in the work session they may not be as critical to completing a draft ordinance for public comment on March 17<sup>th</sup>.

The following, in no particular order, is a list of review criteria that LUPIC members agree are necessary throughout the public input process.

- Is *adequate justification* available to defend one's position on a given issue? This pertains to both the considerations / recommendations and to feedback offered by the public.
- Does the issue allow for a compact community that presents *environmental viability*?
- Does the issue allow for *economic viability* for both the compact community and the County?
- Does the issue allow for a compact community to be *physically possible*, given the size of a tract and the acreage requirements the issue may or may not demand?

### TIER I Issues

**Maximum tract size of 1,000 acres, allowing an additional 10 percent more for commercial use, resulting in a total maximum tract size of 1,100 acres.**

Members discussed flexibility in the acreage formula that ranged from requiring no maximum to allowing some range for the maximum acreage size. The consensus of LUPIC members, however, was to leave the recommendation unchanged.

Necessary justification can be found in the Land Conservation and Development Plan (LCDP), page 26, "Chatham County will limit the overall size of the project if it will compromise the walkability, accessibility, and community feel of the project. In general, such developments will probably range from 400 to 1,000 acres." Additional justification provided in Triangle J research suggesting that people are more likely to choose biking when traveling a distance of ¾ mile or less and more likely to choose walking when traveling a distance of ¼ mile or less. In order to achieve these average distance statistics on a development tract after setting aside acreage for road rights of way, stream buffers, spray irrigation areas, and open space set asides, the development should resemble the recommended maximum size of 1,100 gross acres. The group's general assumptions on set-aside acreage are documented on the attached spreadsheet.

The group also noted that these limitations coupled with other recommendations should provide sufficient scale for successful mixed-use development. The group relied on comparison to the compact communities of Meadowmont and Southern Village. With an estimated 1,500 homes, such a community is comparable to the housing scale in these communities.

#### **Density recommendation of 2.0 residential units per acre.**

Recommending 2.0 units per acre is in conflict with the adopted Watershed Protection Ordinance, which provides for maximum 1.0 units per 40,000 square feet, nearly an acre, including clustered development. Other comments suggested that 2.0 per acre were insufficient.

The group discussed permitting densities that might only be governed by the limitations placed on the tract of land by soil quality for wastewater, impervious surface limits, and adequate facilities in the form of highway and school capacity. It was suggested that, with greater density, and its impact on infrastructure, wastewater spray systems, etc., it would be advisable to increase permitted densities one step at a time. The County may choose to move forward as it learns about the risks of testing the limits of soils and of the true impact greater densities may have on the County's infrastructure and services.

The current recommendation from the LUPIC group is a density of 2.0 residential units per net acre over the entire tract. Net acreage is defined consistent with the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance. The formula starts with the total tract proposed for the project and removes proposed road rights of way, wetland and floodable areas, and existing bodies of water greater than 1 acre in size. The formula typically results in removing 25% to 30% of the tract's acreage for purposes of calculating the permitted density.

In the case of a maximum site of 1,000 acres, allowable density is calculated on an estimated 700 to 750 acres. This results in the potential for 1,400 to 1,500 units. After removing the necessary acreage for spray irrigation, open space acreage, buffers, and donated sites for public facilities, LUPIC estimates densities of 5 to 7 units per acre in the "actual residential built-upon area". These densities are similar to Meadowmont and Southern Village densities.

The group agreed to note a possible exception to the recommended maximum density. The Board may wish to investigate language that allows a developer to achieve higher densities than 2.0 units per net acre when the developer is successful sending wastewater to a municipality for treatment for reuse. These circumstances would limit the risk to water quality provided that the developer succeeds in keeping impervious surface limits below the required level of 24 percent as outlined in the Watershed Protection Ordinance.

#### **Calculating permitted density based on a net acreage formula as described above.**

Members discussed switching the recommended formula for calculating densities from one based on the net acreage to one based on the gross acreage. Switching to gross acres, it was argued, would provide a finite maximum on the number of residential units, potentially relieving public concerns about the maximum size of the development, then permit the science of the soil limitations, impervious surface limitations, and infrastructure limitations to restrict the density on a gross tract of land.

The group agreed that the net formula for calculating density in the current zoning ordinance is sufficient justification for relying on a net formula to calculate density in a compact communities ordinance.

**Two-mile separation.** The consensus was that justification rests with language in the adopted Land Conservation and Development Plan, which states, "Require a minimum separation distance between each compact community and zone the intervening areas between each compact community for R/A use." (Land Conservation and Development Plan, pg. 26)

In an effort to respond to concerns over property rights, LUPIC opted not to recommend "down zoning" land surrounding compact communities which would result in a loss of the current permitted uses of 1 unit per acre with public water. Instead, the group recommended establishing a two-mile separation between communities while leaving the remaining area currently zoned.

The rationale for selecting two miles as the required separation is based somewhat on the group's feel for an appropriate distance combined with the need to maintain lower densities in between communities. The group had some discussion about implementing the two-mile distance requirement only on one side of the four-lane highway. This would allow two compact communities as defined herein to mirror each other. The group's consensus was to leave the distance requirement of two miles in place regardless of location. The two-mile requirement is defined by driving distance. The group deferred the question of whether the requirement should be grandfathered against existing communities (Fearrington) and asked that the Board of Commissioners discuss this issue.

#### **Location of compact communities within 1 mile of a four-lane highway**

While the current location requirement of locating a community within 1 miles of a four-lane highway has not drawn significant controversy, the group's consensus is that the issue is critical to the drafting of the ordinance for March 17<sup>th</sup> public comment. The requirement originated from the objective of locating higher densities to accommodate increased traffic with the use of major thoroughfares. The Board of Commissioners may desire to discuss the issue further.

#### **Location of the commercial uses of the Compact Community.**

The group's consensus in that any ordinance should offer flexibility for locating the commercial uses of the compact community provided these uses meet the criteria of pedestrian accessibility and accessibility to the compact community. The group also discussed encouraging the use of every available alternative transportation facility for use within the community including but not limited to bike paths and the possibility of allowing golf carts on roads within the community.

#### **Requiring a set-aside for passive open space of 30 percent.**

The group decided that the 30 percent requirement is appropriate based on other community ordinances and is in line with the previously proposed Briar Chapel project. The requirement forces the clustering of the community onto the buildable acres, consistent with the ideals of compact communities.

#### **The passive open space set-aside requirement is currently 30 percent. A maximum of 20 percent of this set-aside can be used for spray irrigation.**

The group's consensus was that the 20 percent maximum allowable acreage for spray irrigation on the required open space set-asides is reasonable based on comparable standards that are suggest acreage designated for spray irrigation should be supplemented by undisturbed open spaces not only for passive uses but also as a safety factor. This requirement also encourages more open space in the development and allows for a large area of preserved open space that is free of spray irrigation from the wastewater system. The group discussed the possibility of totally separating spray areas from passive open space requirements, thus, preserving the entirety the open space set aside based on the reasons laid out above. The group returned to the 20 percent requirement as a compromise.

#### **Wastewater requirements more stringent than state regulation**

Water quality science supports the recommended wastewater parameters. Questions of the County's legal authority to rely on higher standards exist and should be investigated thoroughly, but LUPIC recommends the stated requirements under the belief that they are within the County's legal boundaries.

### **Stream buffer widths in excess of 50 ft and up to 150 ft**

Research indicates that, for purposes of protecting against sedimentation, an average of 150 ft is more effective than 100 ft. The group did agree that the 150 ft recommendation could be reduced to 100 ft when a developer employs the use of at-source controls. This recommendation applies to perennial and intermittent streams and, thereby, allows for better flood control protection in areas of higher density. Finally, the recommendation increases habitats for wildlife.

The group's consensus was to remove the 50 ft requirement in the current draft specific to the protection of ephemeral streams. The group agreed that water quality issues on ephemeral streams could be better addressed through Best Management Practices (BMP) in the stormwater control section.

**Wastewater spray fields must be within the boundaries of the compact community.** This requirement facilitates the density/clustering of the compact community. It also supplements open space around the built upon area. In addition, concerns have been expressed that treatment outside the confines of the community, with the exception of wastewater management through an existing municipal wastewater treatment facility, can impact the surrounding communities, rather than the community that is being served. Responsibility must remain within the community.

### **Limiting wastewater treatment capacity only to the needs of one designated compact community.**

In situations where wastewater treatment is managed through spray treatment, it is recommended that the system be designed to accommodate only the community. The proposed community scale is sufficient for economies of operation. Providing the capability for other communities would require the design of the system, up front, including establishing and identifying spray irrigation land. This will further minimize the flexibility and use of the property for the proposed community.

**Allowing homeowners to continue to use existing wells only for drinking water purposes.** The group agreed to remove the reference to the use of wells in this section and instead insert language that encourages conservation and reuse of water wherever possible.

## **Tier II Issues**

- **Examination of the economic and physical impact of the community on the County and its infrastructure** and a determination of the need for **exactions and infrastructure improvements** to offset this impact. Examples include transportation improvements resulting from an analysis of traffic impact and donated recreation, library, and school sites resulting from the need to establish public uses and activity centers. Neighborhood activity centers are encouraged in the adopted Land Conservation and Development Plan, pages 26 and 28.
- **Design criteria**, e.g. porches, building size, design, etc. required by the approved Land Conservation and Development Plan, page 27. Design recommendations subject to public input and BOC direction.
- **Affordable housing** should be integrated inside of the community and should represent 5% based on the definition of affordable housing, provided by HUD. These may take the form of attached homes, townhouses, etc. Five percent is recommended by the Affordable Housing Coalition, and in conjunction with the Land Conservation and Development Plan, page 27, encouraging a diversity of housing types.
- **Water Quality Board.** With increased dependence on spray treatment and critical protection of water and groundwater, the County needs support in review of projects.
- Support for **energy conservation and renewable energy**.

# INTERACTIVE COMPACT COMMUNITY MODEL

Prepared for Chatham County by the Triangle J Council of Governments

(Draft, 2/21/03)

	A	B	C
1	<b>PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>CURRENT DRAFT</b>	<b>SCENARIO #2</b>
2	<b>Project Size and Allowable Units</b>		
3	Max. acreage available for residential development	1,000	1,000
4	Max. additional acreage available for commercial development	100	100
5	Max. allowable site acreage	1,100	1,100
6	Est. % of site in right of way, water, wetlands, floodplain, etc.	30%	20%
7	Net buildable acres for residential	700	800
8	Max. allowable dwelling units per net acre	2.0	2.0
9	Max. allowable dwelling units	1,400	1,600
10	Gross density (d.u./acre)	1.3	1.5
11	<b>Open Space/Recreation</b>		
12	% passive open space required	30%	30%
13	Passive open space land required (acres)	330	330
14	Active recreation land required (acres)	10	10
15	Estimated active rec. land that is impervious (acres)	3	3
16	% of site in water, wetlands, and buffers	20%	10%
17	Total acres in water, wetlands, and buffers	220	110
18	Max. % of passive open space that can consist of water, wetlands, buffers	100%	100%
19	Max. potential acres of water, wetlands, buffers that can be counted toward OS	330	330
20	Actual acres of water, wetlands, buffers that can be counted toward OS	220	110
21	Additional open space needed to meet passive OS requirement	110	220
22	Total water, wetlands, buffers, active rec., and other open space required (acres)	340	340
23	Net open space -- for spray calc. below (Total OS - imperv. rec. - wtr./wet./buff.)	117	227
24	<b>Wastewater Treatment (Does not include safety factor or repair area)</b>		
25	Min. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.30)	0.028	0.028
26	Med. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.03)	0.275	0.275
27	Max. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.01)	0.830	0.830
28	Spray irrigation needed per school w/cafeteria, gym, showers (in d.u. equivalent)	20.83	20.83
29	Spray irrigation needed per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial, institutional (in d.u. equiv.)	0.23	0.23
30	Est. school spray acres needed (using med. LTAR)	6	6
31	Est. other institutional spray acres needed (4 facilities X 30,000 sq. ft. ea.)	8	8
32	Est. commercial spray acres needed (using med. com. sq. ft. and med. LTAR)	20	20
33	Min. total spray acres needed	73	79
34	Med. total spray acres needed	419	474
35	Max. total spray acres needed	1,196	1,362
36	Max. % of net open space that can be sprayed	20%	20%
37	Max. net open space acres that can be sprayed	23	45
38	Med. additional spray acres needed	395	428
39	% of site required for spray irrigation	36%	39%
40	<b>Transportation</b>		
41	% of site in road right of way (acres)	10%	10%
42	Total acres	110	110
43	<b>Community Facilities</b>		
44	School site (acres)	15	15
45	Police/fire station (acres)	3	3
46	Library/community center site (acres)	5	5
47	Solid waste/recycling site (acres)	3	3
48	Total acres	26	26
49	% of site	2%	2%
50	<b>Residential Development</b>		
51	Total required acres (total open space + spray land + ROW + com. facilities)	871	904
52	Required land applied to residential portion	792	822
53	Residentially developable acres (Max. allowable res. - req. land applied to res.)	208	178
54	Max. allowable dwelling units	1,400	1,600
55	Affordable units @ 5% of allowable dwelling units	70	80
56	Net residential density (d.u./acre)	6.7	9.0
57	<b>Commercial Development</b>		
58	Required land applied to commercial portion	79	82
59	Commercially developable acres (max. allowable com. - req. land applied to com.)	21	18
60	Min. square feet of commercial (1% of site @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	215,622	215,622
61	Med. square feet of commercial (1.5% @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	323,433	323,433
62	Max. square feet of commercial (max. @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	407,409	348,603

195

**INTERACTIVE COMPACT COMMUNITY MODEL**  
**Prepared for Chatham County by the Triangle J Council of Governments**  
**(Draft, 2/21/03)**

	A	D	E
1	<b>PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>SCENARIO #3</b>	<b>SCENARIO #4</b>
2	<b>Project Size and Allowable Units</b>		
3	Max. acreage available for residential development	1,000	1,000
4	Max. additional acreage available for commercial development	100	100
5	Max. allowable site acreage	1,100	1,100
6	Est. % of site in right of way, water, wetlands, floodplain, etc.	30%	30%
7	Net buildable acres for residential	700	700
8	Max. allowable dwelling units per net acre	2.0	2.0
9	Max. allowable dwelling units	1,400	1,400
10	Gross density (d.u./acre)	1.3	1.3
11	<b>Open Space/Recreation</b>		
12	% passive open space required	30%	30%
13	Passive open space land required (acres)	330	330
14	Active recreation land required (acres)	10	10
15	Estimated active rec. land that is impervious (acres)	3	3
16	% of site in water, wetlands, and buffers	20%	20%
17	Total acres in water, wetlands, and buffers	220	220
18	Max. % of passive open space that can consist of water, wetlands, buffers	50%	50%
19	Max. potential acres of water, wetlands, buffers that can be counted toward OS	165	165
20	Actual acres of water, wetlands, buffers that can be counted toward OS	165	165
21	Additional open space needed to meet passive OS requirement	165	165
22	Total water, wetlands, buffers, active rec., and other open space required (acres)	395	395
23	Net open space -- for spray calc. below (Total OS - imperv. rec. - wtr./wet./buff.)	172	172
24	<b>Wastewater Treatment (Does not include safety factor or repair area)</b>		
25	Min. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.30)	0.028	0.028
26	Med. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.03)	0.275	0.275
27	Max. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.01)	0.830	0.830
28	Spray irrigation needed per school w/cafeteria, gym, showers (in d.u. equivalent)	20.83	20.83
29	Spray irrigation needed per 1,000 sq. ft. of commercial, institutional (in d.u. equiv.)	0.23	0.23
30	Est. school spray acres needed (using med. LTAR)	6	6
31	Est. other institutional spray acres needed (4 facilities X 30,000 sq. ft. ea.)	8	8
32	Est. commercial spray acres needed (using med. com. sq. ft. and med. LTAR)	20	20
33	Min. total spray acres needed	73	73
34	Med. total spray acres needed	419	419
35	Max. total spray acres needed	1,196	1,196
36	Max. % of net open space that can be sprayed	20%	50%
37	Max. net open space acres that can be sprayed	34	86
38	Med. additional spray acres needed	384	333
39	% of site required for spray irrigation	35%	30%
40	<b>Transportation</b>		
41	% of site in road right of way (acres)	10%	10%
42	Total acres	110	110
43	<b>Community Facilities</b>		
44	School site (acres)	15	15
45	Police/fire station (acres)	3	3
46	Library/community center site (acres)	5	5
47	Solid waste/recycling site (acres)	3	3
48	Total acres	26	26
49	% of site	2%	2%
50	<b>Residential Development</b>		
51	Total required acres (total open space + spray land + ROW + com. facilities)	915	864
52	Required land applied to residential portion	832	785
53	Residentially developable acres (Max. allowable res. - req. land applied to res.)	168	215
54	Max. allowable dwelling units	1,400	1,400
55	Affordable units @ 5% of allowable dwelling units	70	70
56	Net residential density (d.u./acre)	8.3	6.5
57	<b>Commercial Development</b>		
58	Required land applied to commercial portion	83	79
59	Commercially developable acres (max. allowable com. - req. land applied to com.)	17	21
60	Min. square feet of commercial (1% of site @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	215,622	215,622
61	Med. square feet of commercial (1.5% @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	323,433	323,433
62	Max. square feet of commercial (max. @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	329,001	420,952

**REFERENCES, ASSUMPTIONS, AND CALCULATIONS FOR INTERACTIVE MODEL**

Prepared for Chatham County by the Triangle J Council of Governments

(Draft 2/21/03)

	A	B	C
	<b>PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>CURRENT DRAFT</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b>
1	<b>PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS</b>		
2	<b>Project Size and Allowable Units</b>		
3	Max. acreage available for residential development	1,000	Draft Primary Recommendation I (p.8)
4	Max. additional acreage available for commercial development	100	Draft Primary Rec. II (p.8)
5	Max. allowable site acreage	1,100	= B3 + B4
6	Est. % of site in right of way, water, wetlands, floodplain, etc.	30%	= B16 + B41
7	Net buildable acres for residential	700	= (1-B6) x B3
8	Max. allowable dwelling units per net acre	2.0	Draft Primary Rec. IV (p.8)
9	Max. allowable dwelling units	1,400	= B7 x B8
10	Gross density (d.u./acre)	1.3	= B9/B5
11	<b>Open Space/Recreation</b>		
12	% passive open space required	30%	Draft Rec. #31 (p.16)
13	Passive open space land required (acres)	330	= B12 x B5
14	Active recreation land required (acres)	10	Draft Rec. #78 (p.23)
15	Estimated active rec. land that is impervious (acres)	3	assumption
16	% of site in water, wetlands, and buffers	20%	assumption
17	Total acres in water, wetlands, and buffers	220	= B16 x B5
18	Max. % of passive open space that can consist of water, wetlands, buffers	100%	Draft Rec. #31 (p.16)
19	Max. potential acres of water, wetlands, buffers that can be counted toward OS	330	= B13 x B18
20	Actual acres of water, wetlands, buffers that can be counted toward OS	220	IF B19>B17, THEN B17, ELSE B19
21	Additional open space needed to meet passive OS requirement	110	= B13 - B20
22	Total water, wetlands, buffers, active rec., and other open space required (acres)	340	= B17 + B14 + B21
23	Net open space -- for spray calc. below (Total OS - imperv. rec. - wtr./wet./buff.)	117	= B22 - B15 - B17
24	<b>Wastewater Treatment (Does not include safety factor or repair area)</b>		
25	Min. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.30)	0.028	figures provided by Hal House
26	Med. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.03)	0.275	figures provided by Hal House
27	Max. spray acres per dwelling unit (LTAR=.01)	0.830	figures provided by Hal House
28	Spray irrigation needed per school w/cafeteria, gym, showers (in d.u. equivalent)	20.83	calc. from 15A NCAC 02H .021
29	Spray irrigation needed per 1,000 sq. ft. of com., inst. (in d.u. equiv.)	0.23	calc. from 15A NCAC 02H .02;
30	Est. school spray acres needed (using med. LTAR)	6	= B28 x B26
31	Est. other institutional spray acres needed (4 facilities X 30,000 sq. ft. ea.)	8	= (120,000/1,000) x B29 x B26
32	Est. commercial spray acres needed (using med. com. sq. ft. and med. LTAR)	20	= (B61/1,000) x B29 x B26
33	Min. total spray acres needed	73	= (B25 x B9)+B30+B31+B32
34	Med. total spray acres needed	419	= (B26 x B9)+B30+B31+B32
35	Max. total spray acres needed	1,196	= (B28 x B10)+B31+B32+B33
36	Max. % of open space that can be sprayed	20%	Draft Rec. #11 (p.12)
37	Max. open space acres that can be sprayed	23	= B23 x B36
38	Med. additional spray acres needed	395	= B34 - B37
39	% of site required for spray irrigation	36%	= B38/B5
40	<b>Transportation</b>		
41	% of site in road right of way (acres)	10%	assumption
42	Total acres	110	= B41 x B5
43	<b>Community Facilities</b>		
44	School site (acres)	15	Draft Rec. #41 (p.18); DPI Guidelines
45	Police/fire station (acres)	3	Draft Rec. #43 (p.18)
46	Library/community center site (acres)	5	Draft Rec. #45 (p.18)
47	Solid waste/recycling site (acres)	3	Draft Rec. #33, 34 (p.16)
48	Total acres	26	= B44+B45+B46+B47
49	% of site	2%	= B48/B5
50	<b>Residential Development</b>		
51	Total required acres (open space + spray land + ROW + com. facilities)	871	=B22+B38+B42+B48
52	Required land applied to residential portion	792	= B51 x (B3/B5)
53	Residentially developable acres (Max. allowable res. - req. land applied to res.)	208	= B3 - B52
54	Max. allowable dwelling units	1,400	=B9
55	Affordable units @ 5% of allowable d.u.	70	Draft Rec. #61 (p.21); assumption
56	Net residential density (d.u./acre)	6.7	= B9/B53
57	<b>Commercial Development</b>		
58	Required land applied to commercial portion	79	B51 x (B4/B5)
59	Commercially developable acres (max. allowable com. - req. land applied to com)	21	= B4 - B58
60	Min. square feet of commercial (1% of site @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	215,622	= (0.01xB5)x(0.3)x(1.5)x(43,560)
61	Med. square feet of commercial (1.5% @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	323,433	= (0.015xB5)x(0.3)x(1.5)x(43,560)
62	Max. square feet of commercial (max. @ 30% lot coverage and 1.5 stories)	407,409	=B59x(0.3)x(1.5)x(43,560)



**SUMMARY PROJECT STATS FOR  
DIFFERENT COMPACT COMMUNITY SCENARIOS**

Prepared for Chatham County by the Triangle J Council of Governments  
(Draft 2/21/03)

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS	PROJECT STATISTICS			
	Current Draft	Scenario #2	Scenario #3	Scenario #4
Max. allowable site acreage	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100
Max. allowable dwelling units	1,400	1,600	1,400	1,400
Gross density (d.u./acre)	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.3
Net density (d.u./acre)	6.7	9.0	8.3	6.5
Max. allowable commercial (sq. ft.)	407,409	348,603	329,001	420,952
<b>Land Use as % of Total Site Area</b>				
Residential (max.)	19%	16%	15%	20%
Commercial (max.)	2%	2%	2%	2%
Open space (min.)	30%	30%	30%	30%
Active recreation (min.)	1%	1%	1%	1%
Spray irrigation (min.)	36%	39%	35%	30%
Road right of way	10%	10%	10%	10%
Community facilities (min.)	2%	2%	2%	2%

1998

