

Michael Tingle
4165 Arden St
Clemmons, NC 27012

Members of the Planning Board,

Thank you all for the opportunity to speak last night. I wanted to summarize some of my points in written form and also address some of the rebuttals from Isenhaur. As a reminder, we are the O property to the south by southwest of the proposed development. As we stated last night, we are opposed to this development along with every resident I have spoken with on Arden Street. Our concerns are 1) The proposed density of the lots 2) The buffer between their development and our homes. 3) The timing of all of this. This development does not stand to benefit any existing homeowners in the area in any tangible way. Please reject this proposal.

Regarding density, there are 107 families moving into this new development if you include the homes on the parcel marked "Future 3 lot minor subdivision". This is more than double our existing neighborhood. All of these homes will require resources and will generate a tremendous amount of traffic on Hampton Road, also requiring the widening of Haywood and Quinn. Most of the residents on Haywood and Quinn did not receive letters from the village telling them about any of this, and are completely unaware that we were discussing cutting into their property last night. As I mentioned, during my time as Chairman of the Clemmons Transportation committee, I've personally studied these roads with the help of Kimley-Horn, where it was determined a year ago that the volume on Hampton Road was at the precipice of needing widening for center turn lanes to accommodate the growth in the Barrington Oaks neighborhood and the existing Fairmont development. This was after the opening of the Idols Road extension. This fact has been documented as a future problem under existing conditions in the upcoming Clemmons Transportation Plan. This causes me to be extremely skeptical of the claims presented by Isenhaur last night that the addition of 107 families and over 200 additional cars would be "fine".

Furthermore, we enlisted the help of an independent civil engineer with a specialty in community planning. That engineer—a Forsyth County resident—is strongly against the development because of the traffic generation and resource depletion involved, coupled with the unresolved issues with the fire code and the absence of any need in Clemmons for \$400,000 "step-down" homes. These plans were created before covid-19 changed the economic spectrum of the area, further eroding the need for these kinds of homes. Instead of luxury duplexes with a two car garage in every unit leading to four cars in every physical building, these should be single family lots, cutting in half the traffic and resource depletion, staying true to the current surrounding area, and making all of this more economically feasible.

The second issue is the 20-foot buffer yard the developers have planned for this property. Last night Isenhaur stated that the 20-foot buffer was "the minimum required by code". The developers went on the record in front of you stating their intention to do the bare minimum. This is not a quality of a good neighbor, a good steward of the land, or someone who actually cares about Clemmons. If they're willing to do only the bare minimum for the buffer yard, in what other areas of development, construction, planning and safety are they planning to do just "the bare minimum"? This is a tremendous red flag. The developer stated last night that the lay of the land would help further serve as a buffer because the new development would be downhill from the homes on Arden Street. What they failed to state was that these duplexes would be two-story, putting them at

the height of the existing ranch homes if not higher. Furthermore the proximity of the homes to the buffer yard further negates any geographic offset.

Last night I asked you to look at duplex 21, located inside the buffer zone of our property or "right on the buffer yard" according to Isenhaur. As I said, 20 feet is 8 steps, and there is absolutely no reason for someone's living room to be 8 steps away from a fence containing large animals. That's a safety and privacy concern for all parties involved, and further speaks to the developer's disregard for both the existing community and their future residents. The developer packed in these duplexes as tight as they could to maximize profit, and then had the audacity to have Meridian reach out to us--the only contact we have had from any of them--to ask us to give up some of our own land for an easement despite the fact that they have 40 acres to work with. The buffer needs to be 50 feet at an absolute bare minimum.

The final issue I have is with the timing of all of this, which I regarded last night as almost malicious. To clarify, I believe that the developers chose to move forward with this at a time that they knew community input from elderly opponents would be significantly restricted. It was not an accident you heard from so few of us last night. As I told you, the average age of our residents here is over 65, and they are not technically inclined to use computers. I had several people say to me "How can we see the plans if Village Hall is closed?" It's also worth noting that the developer came to the meeting with new plans which had never been seen by anyone, a suspicious and unprofessional act.

Everyone in my neighborhood that I have spoken to is against this, however the majority of them still don't know what's going on. There has been no communication from Isenhour to the neighborhood at all. There has been no meeting called with all the adjoining residents invited to express their concerns and potentially alter their design plans with the concerns of the existing neighbors in mind. The elderly residents of this neighborhood deserve the opportunity to see physical plans and to speak to the planning board and developers face-to-face.

Isenhaur is not acting in good faith, and their treatment of this elderly neighborhood borders on predatory. In reviewing the Youtube video from last night's meeting, while Amanda and I were speaking and expressing our concerns, Isenhaur's team was laughing and talking instead of taking the few minutes required to listen to our concerns. I waited to send this e-mail until after 4:30pm, as I was hopeful that after we went on the record with our issues, that perhaps we would hear from Isenhaur today to discuss our concerns. We have heard nothing, and at this point expect no communication from them until they decide to ask us to give up some of our land for an easement... again.

This neighborhood is not against progress, but there has to be compromise by the developer and some amount of respect given to the existing residents. Isenhaur has shown no intentions of operating in good faith or ever speaking with the community members whose lives they are attempting to drastically change. We're fine with a neighborhood coming in, but it needs to be the right neighborhood with fewer homes and cars, and at least a 50-foot buffer zone around the outside of the property to protect the people currently living here. Please reject this proposal, or at the very least postpone a decision until the quarantine is lifted and the older members of this neighborhood can see the plans and speak to you in person.

Thank you again,

Michael Tingle

Planning & Community Development
3715 Clemmons Road
Clemmons, NC 27012



Telephone 336-766-7511
Fax 336-766-7536
Nasser@clemmons.org

To: Village Council

From: Nasser Rahimzadeh, Village of Clemmons Planning Director

Date: May 20, 2020

Re: Citizen Comment against zoning docket # C-235 within 24 hour period Planning Board

Judy & Billy West
6166 Haywood Street
Clemmons, NC 27012

Ms. West is against the proposed development.

- The increase to traffic would be unacceptable
- Many of the elderly property owners enjoy walking the neighborhood. The increase in traffic may pose as a safety issue
- Connection to the proposed development should be from Idols Road and not Hampton Road
- Concerns about road widening and property taking
- Wish they could voice their opinion better as an in-person meeting would be best

From: [Charles Weed](#)
To: [Nasser Rahimzadeh](#)
Subject: Ref: Zoning Docket C-235
Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 2:53:40 PM

My name is Charles Weed. We spoke briefly during the Clemmons Planning Board meeting last evening May 19, 2020. I wanted to put in writing our concerns that we briefly discussed last evening during our brief phone conversation. I had put comments/questions on the YouTube chat but wanted to also send them to you via email.

1. What would happen to the gravel drive right of way between lots BB & CC on the plan map coming off of Arden Dr?
2. Connectivity needs to somehow take the traffic from the new subdivision out to Cloud Harbor and then to the Idols Rd Extension. Traffic on Hampton Road during prime travel times is still horrible even with the new extension open. We have to sit at the end of Arden Dr sometimes 2-5 minutes to get out in the mornings (that's turning right, longer if turning left)
3. A buffer yard needs to be added to the Arden Drive side of the subdivision. According to the plans a buffer is already being added everywhere except the Arden Dr side. Preferably they would use something other than Leyland Cyprus or Bradford pears. We need something thick and sturdy that won't break with winds.
4. What type of storm/water drainage will be added behind the homes on Arden Dr. The drawings suggest a ditch of some kind. We are concerned about standing water in the ditch. This is not acceptable.
5. How far will the new homes be from the back edge of the properties on Arden Dr. including the drainage ditch.
6. There was discussion about the access roads not being wide enough for traffic and/or emergency vehicles. Arden Dr is not wide enough either and should not be considered as access to the new subdivision. There are drop offs on each side of Arden Dr that already makes it hard for 2 cars to pass without one falling off the road.
7. Also it was mentioned that the fire department requires that access be a certain distance apart, even if Quartersawn Lane WAS extended to Arden Dr through what is now the gravel road, would that even meet the requirements. I don't think so.
8. Would prefer that the builder consider building just single family homes (RS-9) and not the twin homes/duplex/townhouses. The multi family dwellings would increase the traffic more than single family homes.

We have been a resident at this one location (6100 Arden Dr) since December 1988. We purchased this home because of the beautiful location and wide open area around it. We are not looking forward to waking up every morning and looking at a 104 home subdivision/townhomes. This is why the buffer is VERY important to us. Cryptomeria or something similar would be better in the buffer yards.

There are also small children that live in the home right where Haywood would enter this subdivision. Something needs to be put in place as a buffer at that entrance as well to protect those children.

All of the neighbors that we have spoken with on Arden Dr share the same concerns as we have, especially about traffic and the buffers.

Please let us know if we will be able to listen to the meeting Thursday at 3:00 via YouTube as we did last night.

Thank you

Charles E. Weed
Kathy Marlene Weed
6100 Arden Dr.
Clemmons NC
336-287-4913
336-287-4768

Please be aware that e-mail and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: [Cheryl Wilmoth](#)
To: [Nasser Rahimzadeh](#)
Cc: dwilmoth78@gmail.com
Subject: Zoning Docket C-235_Old Mill Subdivision_Comments
Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 1:20:51 PM

Good Afternoon Mr. Rahimzadeh,

My husband, Donald R Wilmoth, II and I reside at 4138 Arden Street and attended the Planning Board Meeting on 19 May 2020 via Zoom. After review of the plans and receipt of testimony during last night's call from both our neighbors and Isenhour Homes, **we are very much opposed** to the creation of subdivision as it is proposed now. We echo much of our neighbor's sentiments that spoke last night via phone, as well as other neighbors we have spoken to since the plan has been made known to our community. Below, I have noted some precise comments supporting the reasons why we oppose such a development:

- We are not agreeable to the future 3 Lot section, directly across from our residence, being re-zoned to RS9 from RS15. All of the homes in this small community are single family dwellings with more acreage than is seen in more newer developments. The creation of townhomes in this lot would not be in keeping with the current architectural style or character that has drawn many families to want to buy in our area. This area is also desirable for families who would like a quiet and more mature neighborhood to reside. This is why we bought here and why many of our neighbors did the same. Additionally, utilizing this area as an egress from the neighborhood in no way reduces the impact to the community, as this egress will still have to spill out on Haywood or Quinn to reach Hampton.
- As stated on the call last night, the major concern is the traffic – both on Quinn/Haywood, as well as Hampton. With regard to Quinn/Haywood, these roads are merely side streets, used to support a small community. As a result, the roads are narrow and often quiet – again making this community ideal since we all use this road to walk with families and pets. Children often ride their bikes with little thought of traffic - our own son did. The roads are also not well equipped to handle two lanes. Currently, if we meet a car going in the opposite direction, we slow down and ensure each has enough room to pass. This is doable since the traffic is in fact quite low right now. Finally, Hampton Road is famously congested and under suited as a thoroughfare currently. The opening of the bypass helped a bit, but the traffic is still very high, particularly during peak times.
- Another concern is the lack of secondary access. Again, Quinn and Haywood are not suited to accommodate traffic from what could be 100 extra vehicles. It's unimaginable. I realize that Isenhour Homes rebutted this argument and suggested that their average consumer does not create the kind of traffic as a typical community; but, even if that's true, and even if it's only 50% of that, that is still too much for what is essentially two side roads.
- As our neighbors noted last night during the call, the impact to privacy is a major concern for those neighbors that would directly adjoin this development.

In conclusion, we highly recommend that further discussions related to the review of this development be tabled until the current COVID-19 pandemic is resolved. Most residents in this neighborhood are retirees, consisting of veterans, elderly and disabled. They quite simply do not

have access to the resources and opportunity to engage in discussion in this current setting. Finally, there was no discussion last night regarding anticipated timelines for review and finalization of this development. Can I request a basic time frame to understand our options related to rebuttal. As our neighbor pointed out, the letter and posting was the first time we, in this neighborhood, were made aware of the development. Additionally, will Thursday's meeting (21 May 2020) be available via Zoom or You Tube?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with these comments and questions. I appreciate any response you may be able to offer and please don't hesitate to reach out to us for any further clarification.

My Best,

Donald and Cheryl Wilmoth

336-244-8947

336-428-2829

This email transmission and any documents, files or previous email messages attached to it may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering this transmission to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you must not read this transmission and that any disclosure, copying, printing, distribution or use of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone or return email and delete the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

Please be aware that e-mail and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: [Pattie Shoemaker](#)
To: [Nasser Rahimzadeh](#)
Subject: Re: Zoning/Arden St
Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 11:58:08 AM

Good morning Mr. Nasser,

I just finished listening to the meeting from last night and I appreciate you bringing up my concerns with the planning board.

I do not have a problem with the developer building behind our property, I just wanted to know what was the plan for a possible entrance/exit on Quinn St coming right by my property. I am still not clear on that as I understand there is still an issue with the fire code, etc and I assume that the reason Esenhour Builders has not communicated anything with us property owners is that the planning board has to make a decision. However, I do feel they should have let us know what their intentions are regarding this issue. With that being said. I guess I will wait to hear what decisions will be made. If you can give me any additional information, I would greatly appreciate it.

Thanks very much

Pattie Shoemaker
4071 Arden St.
Clemmons, NC

On Tuesday, May 19, 2020, 06:40:10 PM EDT, Nasser Rahimzadeh <nasser@clemmons.org> wrote:

Ms. Shoemaker,

You may watch the Planning Board meeting right now. Please click on the [channel](#). We will be discussing Quinn and Haywood Street. I will make your comments known to Planning Board.

From: Pattie Shoemaker <pjoeshoe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2020 6:07 PM
To: Nasser Rahimzadeh <nasser@clemmons.org>
Subject: Zoning/Arden St

Mr. Nasser,

My name is Pattie Shoemaker and I live at 4071 Arden St. From my understanding, the access road into the new proposed development is coming right up Quinn St. and by my property. I am very concerned about if the road is going to be widened to the affect that will affect my property and if so, how much and would it cut into my driveway? If so, where in the world would "we" park?? Will we be compensated for any of these changes as if it would cost us "out of pocket", that is certainly not a good way to do business by having us pay the price of this problem. Also if this entrance is the "main" entrance, we are talking about a ton of traffic going in and out. Please advise asap!!

From: [MB BREWER](#)
To: [Nasser Rahimzadeh](#)
Subject: Ol Mill Development
Date: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 11:41:04 AM

May 20,2020

Dear Sir,

My name is Lisa Brewer. My husband Michael and I live on Arden Drive. We watched the zoning meeting last night about the Old Mill development. We have several concerns regarding this project. First would be, as Mr. Tingle stated in his call last night, that the timing of this whole thing is very bad. All the residents that are affected by this project deserve the right to personally and publicly convey their concerns and ask questions to the board and the developer. At this time because of the pandemic it is not prudent to have a public meeting, so there for, this zoning request should be postponed until at which time it is possible to have a public meeting, Again as Mr. Tingle stated, not all residents even know about this project and some of the ones that are aware may not have been able to attend the Zoom meeting because of lack of internet or the knowledge of how to navigate the internet. The only fair and appropriate thing to do is delay the decision until an actual public meeting can be held!

Secondly, the traffic that this development would create coming out onto Hampton Road would be horrible! Even now in the mornings it is hard to get off of our road (Arden Drive). I need to turn left onto Hampton Road which is almost impossible in the morning! Some mornings I have to sit and wait several minutes to turn left! Some mornings I just give up and turn right and go up and turn around to then head in direction that I want to go. If you have a hundred plus home in that development then you are looking at a minimum of a hundred cars being added to that already very busy traffic situation! It would be horrible to get out of Quinn St., Haywood St. and Arden Dr. in the mornings!! An entrance /exit from Arden Drive would not be the answer because that is still emptying all the traffic onto Hampton! And, there is another tract of land on Cloud Harbor that very possibly in the near future will be developed so that will add many more cars on Arden getting onto Hampton. So, it seems to me, the best solution would be to put an entrance/exit emptying out unto to the new Idols Road extension! I thought that the original purpose of spending the money to build this road was to alleviate the traffic on Hampton and through Clemmons. So it makes no sense that you would consider a development that empties a hundred plus cars onto Hampton when the cars can be emptied onto Idols! And that not is not even mentioning the concerns of fire marshall and the fire codes about entrance/exit in the development!

Thirdly, I am concerned about the number of dwellings that are being planned for this development! Other than MONEY, why are there so many? If you look at the size lots that they are proposing and the number of houses that could be built, then those house are going to be on top of each other! That is definitely not keeping to the look of the surrounding neighborhoods! The lots in established neighborhoods have lots at least twice as big as those small ones they are proposing. Why not, bigger lots with less houses with some nice trees to keep it more to the look of our neighborhoods. And not to mention, fewer houses means fewer cars, means less traffic!!!!

And lastly, and most important to me, is the fact that my daughter, son-in-law and two grandkids live at 6141 Haywood Street. This is the last house on Haywood Street. The new entrance to development would basically begin at their driveway. The traffic that this entrance would create at their property is very concerning because my grandkids are 8 and 3. They love playing outside in their yard. The fact that my daughters property is at the end of the street and that they have this beautiful open field in front of their house was one of the main reasons they bought the house. It has been a wonderful home for them and their children! According to the zoning map there is a planting buffer area between new development and properties on Arden Street but it does not show a buffer area starting at my daughter's property on Haywood and then down behind properties that face Arden Drive! Why is this? The properties on both sides of development deserve that privacy/buffering area. That would only be fair! My daughter's house actually faces the land that would be developed, unlike other properties that backs up to the land! This definitely needs to be addressed!!

If you would ask me if I am for or against this development. Then I would honestly say that I am against it! We have lived on Arden Drive for 28 years! It has been a wonderful neighborhood to live and raise our family! We were thrilled that our daughter and son-in-law bought the house on Haywood because we can see them and be involved with them everyday! We can walk to their house, they can walk to ours! But, I realize that things change and we figured eventually there would be development in that beautiful field that we have so enjoyed all these years. I would just ask that all things be considered in this decision and that you would delay that decision until all citizen's concerns can be addressed in a public forum!

Thank you so much for your time and consideration!

Lisa Brewer
6040 Arden Drive
Clemmons, NC 27012
336-766-9851

Please be aware that e-mail and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

My name is Miranda DiCello, property owner at 6124 Arden Dr.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

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

From: Nasser Rahimzadeh <nasser@clemmons.org>
To: mdicell@aol.com <mdicell@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, May 19, 2020 5:56 pm
Subject: RE: C-235 Old Mill Subdivision
Would you like to speak tonight?

From: mdicell@aol.com <mdicell@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2020 5:54 PM
To: Nasser Rahimzadeh <nasser@clemmons.org>
Subject: Re: C-235 Old Mill Subdivision

Should comments be sent to you or be made during the Zoom meeting? If to you then:

1. no Leyland Cypress or Bradford Pear trees in the bufferyard plantings
2. *** Add bufferyard plantings behind lots 37 - 48. Same preference - no Leyland Cypress or Bradford Pears.
3. If Quartersawn Lane is extended to Arden Dr. then bufferyard plantings should be included along that road. Same planting preference - no Leyland Cypress or Bradford Pears.
4. A question: If Quartersawn Lane is extended to Arden Dr are any changes expected to be made to Arden Dr.?

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

From: Nasser Rahimzadeh <nasser@clemmons.org>
To: mdicell@aol.com <mdicell@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, May 19, 2020 12:13 pm
Subject: C-235 Old Mill Subdivision

Good afternoon,

Per our conversation, The Village of Clemmons YouTube [channel](#) will be airing the hearing at 6:00pm later today. You may access C-235 Old Mill Subdivision on our [website](#). Let me know if you need anything else.

Nasser Rahimzadeh
Village Planner
Village of Clemmons
3715 Clemmons Road
Clemmons, NC 27012
336.766.7511 Office
336.703.7008 Mobile

Please be aware that e-mail and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: mdicell@aol.com
To: [Nasser Rahimzadeh](#)
Subject: Re: C-235 Old Mill Subdivision
Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2020 9:56:51 PM

I joined the meeting tonight primarily to voice an opinion about the buffer yard areas. After hearing how this meeting went, I now have concerns about the project as a whole. I think the zoning decision should be postponed until Covid restrictions are lifted to the point where a normal planning board meeting can take place. I was a resident when the plans for Hawks Ridge and the other apartment complex were first proposed and this development is being handled very differently. The AAA folks did a much better job with their community outreach efforts. At the very least, if postponement is not an option the RM5-S zoning is too dense for the area and should be rejected.

Here are my concerns after hearing the presentation today:

1. The zoning plans on the Village website are dated 2/27. New plans submitted 3/7 were submitted and it doesn't appear they are available for review. This certainly creates the impression that there has been a lack of transparency with the plans for this development.
2. All of the ancillary concerns should also be addressed and presented along with the zoning plans, such as whether or not Quinn, Haywood or Arden St would be widened. If widening Quinn, Arden St. and Haywood are not part of the Village's future plans without this subdivision, then all those residents should be able to weigh in on this ZONING request with the knowledge that the ZONING approval is going to result in widening all those streets. The same is true for the residents of Arden Dr. who will surely be impacted if there is stub road access to Cloud's Harbor Trail.
3. The Isenhour people said 'at this time' they have no plans to create a connector to Arden Dr. But if the zoning is approved and they change their minds do the residents of Arden Dr get a voice in any changes?
4. Another unresolved detail is the property that would likely become green space and have access to Cloud's Harbor Trail. The details of that access need to be finalized before the plan is approved. Why does there need to be access to Cloud's Harbor Trail? The dirt road to Idols Rd Extension is private and should not be used by any Old Mill or Arden Dr residents for access to Idols Rd. That means traffic would turn left onto Cloud's Harbor Trail and then left on to Arden Dr. and now you have a whole other group of folks who should have been notified about this zoning meeting.
4. It is disingenuous for the Isenhour folks to say traffic is reduced on Hampton Rd. Idols Rd extension was built to service the areas zoned light industrial. Any impact on Hampton Rd. traffic is incidental and will be short lived with the addition of the traffic from this one MAJOR subdivision alone.
5. It's presumptive on the part Isenhour to imply there will be no impact to schools because their studies show the demographic for these properties are older and without children. Clemmons is a highly desirable area and I would challenge the impartiality of their data. If they're wrong it'll be too late and Clemmons will have to address the school issues. The board should view this from the other side too. What if every single one of those 100+ homes has 1 - 3 children living in them?? Would the plans need to change if that were true?
6. A note about the RM5-S zoning... The lady from Isenhour said several times the totality of the development was less than 2 per acre. But the home sites backing up to Arden St. look to be just under 4 to 1 when compared to the Arden St. homes. No wonder they are upset!!
6. Lastly, postponing would give impacted citizens a chance to view more complete development plans that you might possibly be able to actually read. It's very hard on the OUTDATED plans available on the Village website to tell what size anything is, especially the buffer yards.

Thank you

Pattie Shoemaker

4071 Arden St.

Clemmons, NC 27012.

Please be aware that e-mail and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: jeannie.wagner
To: Nasser.Rahimzadeh
Subject: Re: House developing
Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2020 9:55:15 PM

I didn't No we could make comments on the YouTube feed. But I wanted to make it clear that we still oppose the development of the houses and townhouses behind our neighborhood. We feel like there's going to be an excessive if amount of traffic in our neighborhood. And we are concerned about the building of the houses. Not to mention The overpopulation for our schools and our town.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Wednesday, April 22, 2020, 3:32 PM, Nasser Rahimzadeh <nasser@clemmons.org> wrote:

<https://www.clemmons.org/174/Site-Plan-Reviews>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iKxWZr5BhEI>

From: Nasser Rahimzadeh
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2020 3:29 PM
To: 'jeannie.wagner' <mamapigof3@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: House developing

From: jeannie.wagner <mamapigof3@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2020 1:21 PM
To: Nasser.Rahimzadeh <nasser@clemmons.org>
Subject: House developing

Hi how are you doing I noticed in my backyard a survey stakes sticking up with a pink ribbon and when I called Clemmons they told me that there was a housing development that's Being looked at and I would like to know a little bit information about it please and my name is Frankie and my number is 336-749-0476 thank you

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Please be aware that e-mail and attachments sent to and from this address are subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.



9:34R DiCelloHere are my comments about c-235.



10:49R DiCello1. no Leyland Cypress or Bradford Pear trees in the bufferyard plantings 2. ***
Add bufferyard plantings behind lots 37 - 48. Same preference - no Leyland Cypress or Bradford
Pears.



11:57R DiCello3. If Quartersawn Lane is extended to Arden Dr. then bufferyard plantings should
be included along that road. Same planting preference - no Leyland Cypress or Bradford Pears.



12:28BigPoppa CrakahhBegin holding developers accountable for their landscape plans, no Crepe
Myrtle murders and butchery as you can see around the village. Property owners need to have
consequences for failure to comply

May 18, 2020

Re: Zoning Docket C-235, Request for RS-9 and RM5-S Zoning for Old Mill Subdivision

Mr. Rahimzadeh, Members of the Clemmons Planning Board,

Our names are Mike and Amanda Tingle, we reside at 4165 Arden Street, Clemmons. Our property is marked as lot "O" on the proposed site plan, and we share 1,103.5ft of property line with the proposed Old Mill Subdivision. We are in opposition to the existing site plan, and will outline our chief concerns here in this statement.

It is clear from the site plans submitted thus far that the primary objective of Isehour Homes is to wedge as many houses on to the site as possible. And, in doing so they are showing a blatant disregard for the policies and procedures set forth in the Clemmons UDO and the desires of the Village members as captured by the Clemmons Community Compass 2040.

Traffic Impact

As members of the Clemmons community we are all well aware of the traffic issues which are prevalent in our area. If any of you live in the Hampton Rd/Hwy 158 corridor, you are very familiar with the congestion which builds up and creates mile-long traffic jams at peak times. As you look forward and approve plans for future developments, I urge you to always be mindful of the traffic impact. I see in the staff report that the Old Mill Subdivision is expected to add an additional 78 trips in the morning and 99 in the evenings. While this may seem insignificant, take a look at a map of this area and you will realize that all of those additional trips would be taking place via Quinn Street and Haywood Street. These two roads were initially constructed in the 1950's to support the Arden Park subdivision. These additional motorists will need to drive through the existing neighborhood in order to reach Hampton Road. As a daily commuter, I can't even fathom what that will look like, to be queued up on secondary streets, just to get to Hampton Road.

If the additional trips necessitate the addition of turn lanes on Hampton Road, will the existing taxpayers have to bear that burden? And it is noted in the Technical Review that additional modifications may be needed to Arden Drive, Quinn Street and Haywood Street, would these also be at the existing taxpayers expense?

Lack of Accessibility –As stated in the Clemmons Community Compass, subdivisions should be designed to provide connectivity throughout. As noted in the Technical and Staff reports, the current site plan for the Old Mill subdivision does not follow a grid pattern of connectivity, it instead incorporates a series of dead ends which allow the developer to maximize the number of housing units on the property. The existing roads do not allow for adequate turnaround for firetrucks, and I would imagine that the garbage trucks and snow plows would have a similar issue. In order to mitigate traffic congestion on Quinn Street and Haywood Street, and to give Old Mill residents alternative routes, I would strongly suggest that the Planning committee follow up on the notes in the Technical and Staff reports regarding extending

Quarter Sawn Ln to connect with Arden Drive, and to create the stub for a future extension of Haywood Street. With the additional option of Arden Drive, some of the residents may choose to take this route to the new Idols Rd connector and avoid Hampton Rd entirely.

As outlined in the Clemmons UDO and Community Compass, RM-5 zoning districts are intended for pedestrian oriented sites and communities. The proposed site is not located in an area which would be considered pedestrian friendly. Hampton Road is heavily travelled and has no sidewalks, not even a shoulder for the road. Where would/could people safely walk to other than the Clemmons Mill feedstore? The nearest shopping center is a mile from the proposed site and it would require someone on foot to cross HWY 158 in order to access the center. And, again, there is not a continuous sidewalk system in place. For this reason alone, the request to re-zone to RM-5S is nonsensical. Single family attached housing is best suited to areas adjacent to major thoroughfares and within close proximity to shopping and dining options. The twin-home neighborhoods on Kinnamon near Peace Haven are good examples of twin-home housing units with direct access to primary thoroughfares.

Environmental Impact/Quality of Life

The proposed site consists of 40 acres of farmland and the developer has chosen to provide payment in lieu of the appropriate amount of open recreation space. How is this in keeping with the desire for increased recreational opportunities for Village members? How would this help to maintain the rural character that so many find appealing here in Clemmons?

Since the developer has not yet applied for the necessary erosion control, grading or stormwater treatment permits, it is unknown whether their proposed land disturbances will even be allowed. It seems premature to make a decision to green-light this project without that information at hand. There is an existing pond on this site, a dam and a stream, all of these will be affected by this development.

Economic Impact

It seems ill advised to be planning a development of this scope when the world economy has been turned upside down. The current US unemployment rate is at 14.7% and here in North Carolina more than 1M people have filed for unemployment benefits. More locally, the largest employer in Forsyth county, Wake Forest Baptist Health, has instituted furloughs, and Wake Forest University has already put hiring and salary freezes in place for the upcoming year. The housing market is already changing as is evident by the April HUD reports, and will continue to change dramatically in the coming year(s), as many families who were comfortable prior to March of this year are now facing economic hardships they had no time to plan for. I imagine that Mr. Isenhour will market the twin homes to older members of our community, is now really the time for them to be purchasing new homes, when stocks, bonds and 401K's are performing so poorly? A quick look at the Isenhour Homes inventory will give you a sense of the proposed price point for this new development, and these prices are significantly higher than the average for homes in Clemmons. This seems to be at odds with what is happening in the economy right now. I would urge you to seek out a revised economic outlook study for the local housing market, one using post-COVID-19 numbers to justify new developments of any size, and especially for ones with this level of density.

As you review the documents before you, ask yourselves, how does this development, in its current state, fulfill the values and objectives set forth in the Clemmons Community Compass 2040? The proposed development would negatively impact the traffic patterns of the immediate area, necessitating modifications to existing roadways at Village and taxpayers expense. The site plan disregards the Village requirement for roadway connectivity, and most importantly disregards public safety by not adequately planning for fire, garbage and snow clearing services. Rather than embracing the agricultural nature of the existing land and working with its rural character, which would be in keeping with the desires set forth in the Community Compass, the developer has opted to build on every foot of land possible. It is for the reasons stated above that we implore you to deny the request for re-zoning to RM-5 and RS-9 on the proposed Old Mill Subdivision site.

Sincerely,

Amanda & Mike Tingle