From: Jacob Terrell [mailto:Jacob Terrell@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 12:24 PM

To: Lindsay Ray <<u>lindsay.ray@chathamnc.org</u>>; Karen Howard <<u>karen.howard@chathamnc.org</u>>; Mike Dasher <<u>mike.dasher@chathamnc.org</u>>; Diana Hales <<u>diana.hales@chathamnc.org</u>>; James Crawford <<u>james.crawford@chathamnc.org</u>>; Andy Wilkie <<u>andy.wilkie@chathamnc.org</u>>; Jason Sullivan <<u>jason.sullivan@chathamnc.org</u>>; Angela Plummer <<u>angela.plummer@chathamnc.org</u>>; glucier5@gmail.com

Subject: [Ext] Requested zoning change on Marvin Edwards Lane

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Chatham County network. Do not reply, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. When in doubt, please call the sender (do not use the number listed on the email in question).

Dear County Commissioners and Chatham County Planning Board,

I was unable to speak at the public hearing last night and so am writing in regards to the proposed zoning change and mini storage on the existing residential property on Marvin Edwards Lane, across from the Walmart.

My wife and I are adjacent landowners at 225 Cassidy Ln.

We have the following concerns with this proposal:

It does not seem to be in compliance with the Chatham County Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use and Conservation Plan Map(reference page 45 of the plan) map shows a schematic yellow dot in the vicinity of the Walmart, identifying a "neighborhood center". The text of the plan(reference page 47) under the heading "Neighborhood center" identifies this location as "Walmart on 15 -501". It does not identify it as "The residential land on the other side of the highway from Walmart". Just because the schematic graphical yellow circle on this map bleeds a little bit on to the west side of 15 501, I do not believe that the intent of the Plan was to take existing zoned residential land and convert it to commercial purposes on the west side of the highway. Furthermore, it it is not crystal clear to us that mini storage quite fits the bill for the facility uses described in the "Neighborhood Center" text of the plan. ie does mini storage fall under " mix of uses include grocery anchored retail with some restaurants, services and office uses"?

At the hearing last night, when we heard other adjacent landowners speak in favor of (or not oppose) the project they were saying things like "at least it's not a big box store..." or "they've always said the county will change this to commercial land...", and I fear that perhaps they are not fully understanding that this land is zoned as R2- and cannot legally be developed in those ways. We are wondering if that was fully explained to them when they were asked whether or not they were in favor of this particular project. It seems as if these people have conceded that mini storage is "the lesser of evils" that could happen on this land when in fact it is not compliant at all with the current zoning.

Whether or not the new storage unit is "a needed service" or will/ will not negatively impact the value of adjacent property seems subjective. Seemingly (as we saw at the hearing), one can hire a consultant to reference many different data sets to try and make a case for either side. But in our opinion if even one adjacent landowner, who bought their property with the understanding that the zoning was

meaningful and would remain in place, is not in favor of the zoning change - then that demonstrates "devaluation" and should be considered.

Marvin Edwards Lane is a residential road that must be used to access the residential property behind it. The prospect of having a mini storage at the front of this road seems non sequitur and out of place. A similar fate has already been suffered on Booth Road where the Starpoint storage serves as the main entrance to the neighborhood behind. This seems to have resulted from lack of planning/zoning and foresight. Also, At a minimum- having a storage unit immediately adjacent to the residential land behind it will shrink (and hence devalue) the usable acreage of that residential land.

Among other things, the Intention of zoning is to provide stability and predictability for homeowners when they are making land purchasing decisions. If zoning is changed then this concept is eroded and holds no value. Just because land fronts a highway does not mean it should automatically be used for commercial purposes.

We, like many of the homeowners in this vicinity, intentionally bought land surrounded by and adjacent to R2 zoning because we wanted to have space and did not want to be in the vicinity of commercial development.

While we feel that that the developer and their civil design firm seem to have been very responsive and conducted themselves professionally and admirably and have made strides to address community concerns; and that mini storage is on the lower end of the scale of impactful commercial development - the fact is that this land is zoned for residential and this project does not seem to meet the "five findings" and is not in compliance with the Comprehensive plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these thoughts and concerns.

Respectfully, Jacob and Mary Terrell 225 Cassidy Lane **To:** Chatham County, N. C. Board of Commissioners

From: Mary Mahoney, owner, duplex @ 110A & 110B Woodbridge Drive, Chapel Hill

Re: OPPOSITION to Zoning Change requested by 919 Storage LLC on Parcel 3080, located at 72 Marvin Edwards Lane; zoning request is to change from R-2 Residential to "conditional use/regional business district (CD-RB) on approximately 7.93 acres out of the 17.64 acre tract for self-storage mini warehouse facility" AKA 15/501 mini storage site

Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020, 6. p.m. meting

Due to the pandemic, as a quarantined Massachusetts resident, I am unable to attend this meeting. Thank you for this opportunity to present my *reasons for opposition to this zoning change* & my unequivocal opposition to the proposed mini storage project directly abutting my property.

<u>The factual comments</u> I am submitting rely on maps, documents and information I was able to research online via your very user friendly website.

<u>The personal experiences</u> I am relating are based on my experiences over the last 17 years, owning my duplex and having family and friends live at 110-A and 110-B Woodbridge Drive.

What's At Stake?

Eight acres, about half of this R-2 site that was previously zoned for residential use and a community center, would become a mini storage business. Each of the three buildings proposed would be about the length of a football field. One building is two stories; the others are single story. Roads, parking, lighting, septic system, noisy ventilation, traffic and other factors would replace the current green space that contains eight potential residential lots (estimating each lot @ an acre each). Most likely, the remaining 8 acres, even if still zoned R-2, would never be desirable for residential use or community center use, thus affecting the property values of many of our residential properties. Extending our lovely neighborhood into acreage behind a storage facility is improbable if not totally out of the question.

- * This conditional zoning change request is a type of encroachment that is detrimental to our community and our quality of life.
- * Putting a storage business in the middle of a respected residential community smacks of a commercial developer putting profit before people.

Community Needs

This proposal for rezoning <u>claims</u> a need for mini-storage to serve this area and to encourage competitive pricing. My family and I used one of the <u>overabundant</u> (3-4?) storage facilities nearby when we needed that type of service. My tenants, if need arises, also have reported no hardship, no lack of choices nearby and no price gouging. We do NOT need another mini-storage business.

WE DO NEED: Safe affordable housing for many in Chatham who are productive, but often underserved citizens, some beginning careers or working to afford educational opportunities afforded at nearby UNC. The low density, low crime, quiet almost rural like atmosphere is what has made this particular housing area extremely desirable. In many ways, this neighborhood is a planning board's futuristic dream. It offers an alternative to small families, especially those headed by a single parent. Both retirees and disabled on fixed incomes, often needing one story floor plans, find the neighborhood both desirable and affordable. Students can focus on their studies without stress or interruption. Green space and parking are ample, as is access to public transportation.

The aforementioned reasons are exactly why my family bought our duplex: my daughter was undertaking an accelerated nursing degree program at UNC which would award her a joint RN degree and a Bachelor of Science degree in 18 months. As a young woman living alone and sometimes working night nursing shifts, our emphasis was on a quiet, SAFE, low traffic but not totally secluded neighborhood with easy access to school and services, exactly what this neighborhood offers.

As her recently retired parents, we now plan to relocate to the duplex as part of our downsizing. We have never had issues with criminal activity and always found the community friendly and stable.

North Carolina has been extremely forward thinking in its land use as the population has exploded.

Parks & nature trails have been prioritized during development in the Raleigh/ Durham /Chapel Hill area.

As Commissioners who determine the future direction of Chatham County, especially in its development and how citizen needs are met, I sincerely hope you will protect the rights of us who have invested our time, energy, money and lives into maintaining affordable housing and open spaces for future citizens.

Please protect our quality of life in our neighborhood.

Vote no on this "for profit, not for people", project.

Sincerely,

Mary C. Mahoney

Owner of adjacent property 110-A and 110-B Woodbridge Drive

Addendum

I would need time to research two other issues which make this project a worrisome prospect.

Possible Septic Issue?

My property, PIN 9776-00-46-3746, on the South side of the proposed parcel, has a leeching field extremely close to the planned septic system. Already the proposal admits this mini-storage site can only support a septic system geared to "one person". I suspect there could be interference with the other two properties that also have their fields on the Marvin Edwards Lane side (south side) of the proposed project.

Fire Department Access?

I have not seen the issue of emergency responders addressed in this proposal. I was living in the duplex in January, 2008, when a house fire erupted, very far down Marvin Edwards Lane. Engines had to use pumper trucks, transferring the water from a hydrant that was near the corner with 15/501. Luckily, the fire was in an abandoned house not too close to the many duplexes. But it was extremely dangerous and took many hours to extinguish. The paved/gravel roads on this plan could indeed be problematical to public safety.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Chatham County network. Do not reply, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. When in doubt, please call the sender (do not use the number listed on the email in question).

Dear County Commissioners and Chatham County Planning Board,

I was unable to speak at the public hearing last night and so am writing in regards to the proposed zoning change and mini storage on the existing residential property on Marvin Edwards Lane, across from the Walmart.

My wife and I are adjacent landowners at 225 Cassidy Ln.

We have the following concerns with this proposal:

It does not seem to be in compliance with the Chatham County Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use and Conservation Plan Map(reference page 45 of the plan) map shows a schematic yellow dot in the vicinity of the Walmart, identifying a "neighborhood center". The text of the plan(reference page 47) under the heading "Neighborhood center" identifies this location as "Walmart on 15 -501". It does not identify it as "The residential land on the other side of the highway from Walmart". Just because the schematic graphical yellow circle on this map bleeds a little bit on to the west side of 15 501, I do not believe that the intent of the Plan was to take existing zoned residential land and convert it to commercial purposes on the west side of the highway. Furthermore, it it is not crystal clear to us that mini storage quite fits the bill for the facility uses described in the "Neighborhood Center" text of the plan. ie does mini storage fall under " mix of uses include grocery anchored retail with some restaurants, services and office uses"?

At the hearing last night, when we heard other adjacent landowners speak in favor of (or not oppose) the project they were saying things like "at least it's not a big box store..." or "they've always said the county will change this to commercial land...", and I fear that perhaps they are not fully understanding that this land is zoned as R2- and cannot legally be developed in those ways. We are wondering if that was fully explained to them when they were asked whether or not they were in favor of this particular project. It seems as if these people have conceded that mini storage is "the lesser of evils" that could happen on this land when in fact it is not compliant at all with the current zoning.

Whether or not the new storage unit is "a needed service" or will/ will not negatively impact the value of adjacent property seems subjective. Seemingly (as we saw at the hearing), one can hire a consultant to reference many different data sets to try and make a case for either side. But in our opinion if even one adjacent landowner, who bought their property with the understanding that the zoning was meaningful and would remain in place, is not in favor of the zoning change - then that demonstrates "devaluation" and should be considered.

Marvin Edwards Lane is a residential road that must be used to access the residential property behind it. The prospect of having a mini storage at the front of this road seems non sequitur and out of place. A similar fate has already been suffered on Booth Road where the Starpoint storage serves as the main entrance to the neighborhood behind. This seems to have resulted from lack of planning/zoning and foresight. Also, At a minimum- having a storage unit immediately adjacent to the residential land behind it will shrink (and hence devalue) the usable acreage of that residential land.

Among other things, the Intention of zoning is to provide stability and predictability for homeowners when they are making land purchasing decisions. If zoning is changed then this concept is eroded and holds no value. Just because land fronts a highway does not mean it should automatically be used for commercial purposes.

We, like many of the homeowners in this vicinity, intentionally bought land surrounded by and adjacent to R2 zoning because we wanted to have space and did not want to be in the vicinity of commercial development.

While we feel that that the developer and their civil design firm seem to have been very responsive and conducted themselves professionally and admirably and have made strides to address community concerns; and that mini storage is on the lower end of the scale of impactful commercial development - the fact is that this land is zoned for residential and this project does not seem to meet the "five findings" and is not in compliance with the Comprehensive plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these thoughts and concerns.

Respectfully,
Jacob and Mary Terrell
225 Cassidy Lane

From: Mike Mansson < mmansson@zpi.net > Sent: Thursday, August 27, 2020 12:08:54 PM

To: Kaitlyn Warren karen Howard karen.howard@chathamnc.org; Karen Howard karen.howard@chathamnc.org; Diana Hales diana.hales@chathamnc.org; Mike Dasher mike.dasher@chathamnc.org; James Crawford james.crawford@chathamnc.org; Andy Wilkie andy.wilkie@chathamnc.org; Andy Wilkie andy.wilkie@chathamnc.org;

Subject: [Ext] Detailed Opposition of Application from 919 Storage LLC for Rezoning of 72 Marvin

Edwards Lane

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Chatham County network. Do not reply, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. When in doubt, please call the sender (do not use the number listed on the email in question).

Chair Karen Howard, Vice Chair Diana Hales and fellow Board of Commissioners Members,

Attached please find detailed opposition pertaining to the application submitted by 919 Storage LLC for the Rezoning of 72 Marvin Edwards Lane. Within the attached letter and supporting enclosures you will find details based on factual documentation which will provide evidence that the above mentioned application does NOT meet three (3) of the five (5) required criteria items listed within the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance (section 17.1). I will be speaking at the Public Hearing this evening and providing a highlighted snap shot of these findings, but want for you to be able to have the formal

documentation for your files and reference which will support all the oppositional facts that I bring up this evening.

Thank you in advance for your time and should you have any questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL S. MANSSON, LEED AP, CCIM

Ziff Properties, Inc. | Director of Development

200 Wingo Way, Suite 100 | Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464 o: 843.724.3460 | c: 843.991.4360 | f: 843.724.3400

 $\underline{mmansson@zpi.net} \mid \underline{www.zpi.net}$



My property directly adjoins the land for this proposed self storage project at 72 Marvin Edwards Lane.

The development team has been responsive to feedback to improve the final project in terms of size, aesthetics, and security details.

My family supports the proposed rezoning to a self-storage project.

I further support this project because it increases our tax base without increasing demands on schools and services.

Thanks for considering my support of this project.

Signature

JEFFREY W. EARLE

Printed Name

12405 MS HW 15-501 N. CHAPEL HILL WC 27517

Address

My property directly adjoins the land for this proposed self storage project at 72 Marvin Edwards Lane.

The development team has been responsive to feedback to improve the final project in terms of size, aesthetics, and security details. I request they add a thick buffer the final size of Maurice Edward Lane (entire) My family supports the proposed rezoning to a self-storage project.

I further support this project because it increases our tax base without increasing demands on schools and services.

Thanks for considering my support of this project.

Alegat M. Linte Signature

NEGEST M. KINTE

Printed Name

P. J. Add 725 Carrbore 9 C 27510

descent Dreserty

CHARL HILL, N.C. 27514

My property directly adjoins the land for this proposed self storage project at 72 Marvin Edwards Lane.

The development team has been responsive to feedback to improve the final project in terms of size, aesthetics, and security details.

My family supports the proposed rezoning to a self-storage project.

I further support this project because it increases our tax base without increasing demands on schools and services.

Self-storage is a demonstrated need for local people. And for those who need to use self storage, it is both essential and convenient. More of a service like this is good for customers in creating choices and potentially more competitive pricing.

Thanks for considering my support of this project.

Margeny Lated
Signature

Margery Gates

12455 US Hwy 15 501 N Chapel Hill NC 27517-6013 Address

My property directly adjoins the land for this proposed self storage project at 72 Marvin Edwards Lane.

My family supports the proposed rezoning to a self-storage project.

Thanks for considering my support of this project.

Dainte d Norma

77 phobey Rood, Chapel Hill N.C 27574

Address

- My property directly adjoins the land for this proposed self storage project at 72 Marvin Edwards Lane.
- The development team has been responsive to feedback to improve the final project in terms of size, aesthetics, and security details.
- My family supports the proposed rezoning to a self-storage project.

I further support this project because it increases our tax base without increasing demands on schools and services.

Self-storage is a demonstrated need for local people. And for those who need to use self storage, it is both essential and convenient. More of a service like this is good for customers in creating choices and potentially more competitive pricing.

Thanks for considering my support of this project.

Robert C. Mistour of Signature

Refrest C. M. TorouTL, JT Kerch 1, 2020
Printed Name

90 Albey Rd, Chapel Hell, 27516 Address