

November 30, 2020

Dear Chatham County Planning Department Staff and Planning Board,

I would like to state my opposition of the rezoning and proposed self storage facility located at 72 Marvin Edwards Lane.

This rezoning and development of yet another self storage facility in the immediate area will be a detrimental impact to the rural character of this residential area. I along with many of the other adjacent property owners purchased our homes based on the fact that all of the surrounding areas were zoned residential. I have purchased two separate properties in this area, based on the residential zoning which was already decided. The big draw of this neighborhood has always been the rural/residential feel and I would hate for this to change based on a rezoning.

Additionally, I have recently learned that the applicant is providing false information having produced a document which shows that I have either provided my support or am not in objection to the proposed rezoning and development. This is not accurate. I have not provided in writing or in other forms provided any support or non-objection of this proposed rezoning and development.

I thank you for allowing me to notify you all of my opposition as well as the inaccuracy of the applicants map showing properties in support or non-objection to this proposed project.

Respectfully,



Ted Traynor
0 & 235 Jason Glen Rd
Chapel Hill, NC

From: **Karla Haeuser** <karla.haeuser@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon, Nov 30, 2020 at 4:42 PM

Subject: "Against Rezoning - 72 Marvin Edwards Ln"

To: planning@chathameoc.com <planning@chathameoc.com>, chathamncplanning@gmail.com <chathamncplanning@gmail.com>

To whom it may concern,

I have just been made aware of the forthcoming vote by the Planning Board associated with the proposed rezoning and development of 72 Marvin Edwards Ln by 919 Storage LLC. To date I have not received any notification of this proposed rezoning or development which is concerning to me as land owner in extreme close proximity to this property. Please accept this email as my opposition to the proposed rezoning and development of 72 Marvin Edwards Ln. I do not wish to see this property rezoned from residential taking away the rural character of this part of the county.

Respectfully,

Karla Haeuser

To: Chatham County, N.C. Planning Board

From: Mary Mahoney, owner, 110-A & 110-B Woodbridge Drive duplex, adjacent to proposed project

Re: Opposition to the proposed zoning change to allow construction of 919 Storage LLC buildings

Meeting Date: December 1, 2020

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at the November 10 meeting. I am also registered to participate tonight.

You have my previous written input (2 items) under "additional public input", pages 21 thru 25. One letter is an overview of why I oppose this project.

The second document is a copy of a letter I received from a CE Group representative (July 24, 2020), pressuring me to "support this project because I "only get to pick what is in my backyard one time." When I did not sign on with support, I began getting numerous calls here at my home in Boston from assorted realtors trying to get me to sell. To say, as a CE Group rep did at the November 10 virtual meeting, that these tactics were attempts "to address my concerns" is an outright lie. Not all "facts", however well presented, are truthful. I will not cave in to pressure and slick presentations.

Since the virtual meeting, I have read many of the documents submitted by 919 Storage LLC. I have also reread the Plan Chatham, created November 20, 2017 and amended March 16, 2020. The Plan is detailed in its guidelines to reach its praiseworthy goals. With careful enforcement, I believe Chatham County will meet its goals for land use. However, making exceptions and amendments so early on may become the opening of the proverbial Pandora's Box. Setting precedents can be dangerous to the overall success of what seems to be a commendable forward thinking Comprehensive Plan.

I have listed reasons, under each item as presented at the November 10 meeting, reasons why this 919 Storage LLC project should not be allowed to change the character of my neighborhood, a residential neighborhood whose safe, secure, secluded duplexes fill a niche in a housing market that is often overlooked: students, handicapped needing one floor entry, single parents with school age children, retirees, and others who are on limited incomes.

We all deserve quality affordable housing with healthy green space and hopefully, one day, a nature trail or park. We are not zoned for nor should we have a commercial venture encroach on our borders.

Thank you for your efforts to keep Chatham County on a constructive, prosperous path as it grows.

Sincerely,
Mary Mahoney

Reasons To Deny This Zoning Change

*** Item #1

I find this standard very confusing. There may be no error in the ordinance but I believe the conditional district rezoning would condone an inappropriate commercial project being built in a zoned residential area. All of this land should remain R-2 residential. There are many other sites with appropriate zoning for a 919 LLC project. The "allowed application" by 919 Storage request for a zoning change should be denied. The land in question clearly is designated as a neighborhood center, not a place to store whatever anyone cares to pay to lock up. Neighbors deserve to know what is "living" next to them. Zoning is designed to ensure that protection.

*** Item #2:

The proposed amendment is absolutely NOT necessary to the promotion of the public health, safety and general welfare. The presentation by the proponents is very misleading and quite frankly, "puts a pretty face" on a very objectionable project. A storage facility should not be adjacent to a well-established neighborhood. It does not "preserve the rural lifestyle and character of Chatham County". It introduces a commercial venture into a very secluded, serene, safe 45 year old development of 2 bedroom duplexes. An established neighborhood deserves to have a resource that adds to their quality of life with no anxiety about what is being stored by transients, and for what purposes. A walking trail, park or other green area would meet this standard.

These duplexes should not be the backyard of folks who need storage SOMEWHERE but who do not share the same neighborhood values or needs as the residents. There are plenty of available storage units nearby, not in residential zones. The need for yet one more storage facility, *even if it were proven*, does not justify this R-2 site.

*** Item #3

The "Economic Center "node" in the front area" is another attempt to justify building football field sized storage buildings in a clearly residentially zoned area. There is no documentation that defines the node as being 8 acres, the size of this project. The comparison to the Walmart site is "grasping at the proverbial straw" because the similarity is nonexistent. Our neighborhood in no way resembles retail space.

*** Item #4 It is a back door encroachment to claim that the remaining acreage would be used as residential or recreational. Once the commercial element is introduced, the likelihood of any builder gambling on building houses for homeowners to live behind football field sized miniwarehouses is most deceiving. Please reread the letter I received which was an attempt to force my support. I am quarantined in Boston and unable to reach out to my neighbors. But support was not necessarily strictly voluntary. Many owners are not truly aware of what this entire project involves for the neighborhood.

***Item #5

I question the claim that one attendant's water and wastewater usage will be less than 100 gallons per day. It seems unlikely that water will not be needed for cleaning purposes for a project of this size. That likelihood certainly should be revisited with regard to the WSIV-Protected Area Jordan Lake watershed drainage area.

**If this were your neighborhood, how assured would you be
that this project would actually be an asset?
Would you be confident that this project would be monitored
to avoid negative impact on your neighborhood?**