

From: Jason Sullivan <jason.sullivan@chathamcountync.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2024 10:22 AM
To: Adkins, Jeff <Jeff.Adkins@hdrinc.com>; Marissa Clifford <marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com>
Cc: Blake Mills <blake.mills@chathamcountync.gov>; Dan Lamontagne <dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov>; Angela Plummer <angela.plummer@chathamcountync.gov>; Boone, Kelly <BooneKR@cdmsmith.com>; Bill Dowbiggin <DowbigginWB@cdmsmith.com>; Miller, Sydney <Sydney.Miller@durhamnc.gov>; Christopher Summerlin <chris.summerlin@chathamcountync.gov>; Inga Kennedy <inga@peqatl.com>; Neil, Chris <Chris.Neil@hdrinc.com>
Subject: RE: Public hearing -zoning

Ms. Clifford,

Thank for you providing your questions and I've provided responses to two of them below. The consultants who are working on this project have responded to your other questions and concerns. Please let us know if you have additional questions.

Question: After receiving Mr. Sullivan's email about signs being posted advertising the public hearing, I went out to look for them. I did locate two signs on Seaforth Rd, prior to the N. Pea Ridge intersection. Thank you for pointing this out. I do have some feedback regarding the signs. As the signs are 'generic' and don't inform citizens about "the what and the when" of the public hearing, they may not achieve your desired goal of citizen participation. In addition, the phone number is to the main planning department with no instructions or information related to the public hearing notice, or what prompt to select to learn more. I appreciate this is likely a cost saving measure, so you may use the same signs for all public hearings, however I feel this is self-limiting and am concerned that the true intent of the public notice effort may be being subverted.

Response: I appreciate your concern regarding the public hearing signs, and it is a balance between meeting the legal requirements and our budget constraints. We use the generic signs because there have been occasions when we've had to post hundreds of them for a hearing and this was the most practical option for the county at that time. At some point in the future we will need to purchase new signs and will re-evaluate the type, size, etc. You have a good point about the automated message on the main number for the department and I've started the process to update it to include a prompt for inquiries about public hearing notices.

Question: Homeowners bought into this subdivision with the expectation and good faith of a quiet rural setting and understood surrounding parcels to be residentially zoned. Q: Does the planning department and Board feel it is appropriate to change this rather than requiring the WIP to seek a parcel that is already zoned appropriately without residential neighbors, or use the acres of land near the high school and not squeeze this oversized "factory" into this small wedge of land, after permitting large lot luxury homes to be built? Many of the residents are near retirement or retired, looking for a peaceful neighborhood. A decision to allow this facility to be built, here, would be ruinous and am dismayed that the proposal has progressed this far with very limited consideration of the impact to the subdivisions.

Response: I can't speak for the board, but the western intake project has been in the planning stages for many years on this property and it was acquired by the Orange Water and Sewer Authority in 1989 for this purpose. Many government functions are unique and must be located in areas where non-governmental businesses typically wouldn't be allowed. In this instance, the proximity to Jordan Lake is a

critical part of the location criteria like the county's existing water treatment plant on Beaver Creek Road. Additionally, this regional plant will serve multiple jurisdictions which adds more constraints to the location because of where the Corps of Engineers will allow an intake on the lake and how the treated water will be distributed between three counties and the municipalities that are included in the partnership. Other examples of county operations that are in residential areas include schools, collection centers, recreation facilities, and county owned telecommunication towers for emergency operations. The county is sensitive to the surrounding community when we have to locate facilities in areas that are primarily residential, and the Western Intake Partners have tried to do the same with the site planning for the water treatment plant.

Jason Sullivan
Planning Director
Chatham County
P.O. Box 54
80-A East St.
Pittsboro, NC 27312
Office: 919/542-8233
Fax: 919/542-0527

Recode Chatham is underway and you can view the status and register for updates on www.recodechathamnc.org

Plan Moncure has been adopted and you can view the small area plan at <https://www.recodechathamnc.org/planmoncure> In keeping with the NC Public Records Law, e-mails, including attachments, may be released to others upon request for inspection and copying.

Jason Sullivan
Planning Director
Chatham County
P.O. Box 54
80-A East St.
Pittsboro, NC 27312
Office: 919/542-8233
Fax: 919/542-0527



Recode Chatham is underway and you can view the status and register for updates on www.recodechathamnc.org

Plan Moncure has been adopted and you can view the small area plan at <https://www.recodechathamnc.org/planmoncure>

In keeping with the NC Public Records Law, e-mails, including attachments, may be released to others upon request for inspection and copying.

From: Adkins, Jeff <Jeff.Adkins@hdrinc.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2024 9:55 AM
To: Marissa Clifford <marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com>
Cc: Blake Mills <blake.mills@chathamcountync.gov>; Dan Lamontagne <dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov>; Angela Plummer <angela.plummer@chathamcountync.gov>; Boone, Kelly <BooneKR@cdmsmith.com>; Bill Dowbiggin <DowbigginWB@cdmsmith.com>; Miller, Sydney <Sydney.Miller@durhamnc.gov>; Christopher Summerlin <chris.summerlin@chathamcountync.gov>; Jason Sullivan <jason.sullivan@chathamcountync.gov>; Inga Kennedy <inga@pegatl.com>; Neil, Chris <Chris.Neil@hdrinc.com>
Subject: RE: Public hearing -zoning

Good morning, Ms. Clifford. I was glad to see that you and Inga Kennedy, who coordinates individual outreach on behalf of the Western Intake Partnership, have set a time Sunday to meet in person.

Attached is a table which summarizes your comments and questions, and provides detailed responses from the Partnership to questions addressed to us. I hope this additional information is helpful. Planning will respond separately to the questions addressed to them.

Thank you again for your engagement, and for sharing your concerns.

Best Regards, Jeff

C. Jeff Adkins, PE

D 919.232.6639 **M** 919.746.6208

hdrinc.com/follow-us

From: Marissa Clifford <marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2024 5:33 AM
To: Adkins, Jeff <Jeff.Adkins@hdrinc.com>
Cc: Blake Mills <blake.mills@chathamcountync.gov>; Jenifer Johnson <jenifer.johnson@chathamcountync.gov>; dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov; Angela Plummer <angela.plummer@chathamcountync.gov>; Boone, Kelly <BooneKR@cdmsmith.com>; Bill Dowbiggin <DowbigginWB@cdmsmith.com>; Miller, Sydney <Sydney.Miller@durhamnc.gov>; Christopher Summerlin <chris.summerlin@chathamcountync.gov>
Subject: Re: Public hearing -zoning

You don't often get email from marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: [EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Adkins,

Thank you for your response and will look for the the WIP follow-up. Yes, would be happy to see schedules permit to meet with Inga.

Best, -Marissa

On Jan 7, 2024, at 5:10 PM, Adkins, Jeff <Jeff.Adkins@hdrinc.com> wrote:

Ms Clifford, thank you for providing us with details on your concerns and questions. Speaking for the Western Intake Partnership, we will review the email in detail this week and would be glad to follow up with you. Our outreach coordinator Inga Kennedy has plans to be in your area this coming week. Could she reach out to you to see if it might work out for her to stop by?

As before, I'm also available if you would like to call me this week.

Regards, Jeff Adkins

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Marissa Clifford <marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 7, 2024 3:54 PM

To: Adkins, Jeff <Jeff.Adkins@hdrinc.com>; Blake Mills <blake.mills@chathamcountync.gov>

Cc: Jenifer Johnson <jenifer.johnson@chathamcountync.gov>; dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov <dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov>; Angela Plummer

<angela.plummer@chathamcountync.gov>; Boone, Kelly <BooneKR@cdmsmith.com>; Bill Dowbiggin <DowbigginWB@cdmsmith.com>; Miller, Sydney <Sydney.Miller@durhamnc.gov>; Christopher

Summerlin <chris.summerlin@chathamcountync.gov>

Subject: Re: Public hearing -zoning

You don't often get email from marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: [EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Sullivan, Mills and Adkins,

I would like to thank each of you for taking the time to respond to my email, providing detailed background information and your openness to discussing further. Learning of this effort to rezone the lot on Thursday was quite shocking and upsetting.

I have reviewed all the materials posted on the website and have some questions and a high degree of concern. I feel that the report overall, application and the five findings report inadequately address resident impact to the safety and enjoyment of our property including risk of hazard materials, increased traffic, noise and light pollution, as well as property value. I have outlined these areas and questions below. I apologize in advance for the number of questions, particularly if these are items that you previously addressed in the July 20th meeting. We moved to this neighborhood for the peace and quiet it offered, NOT to live next to an industrial facility that is servicing other counties with no consideration for our safety and quality of life or our own water needs.

General questions / comments

- I am concerned that we did not receive written notice for the referenced July 20th meeting as my husband and I certainly would have attended. Q: Would you please clarify why we were not included on the communication as a resident of Seaforth Landing?
- Mr. Adkins email below implies that this site has been planned since 1989. The WIP Environmental Impact Report indicates that this site is part of an alternative analysis conducted as opposed to utilizing the previously acquired site for a RWTF. Q: Where was the original site? Why has the WIP shifted to an alternative that has significant impact to residents, habitat and requires deforestation of old growth hardwood trees?
- Q: Why did the WIP not analyze parcels already zoned appropriately and only looked at residential parcels for alternatives sites? This seems counterintuitive that in an alternative analysis, residents would be negatively impacted in all and would require rezoning.
- I am hesitant to believe that the Board would have approved the development of Seaforth Landing and other nearby subdivisions if they planned to convert a residential parcel/lot to industrial allowing the installation of 34 structures, 23-50 feet high ranging from 2,600sq ft to 18,000sq ft that will receive, store and utilize hazardous materials, including chemicals in the quantities of 6,000 gallons while producing light and noise pollution in a 24/7 operation. Q: At what point was the Board made aware of this plan and if prior to Seaforth development approval the Boards' rationale for how these two disparate land usages can live in harmony and be consistent with the development goals, rights of citizens and maintaining the rural beauty of Chatham County.
- It appears that the main entrance is the one off of Seaforth Rd., closest to the Seaforth Landing development. Q: Why is that selected as the main entrance rather than further north and closer to Highway 64? How often will this be used daily and for what purposes?
- Q: How often will the entrance on N. Pea Ridge Road be utilized and for what purposes?
- The report indicates that sediment and sludge will be removed by truck while large volumes of chemicals (6,000 gallons) will be delivered. Q: Will these be diesel 18 wheeler trucks? How often will they be delivering chemicals? How often will waste be picked up? What entrance will they be using? Neither Seaforth Rd or N. Pea Ridge Rd are designed for this type of traffic and the noise and pollution is disruptive to residents.
- A 24/7 operation that has the risk of noise, vibration, hazardous materials and light pollution impacting residents does not seem like a reasonable ask when options that don't impact residents are readily available in Chatham County and the 180 miles of Jordan Lake shoreline. Q: Why has the WIP not identified appropriately zoned locations or location more proximate to Hwy 64? For example, huge swaths of undeveloped land owned by the US government have lake access further north and closer to Hwy 64.
- Q: Does the construction period of three years also include the running of the pipelines down Seaforth Rd and N. Pea Ridge? A construction period of three years with 150 construction

workers is a significant disruption to the community and will produce particulate matter, road debris, noise and significant traffic issues that will hinder the ability to enjoy our property. This neighborhood has limited access to enter and leave and the scale and duration of this type of project is an undue burden. Residents would see this everyday coming and going, as well as interested persons in home resale opportunities that could provide a negative perception.

- The speed limit on Seaforth Rd and N. Pea Ridge are already dangerously high, prohibiting cyclists, runners and pedestrians to enjoy the roads. Increased traffic with large trucks delivering chemicals and removing waste put residents at further risk and speed limits should be lowered. What mitigation do you have planned to address this?
- After receiving Mr. Sullivan's email about signs being posted advertising the public hearing, I went out to look for them. I did locate two signs on Seaforth Rd, prior to the N. Pea Ridge intersection. Thank you for pointing this out. I do have some feedback regarding the signs. As the signs are 'generic' and don't inform citizens about "the what and the when" of the public hearing, they may not achieve your desired goal of citizen participation. In addition, the phone number is to the main planning department with no instructions or information related to the public hearing notice, or what prompt to select to learn more. I appreciate this is likely a cost saving measure, so you may use the same signs for all public hearings, however I feel this is self-limiting and am concerned that the true intent of the public notice effort may be being subverted.

Aesthetics

- Q: What type of perimeter fencing is proposed? What is the height of the fence? Will the fencing be visible from the road? The Apex/Cary WTF looks like a prison yard is an absolute eye sore, that seems to attract degraded home upkeep and roadway trash. While I feel that the Board should require the WIP to find a more suitable space that does not abut a residential development, at a minimum the entire facility should be out of sight and of enough distance from the road so that the 34 large structures and lighting are not visible. If the fencing is visible from the road, it should be aesthetically pleasing and with the purpose of securing the site and screening the view. A composite wood fence would be one option. The 'screening landscaping' at the Apex/Cary facility is inadequate and does not hide the chain link fence with barbed wire at the top, along with hazardous material signs. All the buildings are visible and you feel as if you are looking at a chemical plant site off the New Jersey Turnpike. This type of compound would not fit in with the rest of the rural area or the entrance of a state recreational site.
- The number and size of the structures seem too many for the size of the lot and along with the clearcutting is not consistent with maintaining the rural beauty of Chatham County, let alone the entrance to a subdivision with \$1 million+ homes and the state recreational facility. Q: Why is the administrative building so large for 18-20 staff and what would a 6,000 sq ft expansion of the 2nd floor look like and what purpose would it achieve? This seems excessive and not appropriate for a rural corner abutting a subdivision and state recreational facility.
- The clearcutting of the forest will be inconsistent with the surrounding area and the limited landscaping as outlined in the plan will neither screen the 34 enormous structures that are being constructed or limit the glow from the lighting. While I feel the Board should require the WIP to find a more suitable location that does not impact residents, at a minimum the placement of the structures should be far enough back from the roads so that they are not visible.
- I believe some areas of the documents indicated a 50ft buffer while others indicate a 100ft of natural vegetation will remain. Q: is it 50 or 100 feet? Are you counting the already cleared land from the road to the tree line? The reality is neither 50 or 100ft is adequate to hide the buildings, tanks, roads and related lights. The trees are pine and there is no low ground cover. A

more appropriate site should be selected or, at a minimum, the number of structures and/or size should be decreased so they are set farther back from both roads. Q: How can you further mitigate the plan to ensure the buildings are hidden and related lighting is not visible given the limited number of 'canopy trees' and the limited screening planting planned?

Lights

- Q: How many pole lights across the facility will be installed? On the diagram I counted at least 40?
- Q: How many exterior building lights will be installed? The diagram was illegible at that level?
- Q: Will the interior building/structure lights remain on overnight?
- The light pollution seems significant for both residents and wildlife and not appropriate. Q: Why is this level of lighting required at night when only a limited number of staff will be working and the site is secured by fencing? The lighting plan appears to be designed as if it is an airport or shopping mall. I am unclear how the limited amount of existing vegetation that will remain after clearcutting and is primarily pine trees will block this amount of light.
- The documents reference timers for the light which while is good from an energy standpoint, it does not address the glow that will be visible from the surrounding area if this amount of lighting is permitted. Q: How can the lighting plan or placement be changed to avoid negatively impacting the neighborhood.

Noise

- The report acknowledges that currently noise levels are exceedingly low in the location as it is undeveloped and the adjacent properties are also quiet.
- The report further acknowledges that the facility will generate noise 24/7 but a 'noise study' will occur during the design phase and that they will abide by the county noise ordinance. Q: What is the purpose of the noise study? What is the expected dBA? What is the maximum dBA they will abide by, per the noise ordinance? Does the WIP feel the maximum dBA is appropriate at all times of operation? What additional mitigation can be utilized to ensure noise is not heard in the Seaforth Landing subdivision?
- The Apex/Cary WTF facility emits a constant humming noise and like it the planned facility will reverberate noise in this quiet community. It is not reasonable to ask the community to live with 24/7 noise levels from an industrial facility next door, when the zoning was originally established to protect residents from this type of burden. The WIP should be required to seek a parcel that is zoned appropriately and not adjacent to residential properties. At a minimum, the WIP should be required to conduct the noise study and prove they have buildings and technology in place that will not create noise burden to the neighborhood, PRIOR to a rezoning being approved.
- The report mentions the potential for vibrations to residents but offers no mitigation other than to 'notify residents and measure them.' Q: Are residents expected to just live with 24/7 vibrations and noise from an industrial site? The WIP should be required to prove that they have buildings and technology to prevent vibration along with the noise PRIOR to a rezoning being approved.
- It is unreasonable to ask this community to live with the noise and disruption from 3 years of construction, including clearcutting, filling, building, etc. The WIP should be required to seek a

parcel that is zoned appropriately, not adjacent to residential properties and perhaps already cleared of trees, rather than deforestation of old hardwood trees.

Hazard

- The chemical storage facility is located on the side of the lot nearer to Seaforth Landing. The report offers no information on the risks to our health or safety if a chemical spill or fire were to take place. Transporting into the site, transferring them to storage and then utilizing the chemicals in the treatment all offer unique risks of an accident. Q: Was a health analysis conducted and, if so, where are the findings. If not, why? What is the environmental impact if a spill or fire were to occur? How would that impact wildlife and the lake? How would such an occurrence impact our land value?
- We are dependent on well water. I did not see any impact analysis to our own drinking water in the event of a chemical spill or overflow of the waste from the treatment facility. Q: Has this analysis been conducted? If so, where are the findings? If not, why not?
- I don't see any information that would indicate that water service would be extended to Seaforth Landing, yet we would bare the burden of the treatment facility for other counties and other areas of Chatham County. The benefits of this site will accrue to developers like Chatham Park at the expense of nearby residents and the environment. Q: What consideration has been made to extend water service to this neighborhood if the Board moves forward with approving the rezoning, regardless of resident objection?
- One of the documents mentions posting of caution signs for hazardous materials. Q: Where will these be posted and what is the size of them?

Land Value

- The report states that land value will not be impacted but offer no evidence to support this assertion. Q: What comparator data or analysis has been completed to support the findings that land values will not be impacted. It appears that this may be required, but I did not see any evidence of a land value report.
- Homeowners bought into this subdivision with the expectation and good faith of a quiet rural setting and understood surrounding parcels to be residentially zoned. Q: Does the planning department and Board feel it is appropriate to change this rather than requiring the WIP to seek a parcel that is already zoned appropriately without residential neighbors, or use the acres of land near the high school and not squeeze this oversized "factory" into this small wedge of land, after permitting large lot luxury homes to be built? Many of the residents are near retirement or retired, looking for a peaceful neighborhood. A decision to allow this facility to be built, here, would be ruinous and am dismayed that the proposal has progressed this far with very limited consideration of the impact to the subdivisions.

I appreciate again your attentive response and answers to these questions. We will plan to attend the meeting and submit our written comments once we have additional clarity on the questions above so that we have the most accurate understanding of the project

Thank you,

Marissa Clifford

From: Adkins, Jeff <Jeff.Adkins@hdrinc.com>

Date: Friday, January 5, 2024 at 4:34 PM

To: Blake Mills <blake.mills@chathamcountync.gov>, marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com
<marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com>

Cc: Jenifer Johnson <jenifer.johnson@chathamcountync.gov>, dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov <dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov>, Angela Plummer <angela.plummer@chathamcountync.gov>, Boone, Kelly <BooneKR@cdmsmith.com>, Bill Dowbiggin <DowbigginWB@cdmsmith.com>, Miller, Sydney <Sydney.Miller@durhamnc.gov>, Christopher Summerlin <chris.summerlin@chathamcountync.gov>

Subject: RE: Public hearing -zoning

Ms. Clifford, the information Mr. Mills has provided will give you a lot of resources for understanding the proposed rezoning and the water treatment facilities. Another source for information about the Western Intake Partnership project is the website. [Home :: Western Intake Partnership](#). We highly value open and frequent communication with the community, as reflected in the number of prior meetings with the public that Mr. Mills listed in his email. I believe you are a resident of Seaforth Landing, or live nearby?

Please take a look at the resources and information on the County's website and the Partnership website, then feel free to give me a call or email with thoughts or questions. My contact information is below. Also, please take a moment to sign up for future updates about the project at [Contact Us :: Western Intake Partnership](#) (form is at the bottom of the page).

Jordan Lake is an important water supply resource for the region, and the property was purchased in 1989 by one of the Partner water systems – Orange Water and Sewer Authority – expressly for the purpose of constructing water supply facilities there.

Best Regards, Jeff Adkins

C. Jeff Adkins, PE

Western Intake Partnership Program Manager

D 919.232.6639 **M** 919.746.6208

hdrinc.com/follow-us

-----Original Message-----

From: Blake Mills <blake.mills@chathamcountync.gov>

Sent: Friday, January 5, 2024 3:37 PM

To: marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com

Cc: Jenifer Johnson <jenifer.johnson@chathamcountync.gov>; dan.lamontagne@chathamcountync.gov; Angela Plummer <angela.plummer@chathamcountync.gov>; Adkins, Jeff <Jeff.Adkins@hdrinc.com>;

Boone, Kelly <BooneKR@cdmsmith.com>; Bill Dowbiggin <DowbigginWB@cdmsmith.com>; Miller, Sydney <Sydney.Miller@durhamnc.gov>; Christopher Summerlin <chris.summerlin@chathamcountync.gov>
Subject: RE: Public hearing -zoning

CAUTION: [EXTERNAL] This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ms. Clifford,

I am sorry you have not been made aware of the Rezoning Public Hearing for the Western Intake Partners Regional Water Treatment Plant proposed at the corner of Seaforth Road and North Pea Ridge Road.

The Chatham County website link to the Western Intake Partners Rezoning is below:

<https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.chathamcountync.gov%2Fgovernment%2Fdepartments-programs-i-z%2Fplanning%2Frezonings-subdivision-cases%2F2024-items%2Fwestern-partners-intake-rezoning&data=05%7C02%7CJeff.Adkins%40hdrinc.com%7C5ac6c28a21c14b3cb16208dc0e2e0cc7%7C3667e201cbdc48b39b425d2d3f16e2a9%7C0%7C0%7C638400838145702525%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6IjEhaWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=OvRj2jrtUwZBW7JSR4lqWyo6iH7oh57sYC9LcV%2Fw2%2BI%3D&reserved=0>

It will provide information related to the project and rezoning.

Previously, there have been several meetings and community outreach efforts related to the project such as

Jan. 10, 2023, Public Open House at the Chatham County Community Library from 4:30 - 7:30 p.m.
April 5, 2023, Public Meeting with Seaforth Landing Community HOA at the Chatham County Community Library from 6:00 - 7:00 p.m.
July 20, 2023, Rezoning Development Input Meeting (for the adjacent and adjoining property owners to the proposed Water Treatment Plant) at the Chatham County Community Library from 6:30 - 7:30 p.m.
August 23, 2023, Chatham County Appearance Commission Meeting at the Old Agricultural Auditorium from 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

You may not have been made aware of the previous meetings however, great efforts were made to notify the public for the open house on Jan. 10, 2023 by advertising in the Raleigh News and Observer, direct mailers postcards to residents in the local area around the proposed Water Treatment Plant, news releases, Chatham County website and social media posts and similar efforts were made related to the other meetings.

The Public Hearing for the Rezoning is scheduled for Jan. 16, 2024 at Chatham County Agricultural and Conference Center located at 1192 US 64 Business and starts at 6:00 p.m. The Agenda for this Board of Commissioners meeting will be posted on the Chatham County website on Friday, January 12,

2024. The Public Hearing is advertised in the News and Observer for 2 weeks prior to the meeting and posted on Planning Department webpage (same link shown above at top of email).

Chatham County is a partner in the proposed Water Treatment Plant along with Durham (Lead Partner), OWASA and Pittsboro and I have copied on the email Syd Miller with Durham the Water Treatment Plant Project Manager as well as the engineering team that will be presenting the Rezoning at the Board of Commissioners meeting on Jan. 16 (Jeff Adkins with HDR - Engineering Program Manager, Kelly Boone with CDM Smith (water treatment plant engineer) and Bill Dowbiggin (Water Treatment Plant engineer).

Please feel free to ask any questions you may have (copy all on the email) and we will provide answers.

Blake Mills, PE
Chatham County
Public Utilities Director
964 East Street
Pittsboro, NC 27312
919 542-8238

-----Original Message-----

From: Marissa Clifford <marissa.l.clifford@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2024 7:29 PM
To: Jenifer Johnson <jenifer.johnson@chathamcountync.gov>
Subject: Public hearing -zoning

WARNING: This message originated from outside the Chatham County email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Johnson,

Happy new year.

I am writing regarding my concern related to the proposed rezoning from residential to light industrial for the regional water treatment facility at the corner of Seaforth Rd. and N. Pea Ridge Rd..

As a community member, I do not support this measure and am equally concerned regarding the seeming lack of information and notice regarding the public hearing. I am not able to find any details on the county website, published meeting calendars or as a drop down option in the public comments form. Would you please clarify for me if a meeting is taking place, when and what type of public notices have been issued?

The stated purpose of public hearings are to inform the Planning Board, Planning Department Board of Commission of public concerns and encourage citizen participation the decision making process. The lack of notice and accessible information prevents this.

Thank you in advance and hope that a scheduled public hearing on the topic will be published well in advance on all county calendars and information boards so citizens have the opportunity to participate.

Marissa Clifford