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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this Study is to take a critical look at the Spring Lake Study Area (as defined herein) in terms of existing conditions, assessing the positive and negative aspects of the Area; and developing recommendations to enhance the positives and creating an action plan to address the negatives with the available resources. The Study addresses the Area in two parts: 1) the Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area and 2) the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area, as approved by the Spring Lake Board of Aldermen and the Cumberland County Board of Commissioners. These two areas represent many separate issues. The Town of Spring Lake and its surrounding area represent all the associated issues of development over a 50-year period. The Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area represents the new development and its associated issues.

The Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area (approximately 6,500 acres) is in the northwestern portion of Cumberland County, sandwiched between the Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base Military Reservations.

The Planning process for this Area began with a vision session held on December 7, 1999 at the Spring Lake Town Hall. Approximately 87 residents were present and they completed 64 questionnaires. Volunteers were solicited to serve on a citizen planning committee charged to develop a Plan with facilitation from the Planning Staff. The Spring Lake Study Area Citizen Planning Committee met between January 2000 to May 2000. On June 15, 2000 the Plan was presented to the residents at a second community wide meeting for feedback.

According to 2000 Census figures, the Town’s population is approximately 8,098 persons (does not include surrounding area population). The study found that a large number of households have children under 18 years of age, the number of persons in the labor force has decreased significantly, the number of military personnel living in the Town has decreased dramatically, the Town is losing population, and the families’ income is lower than the average population of the County.

Due to confinement by the Military Reservation, the only land area available to the Town for growth is north on the Lillington Highway Corridor and northeast toward Ramsey Street in northern Cumberland County, adjacent to the Harnett County Line.

Housing data shows that the Area has a large number of substandard rental home units with most of the substandard units being manufactured homes. This is due in part because the age of the units and the transient population over the years.

The Town provides public water and sewer. Many of the existing lines are old and in need of repair. Other areas surrounding the Town are in need of these utilities. In 1978, the Town constructed a 1.5 million gallon wastewater treatment plant on the Little River. Between 1980 and 1999, the sewage outflow increased 66%. At this rate, the Town will need to expand the plant by 2020. County Health Department records show that between October 1995 and January 1999, there were 41 septic tank repairs in the area immediately surrounding the Town. The Town of Spring Lake also has water issues to address. The existing wells soon will be unable to supply sufficient water to the Town. If the runway at Pope Air Force Base is extended into the Town, it will eliminate three of the Town’s wells. The other well has been plagued by Benzene contamination. Even though the Town purchases water from the Fayetteville Public Works Commission, it is not a truly reliable source in that on several occasions PWC had to divert water away from the Town to meet its own system needs. This has usually occurred during dry weather when the Town was struggling to meet its demand. The existing PWC booster pump station that supplies the Town cannot meet the long-term
projected demand. In addition to supply problems, the Town’s water distribution system lacks sufficient hydraulic capacity to supply all its current service area and meet State mandated minimum criteria.

The primary transportation routes through the Town have been and are currently being upgraded. Lillington Highway (N.C. 210) was upgraded to five lanes through the Area. This is the primary route for access to the Triangle Area. North Bragg Boulevard (N.C. 24/87) is currently being widened from Spring Lake to N.C. 421 in Sanford. This is the primary route for access to the Triad Area. All of the traffic converges at the intersection of N.C. 24/87 and N.C. 210 in the heart of Spring Lake creating traffic congestion. Once the widening of N.C. 87 is completed to U.S 74/76, all the southeastern beach bound traffic from the Triad Area will be able to utilize this route instead of the I-85/I-40 route. Many of the Town’s streets are in need of upgrading, realigning, repairing, and drainage improvements.

Downtown Spring Lake is a hodge-podge of commercial development that is poorly maintained, with no continuity, no pedestrian amenities, and a wide vehicular travel area on Main Street with parking on both sides. The entrances to the Downtown are undefined and “off the beaten path” from the south and the north end of Town. Efforts need to be made to provide directional signage, enhance the visual appearance and image of the Downtown Area.

Military operations at Pope Air Force Base greatly impact the northwestern portion of the Town. This impact includes noise, height, and the designated zones for the possibility of an aircraft crash. These factors restrict the location and type of development. Considerations are now underway to extend the runway into the Town’s land area. This will further reduce the amount of land available for development in the Town. Due to the economic impact of the Military on the Town and the entire region, it is imperative that cooperative accommodations be achieved with Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base.

A key intangible issue brought out in the planning process was the need to improve the image and the visual appearance of the Town. This visual blight results from the incompatible land use, lack of landscaping, lack of adequate sign controls, and the general unkempt condition of property.

The second area studied was the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area. This Area is primarily rural in nature, containing approximately 6,000 acres, with a concentration of a few large new subdivisions. The most significant data for this Area is that the population is increasing rapidly and most of the housing units are single-family stick-built homes. Other data on this Area can be found in the Appendix. The primary focus was to provide the Town with pertinent data about an area added to its Municipal Influence Area. Since the Area is primarily undeveloped, it was felt that the standards and development guidelines created by the Town would be applied to the new development in the Area. It was also concluded that the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan provided sufficient future land use guidance until a more detailed study is done.

The items addressed above are issues the Plan identified that need to be addressed to improve the economic vitality and the quality of life of residents in the Study Area. These issues are multi-pronged and require attacking on many fronts. This document primarily provides recommendations on issues that can be dealt with through comprehensive planning.

**RECOMMENDATION 1: GENERAL**

There were some broad general concepts recommended in the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan, adopted by the Spring Lake Board of Aldermen, that are endorsed by this Study. These concepts are the: 1) Urban Services Area, 2) Municipal Influence Area, 3) Nodal/Corridor Urban Form, and 4) Designated Entrance Corridor.

**RECOMMENDATION 2: COMPREHENSIVE REHABILITATION**

The Plan identified four areas that need extensive rehabilitation. This rehabilitation work must include improvements to the streets, infrastructure, drainage, and housing. A large percentage of the housing in these areas is substandard or dilapidated. There are some areas within the designated rehab areas that have been razed. New construction will be needed in these areas. Spring Lake is part of the Community

---
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Development Entitlement Program of Cumberland County, which is automatically funded annually. The Town should submit a request to the County Community Development Department for a multi-year community development grant to address a prioritized (by the Town) targeted area. The selected targeted area grant should include upgrading the infrastructure, street and sidewalk improvements, drainage improvements, housing rehab, and an incentive program for private investment. While there are some areas that will require concentrated rehabilitation, there are other areas that have scattered substandard housing that must be addressed. The challenge is that many of these scattered substandard units are manufactured homes. It may cost more to bring them up to codes than their real value. A more detailed investigation and assessment of these properties should be undertaken.

RECOMMENDATION 3: UTILITIES

The Spring Lake Study Area Citizens Planning Committee ranked utilities as the number one goal of the Plan. The primary utilities are water and sewer. Adequate utilities are a must for economic development. Utility plans must address existing substandard facilities and provide new facilities in growth areas. The Town contracted the Rose Group to study the water system. They prepared a report entitled the Preliminary Engineering Report Water System Improvements for the Town of Spring Lake, September 1999. This Plan outlines the water improvements that must be undertaken. This Plan called for the Town to tie into the Harnett County Water System which subsequently has been done. This connection provides an alternative source of water for the Town. Other improvements in the water and sewer systems are outlined in the Spring Lake 20 Year Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Program adopted by the Town on August 23, 1999. Efforts should be made to pursue all Federal, State, local, and private funds to accelerate the implementation of the Water And Sewer Capital Improvement Plan.

RECOMMENDATION 4: TRANSPORTATION

Transportation recommendations are made for both vehicular and pedestrian circulation. The primary vehicular circulation issue in the Town should be creating a loop (TIP Project R-2629) around the N.C. 24/87 (North Bragg Boulevard) and N. C. 210 (Lillington Highway) intersection bottleneck, which was addressed by the Spring Lake Loop in the Fayetteville Metropolitan Area Thoroughfare Plan. Due to military operational and environmental concerns, alternative locations for the loop are now being generated. The Town should closely monitor the progress of this endeavor.

Existing streets needing improvements located in targeted Community Development grant areas should be included in the grant for improvement. Streets not in targeted grant areas that require improvements should be included in a Capital Improvement Program developed by the Town. Other street improvements include upgrading Ruth Street from North Main Street to Graham Street (concrete curb and gutters, landscaping, and sidewalks); extend Laketree Street to Ruth Street as outlined in the adopted Fayetteville Metropolitan Area Thoroughfare Plan. The Thoroughfare Plan should be amended to realign Chapel Hill Road with McKenzie Drive at North Bragg Boulevard and upgrade Chapel Hill Road from North Bragg Boulevard (N.C. 87/24) to Lillington Highway (N.C. 210); and extend Chapel Hill Road east to McCormick Road and upgrade McCormick Road to Murchison Road (N.C. 87) and extend it to South Bragg Boulevard (N.C. 24/210) at the Fort Bragg entrance (entire street segment should have boulevard type design with center and side landscaping, limited access, and sidewalks).

Fort Bragg has proposed closing Bragg Boulevard as part of its overall security program. There will be a brainstorming session addressing the proposal by a citizen committee which will include representation from Spring Lake. Spring Lake should actively be involved in this endeavor.

Pedestrian circulation recommendations include the installation of sidewalks on the streets as designated on the Recommended Transportation Plan as well as the greenway/pedestrian trails. These pedestrian walks and trails will connect shopping, residential, recreation, governmental, schools, and cultural facilities together. Funds for these improvements can be programmed into the Capital Improvement Plan and funded through local, State, Federal and private funds.

---
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The Fayetteville Metropolitan Area Congestion Management Plan adopted by the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) on January 30, 2002, calls for the creation of a countywide transit system including mass transit service to Spring Lake. A park and ride lot is proposed in central Spring Lake for residents in the area surrounding the Town. Spring Lake should closely monitor the development of this countywide system to insure that the service is made available to its residents.

**RECOMMENDATION 5: DOWNTOWN**

The Downtown Area is critical in the economic health of Spring Lake. It is also a very complex entity. Development of a plan for the Downtown Area will take time, and the cooperation of the Spring Lake Board of Aldermen and management, the business sector (property and business owners, developers, financial institutions, the Chamber of Commerce, etc). Due to this complexity, it must be addressed through a well-conceived and deliberate process. This process should include: 1) the developing a public-private partnership to define a business plan; 2) defining a future vision for the area; 3) identifying current strengths and weaknesses; 4) developing an understanding of the commercial area’s market (market analysis); 5) choosing strategies that best address the Area’s needs; and 6) cooperatively implementing those strategies. In order to insure the long-term viability of the Downtown Area, it will take cosmetic improvements to the structures by encouraging building maintenance and upgrading; creating financial incentives for rehabilitation; and defining design standards for existing and new construction. There should also be defined and enhanced entrances into the Downtown Area, including directional signage directing the motoring public to the Downtown Area.

The Area’s image must also be improved. This could be accomplished by a public relations program; cooperation and communication among the business owners; a comprehensive long term, and well capitalized formal marketing campaign for the Area; and undertaking efforts to convey to the public that the Area is safe and secure.

The Spring Lake Study Area Citizen Planning Committee recognized that the Downtown has an international mixture of restaurants and markets that are unique. They felt that this international theme is the gem that should be developed for the Downtown Area. A key element to developing this theme is to make the whole area pedestrian oriented with vehicular parking areas strategically located. These pedestrian facilities include fountains, benches, sidewalks, landscaping, lighting, etc. They also felt the Area is an excellent location for mixed-use development and that the surrounding residential areas are critical in the Downtown Area’s success.

**RECOMMENDATION 6: THE LAND USE PLAN**

The Recommended Land Use Plan, as explained in the outset of this summary, consists of two areas: 1) The Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area and 2) The Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area. Both of the areas are included in the Spring Lake Area Recommended Land Use Plan. The recommended land use plan delineated areas for commercial (planned and light), residential (suburban, low, medium, and high density), open space, office and Institutional, industrial (light and heavy), governmental, open space, and downtown.

The Spring Lake Study Area Citizen Planning Committee concentrated on the Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area. Efforts were made to accommodate current military operations; provide area for industrial expansion; accommodate existing and future commercial needs; provide for new residential development; provide for higher density residential development in areas with adequate utilities or recommended for rehabilitation; provide environmental corridors and open space areas; and delineate an area that needs to be considered in the Downtown planning efforts.
RECOMMENDATION 7: IMPROVE TOWN’S VISUAL APPEARANCE AND IMAGE

Efforts should be made to improve the visual appearance and image of Spring Lake. Improving the visual appearance will, in part, address its image. The visual appearance of Spring Lake can be enhanced by implementing the “Designated Entrance Corridor Concept”, which proposes planting street trees along all entrances to the Town. Other measures should include sign control, compatible land uses, code enforcement, landscaping and screening, pedestrian amenities, better property maintenance, etc. These improvements can be achieved by the private or public sector, State and Federal grants, civic organizations, etc.

RECOMMENDATION 8: ESTABLISH PERMANENT SPRING LAKE AREA CITIZEN PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Spring Lake Study Area Citizen’s Planning Committee played a major role in the development of the Spring Lake Area Detailed Land Use Plan. In doing so, they have a great deal of insight and information about the Area. This group should be organized into a permanent group to provide a communication link between the community, the Planning Staff, and the Planning Board. There should be annual updates to this Committee by the Planning Staff and a mechanism put in place to inform the group leader of any planning related matters in the Area. Establishing this group also will provide an organization in the community that can serve as the citizen’s voice when the Plan is to be updated.
INTRODUCTION

The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan is a “generalized” land use plan in terms of providing overall goals and guidelines for development in the County. This Plan is considered the first phase of the land use planning process. The second phase consists of developing “detailed” plans for specific geographic areas in the County. The Spring Lake Area was prioritized by the Planning Board as the fourth area to receive detailed planning.

The purpose of this document is to develop a detailed land use plan for the Spring Lake Area as defined. Two factors that will most likely initiate further development in the Spring Lake Area are 1) the construction of the Fayetteville Outer Loop that traverses the northern portion of the County and the Spring Lake By-Pass (N.C. Highway 24), and 2) the availability of public water and sewer service to a portion of the Area.

This study takes a comprehensive view of all existing features, policies, and conditions that may impact the development of the Area. The cornerstone of the Plan’s development is public participation. The Spring Lake Citizen Planning Committee, which is a group of citizen volunteers from the Area willing to work with the Staff to accomplish this objective, developed the Plan.

This Study addresses the Area in two parts: 1) The Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area and 2) the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area. Detailed data was compiled for both areas but detailed planning was only done for the Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area. Planning for the Municipal Influence Area consisted of the same land use as recommended in the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan.

This Study is organized with the first portion examining existing conditions which include population and economic conditions; community facilities and services; existing land use; existing zoning and zoning history; military impacts; environmental conditions; historic resources; past plans, policies and regulations; and citizen input for Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area. This same data pertaining to the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area is located in the Appendix. The second portion contains the goals of the Plan and the Plan Recommendations.

DEFINITION OF STUDY AREA

The boundaries of the Study Area are as follows: on the west and south by the Fort Bragg Military Reservation; on the east by McArthur Road and the Military Reservation; and on the north by the Harnett County Line (The Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area) and the Municipal Influence Area is defined on the west by the Town of Spring Lake and the immediate surrounding area; to the north by Harnett County; on the south by the Military Reservation, Elliot Farm Road, and Elliot Bridge Road; and to the east by Ramsey Street and the Urban Services Area Line as illustrated in Map 1 – Spring Lake Study Area Boundary.
OVERVIEW

The Town of Spring Lake Study Area is located in the northwestern portion of the County sandwiched between portions of the Fort Bragg Military Reservation. The core of the Area consists of the Town of Spring Lake. Spring Lake was known first as Clayton Cut because of the deep path that was cut through the hills where the railroad now runs. The Lake for which the Town was later named was formed around 1923 when the railroad was built across a swamp, damming up the water. The Town of Spring Lake was incorporated in 1951, and is the third most populous municipality in the County with a population of 8,098 persons, according to preliminary Census 2000 data. It consists of approximately 2.5 square miles and is bordered on the east, south, and west by the Military Reservation. The Town has experienced a considerable amount of commercial growth. It is the third largest business area in the County behind downtown Fayetteville and the Cross Creek Mall area. Public improvements in the Town include a New Town Hall facility, expanded sewerage treatment plant, recreation and park improvements, water and street improvements, a new branch library and a satellite resource center. Spring Lake has a Supervisor-Council form of government, consisting of a mayor and five aldermen/alderwomen. The Town Supervisor is the Chief Administrative Officer charged with carrying out the policies of the Board of Aldermen. The Town government consists of nine departments employing 102 persons. The remaining portion of this Study Area consists of the unincorporated area in the County surrounding the Town.

The second portion of the Study (Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area) consists of primarily a rural developing unincorporated areas of the County that has seen over 80% of its development since 1980. This area is poised for continued growth.
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THE PROCESS

The process utilized in the development of the area plans is very similar to the one used to develop the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan. The cornerstone in the process is citizen participation. Efforts will be made to get the citizens to play a more active role in the Plan development, adoption, and implementation phases of the process, through the organization of a citizen group that will oversee the implementation of the adopted Plan and serve as a steering group for Plan updates.

In order to accomplish the development of neighborhood/area plans, the following must be undertaken:

A. Develop a definition of the study area;
B. Develop data collection method(s) to be utilized;
C. Collect and analyze general information and physical, social and economic data;
D. Conduct a vision session with residents in the area, and establish a citizen planning committee;
E. Compile and analyze citizen input;
F. Develop a base map and map data;
G. Conduct work session(s) with a citizen planning committee; conduct a "crash" course in land use planning; and select a citizen to serve as an area spokesperson;
H. Formulate goals and develop a preliminary land use plan with the citizen planning committee;
I. Conduct a citizen meeting to present goals, review and gather feedback on the preliminary land use plan; and establish a mechanism for a permanent citizen planning committee;
J. Review the citizen meeting feedback with the committee spokesperson and planning committee;
K. Assemble the draft Spring Lake Area Land Use Plan document;
L. Present the Plan to Planning Board for review and set public hearing;
M. Present the Plan to the Spring Lake Board of Aldermen and the Board of County Commissioners for adoption; and
N. Plan implementation.
EXISTING CONDITIONS

POPULATION AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Examination of population and economic characteristics is a necessary step in developing a detailed land use plan. The 1990 U.S. Census data provides specific information that can be used to examine general, social, and economic characteristics of a population for a defined area. The Census information is provided in geographic areas such as County, Census Tract, and Block. For purposes of this Study, the data has been gathered according to Census Tract because this geographic area most accurately reflects conditions within the Spring Lake Study Area. Comparisons have been made between Census Tracts 35 and 36, which cover an area that includes the Spring Lake Study Area and the County as a whole. Available Census data such as age, labor force and income cohorts were selected in order to present existing conditions and growth trends that have occurred within the Study Area since 1970 (as of this writing, the 2000 Census data is unavailable). Although Census data prior to 2000 is helpful in illustrating trends that have occurred within Census Tracts and the County as a whole, it does not accurately portray characteristics and conditions within a smaller geographic area than a Census Tract. The Transportation Planning Section of the Cumberland County Planning Department has recently completed a survey to gather information according to Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ), which has been developed by the Census Bureau to provide accurate information in smaller geographic areas than the existing Census Tracts (similar to the Origin and Destination (OD) Zones used by the Census Bureau). For purposes of this Study, TAZ data is available for the actual Study Area (as opposed to the definition of the Study Area contained in footnote 1 below). Available information includes the number of single-family and multi-family housing units; mobile homes; group quarters; town homes/condominiums; churches and employment information. The housing information has been downloaded from the Cumberland County Tax Office OASIS files (with exception of the mobile homes) and other data has been collected through a door-to-door survey. The TAZ data is not available prior to the year 2000; therefore comparisons cannot be made to show growth, housing and employment trends.

According to 2000 Census data, the total population of Cumberland County is approximately 302,963 persons. According to Exhibit 1 – Comparison of Age Characteristics 2000, the total population of the combined Census Tracts that fall within the Spring Lake Study Area is at least 11,610 persons. This is approximately 5% of the total County population.

Exhibit 1 - Comparison of Age Characteristics 2000

Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, 2000

1 For practical purposes, data for Census Tracts 35 and 36 will be labeled as “Study Area” even though the Spring Lake Study Area is smaller than the two combined Census Tracts. Spring Lake Detailed Land Use Plan, CCJPB, February 2002
This data also indicates that all three age cohorts for the combined Census Tracts within the Study Area as well as the total County share similar percentages. This information is illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>% Of Total County</th>
<th>% Of Total Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 19</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 64</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of this data indicates that for both the Study Area as well as the County as a whole, the majority of the population (at least 60%) is between 20 and 64 years of age. At least 32% of the population is between 0 and 19 years of age. A small percentage of the population (at least 4%) is 65 years of age and older. Closer examination of this data indicates that the total population of the Study Area appears to be younger than the overall population of Cumberland County.

This overall characteristic is interesting when compared to trends of age characteristics that have occurred since 1970. According to Exhibit 2 – Change in Age Characteristics 1970 – 1990, the Spring Lake Study Area experienced a decrease in population of approximately 3% between 1970 and 1990 while the total population of Cumberland County increased at least 29%. Trends also indicate that the overall population within the Study Area aged significantly. The number of persons 65 years of age and older increased at least 184% between 1970 and 1990 compared to 138% for the total County population for the same time-period. Concurrently the total number of persons between the ages of 20 and 64 increased approximately 7% within the Study Area while the overall County population increased almost 46% in the same category. Both the Spring Lake Study Area and the County experienced a decrease in the number of persons between 0 and 19 years of age, 20% and 1% respectively.

Exhibit 2 - Change in Age Characteristics 1970 - 1990

Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, 2000

Because at least 60% of the total population of the Study Area is between 20 and 64 years of age, examination of Labor Force characteristics is appropriate. Exhibit 3 – Labor Force Characteristics 1990 illustrates that both the Study Area and the County overall shares almost identical Labor Force characteristics. Approximately 72% of the total number of persons in the County eligible for the Labor Force (16 years of age and older) is currently in the Labor Force, while 73% is representative for the Study Area. Of the total number of persons in the Labor Force, 71% are within the Civilian Labor Force and 29% are in the Armed Forces. These percentages are identical for the overall County and the Study Area. The aging population trend that has occurred within the last twenty years has a direct impact upon the Labor Force characteristics.

Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, 2000

Spring Lake Detailed Land Use Plan, CCJPB, February 2002
According to Exhibit 4 - Changes in Labor Force Characteristics 1970 – 1990, the number of persons eligible for the Labor Force (16 years of age and older) increased at least 42% within the total County population as opposed to an 8% within the Study Area. The total number of persons in the Labor Force increased at least 52% for Cumberland County as a whole and approximately 24% within the Study Area. A significant increase in the total number of persons within the Civilian Labor Force occurred between 1970 and 1990 for both the County as a whole and the Spring Lake Study Area, 112% and 102% respectively. Within the Study Area there was a 36% decrease in the number of persons in the Armed Forces as opposed to a 10% reduction for the County as a whole. It is interesting to note that the Spring Lake Study Area experienced a 21% decrease in the number of persons not in the Labor Force, while there was a 23% increase within this category for the County.

Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, 2000
Exhibit 5 – Income Characteristics 1990

Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, 2000

Income characteristics are linked to the current Labor Force data. **Exhibit 5 – Income Characteristics 1990** compares the income cohorts between the Spring Lake Study Area and Cumberland County. According to this exhibit, the income characteristics for the Study Area are similar to those of the total County. This data is further illustrated in **Exhibit 6 – Comparison of Income Characteristics (Study Area and Cumberland County)** below.

**Exhibit 6 – Comparison of Income Characteristics (Study Area / Cumberland County)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>% Of Total County</th>
<th>% Of Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or more</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of this data reveals that the majority of income ranges earned by the total families within the Spring Lake Study Area are evenly dispersed among the population, compared to Cumberland County as a whole. This data indicates that the Study Area as a whole has a lower income level than the County. At least 38% of the total families within the Study Area earn an annual income of $14,999 dollars or less, compared to 26% of the total families within the County for the same income levels. At least 74% of the total number of families within Cumberland County earns $15,000 dollars or more annually, compared to approximately 62% of the total families in the Spring Lake Study Area for the same category.

The TAZ data reveals that the estimated population within the actual Study Area is approximately 13,826 persons, as of March 2000. This seems to suggest that the population increased between 1990 and 2000, given the population of Census Tracts 35 and 36 was 11,610 in 1990. Other available TAZ data reveals that approximately 2,660 persons are employed within the Civilian Labor Force.

Summarizing this data reveals several interesting trends that have occurred within the Spring Lake Study Area between 1970 and 1990:

---

Spring Lake Detailed Land Use Plan, CCJPB, February 2002
• A significant increase in the overall age of the population has occurred within the Study Area, as well as the entire County;

• The total number of persons within the Civilian Labor Force increased dramatically in the County as well as within the Study Area;

• The number of persons in the Armed Forces decreased approximately 36% within the Study Area, compared to a 10% reduction Countywide;

• The Spring Lake Study Area experienced an approximate 21% decrease in the number of persons not within the Labor Force, opposed to a 23% increase Countywide;

• The Study Area experienced a 3% decrease in population while the County experienced a 29% increase; and

• The overall income of families within the Study Area is somewhat less than the County as a whole.

Several variables could explain the trends that have occurred within the Study Area. The reduction of the overall population in the Study Area could be due to out-migration of the population due to Military transfer or entering the Civilian Labor Force. The decrease in the persons in the Armed Forces may be due to persons exiting the Armed Forces resulting in an increase in the Civilian Labor Force. The overall increase in the age of the population may be due to the natural aging process and the reduction in the number of younger families living within the Study Area. Numerous retail establishments have been built within the last twenty years, which have resulted in additional jobs for residents thus increasing the number of persons in the Labor Force.

**HOUSING**

The examination of existing housing within a study area is an integral part of detailed land use planning. Housing data can be used to project future housing need and related infrastructure, and illustrate growth trends that have occurred. According to Exhibit 7 – Housing Composition Spring Lake Study Area, approximately 51% of the total housing units are single-family homes (houses constructed on individual lots). At least 27% of the total housing units are defined as manufactured housing (single-wide and double-wide trailers). Approximately 22% of the total housing units within the Study Area are classified as multi-family housing units (apartments, condominiums, duplexes, triplexes and quadraplexes).

![Exhibit 7 - Housing Composition](image)

**Exhibit 7 - Housing Composition**

**Spring Lake Study Area**

- Multi-Family Housing
- Single Family Housing
- Manufactured Housing

**Source:** Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, 2000

Further examination of the existing housing composition is necessary in order to determine the quality (physical condition) of the existing housing units. The quality of the existing housing is used to measure the difference between existing housing and housing that is needed for the citizens within the Study Area. There are three general classifications used by planners to describe the physical condition of a housing unit: standard, substandard, and dilapidated. The term standard refers to a housing unit that poses no threat to the contain health, safety, and comfort of the resident. A residential unit that is considered to be substandard may exhibit one or more of the following characteristics: structurally unsound; hazards such as faulty wiring, asbestos, lead pipes; poorly weatherized; lack adequate plumbing; etc. Dilapidated housing units are
generally characterized as being unfit for human habitation. According to Exhibit 8 – Housing Conditions Spring Lake Study Area, at least 67% of the total housing units within the Spring Lake Study Area are classified as standard. Approximately 31% are classified as substandard and at least 2% are classified as dilapidated.

Additional analysis of this data is necessary since there are a substantial percentage of housing units that are substandard or dilapidated. According to the conditions of the three types of housing units within the Study Area, the total number of manufactured housing units has the highest percentage of substandard units, approximately 84%, as illustrated in Exhibit 9 – Housing Conditions by Housing Type Spring Lake Study Area. According to this exhibit at least 14% of the total manufactured housing units are standard and at least 2% are classified as dilapidated. It also reveals that approximately 11% of the total number of multi-family housing units is substandard. At least 87% are classified as standard and 2% are classified as dilapidated. Single-family housing has the smallest percentage of substandard units within the Study Area (approximately 10%). Additionally, at least 2% are dilapidated and 88% are standard.

It is apparent that manufactured housing is relied upon to provide affordable housing within the Study Area, yet the majority of these units are considered substandard. One of the goals of the Spring Lake Detailed Area Land Use Plan is to “Provide a wide variety of housing types and prices for all area residents, including the elderly, that are attractive, safe and affordable.” Concurrent to this goal are several proposed objectives.
which specifically address the existing manufactured housing in the Study Area: (1) Promote the maintenance and preservation of existing housing through code enforcement and compliance programs; (2) Provide and control the location, type, standards, and visual appearance of manufactured homes and manufactured home developments; and (3) enhance the residents’ living environment in mobile/manufactured home developments.

Presently, through code enforcement by the Town of Spring Lake, several mobile home parks are being abandoned and cleared from their present location, which meets objective (1) listed above.

Housing data can be used to illustrate growth trends within a geographic area. Data is available from the Cumberland County Tax Office, which reflects when a residential structure was built. This information is illustrated in Exhibit 10 – Spring Lake Study Area Residential Structures Year Built Table below and Map 2 – Spring Lake Study Area Residential Structures Year Built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Study Area Structures</th>
<th>Study Area % Of Total</th>
<th>Total in County Structures</th>
<th>Total in County % Of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 – 1999</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>18,631</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 – 1989</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 – 1979</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16,503</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 – 1969</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>16,796</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 – 1959</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 – 1949</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4,603</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930 – 1939</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to 1930</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84,083</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of this data reveals a significant percent increase occurred within the Study Area between 1960 and 1969, which may be attributed to the increase in troop strength during the Vietnam War. Single-family housing stock increased at a steady rate during the remaining decades following 1949. Growth within the Study Area increased approximately 11.0 percent between 1990 and 1999, as opposed to the largest increase in single-family structures within the County (22.0 percent). This trend could have been influenced by several factors such as the Military Installations’ boundary, availability of water and sewer service, soils suitable for septic tank use, available vacant land, location, and quality of life within the Area.
TRANSPORTATION

Transportation in the Spring Lake Study Area encompasses many modes of transportation such as the thoroughfare system, rail, pedestrian, mass transit, and bicycle. The Study considers both existing and proposed improvements to these modes.

The Thoroughfare System
There are no existing expressways or freeways that impact the Study Area. N.C. Highway 24/87 and N.C. Highway 210 are the only existing major thoroughfares in the area. N.C. Highway 24/87 is a primary connector between the Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base installation complex and Camp LeJune near Jacksonville, N.C. Presently, this connector has not been upgraded through Fayetteville and Spring Lake. Plans are presently underway to provide a Spring Lake By-Pass (N.C. Highway 24/87) that will tie into the Fayetteville Outer Loop. The Outer Loop will carry traffic around the Fayetteville Metropolitan Area for through traffic and points in western Cumberland County including Cross Creek Mall and its environs; to the military complex; and northern Cumberland County to Sanford and Greensboro. Both N.C. 24/87 and N.C. Highway 210, which are major thoroughfares and the primary northern gateways into the Town, are being upgraded to multi lanes. Existing minor thoroughfares include Vass Road, Manchester Road, McArthur Road, Chapel Hill Road, and Main Street. Existing collector roads include Spring Avenue, Odell Road, McKenzie Road, Samuel Road, Holland Road, and Deerfield Drive. The thoroughfare plan for the area is illustrated in Map 3 – Spring Lake Study Area Existing Thoroughfare, Bicycle Route, and Sidewalk Plan.

The Rail System
There is no rail service provided to the area. The railroad spur to Spring Lake and Pope Air Force Base was abandoned. The railroad bed right-of-way has been protected for the most part. This is a potential route for the light rail transit service being considered for the Fayetteville Metropolitan Area through the local Transportation Plan.

Mass Transit
Mass transit in the County is provided by the Fayetteville Area System of Transit (FAST), which primarily operates within the City Limits of Fayetteville. There was an experimental route to the Spring Lake/Fort Bragg Area that ended in June 2001. Ridership exceeded expectations, but were not enough for self-sufficiency. The long-range transit plan calls for a Countywide transit system with transit service to the Area.

Bicycle And Pedestrian
The Fayetteville Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, February 1999 proposes a bicycle route and pedestrian sidewalks in the Study Area. The proposed bicycle route (Route 32) begins on Bragg Boulevard at Butner Road at the confluence of Route 8 and Route 25 on Fort Bragg, then north on Bragg Boulevard to Wilson Avenue to 4th and 6th Streets to Spring Avenue along Spring Avenue to McCormick Street, then along McCormick Street to Holloway, Crescent, Cedarwood, and Grogg Streets back to Spring Avenue, then along Pine Tree Lane to N. C. Highway 210 north to Chapel Hill Road, then along Chapel Hill Road and splits where one leg turns on McNeil Street, along McNeil Street to Ross Street to Second Street and back to Bragg Boulevard; while the other leg continues on Chapel Hill Road to Bragg Boulevard then south on Bragg Boulevard to Odell Road then west on Odell Road to Goodyear Drive, then onto Goodyear Drive back to Odell Road and along Odell Road to Laketree Boulevard, then along Lake Tree Boulevard to Duncan Road, then along Duncan Road to Ruth Street, then along Ruth Street to Main Street, then south on Main Street back to Bragg Boulevard to its connection to Route 8 and 25. A map of this Route is as shown in Map 3 – Spring Lake Study Area Existing Thoroughfare, Bicycle Route and Sidewalk Plan.

Pedestrian transportation facilities are addressed in the Study Area. Existing sidewalks in the Study Area are on Lake Tree Boulevard, Duncan Street, along a portion of Ruth Street, a small portion of Main Street in the core downtown area, and along small portions of Bragg Boulevard. Pedestrian sidewalks are proposed on Bragg Boulevard, Chapel Hill Road, N. C. 210 North, Spring Avenue, Main Street, Deerfield Drive, Hunting Bay and Eppingdale Drive in the Deerfield Subdivision. There are also numerous streams and natural areas that may be conducive to nature trails and pedestrian greenways that should be investigated.
Map 3 – Spring Lake Study Area Existing Thoroughfare, Bike Route & Sidewalk Plan
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SCALE: NOT TO SCALE
EXISTING LAND USE

Land uses in the Study Area consist of commercial, single-family (site built and manufactured housing on individual lots) and multi-family residential developments, manufactured home parks, industrial uses, institutional uses and agricultural uses as shown in Map 4 – Existing Land Use in the Spring Lake Study Area.

Land use in the Area consists of a concentration of strip commercial developments along Bragg Boulevard (N.C. 24/87), Lillington Highway (N.C. 210), and Main Street. There are shopping centers at the intersection of Bragg Boulevard and Lillington Highway (Skyland Shopping Center), along Lillington Highway at Chapel Hill Road (Cedarwoods Shopping Center), and along Bragg Boulevard at Odell Road (Southwinds Shopping Center). There are additional commercial sites along West Manchester Road and others scattered throughout the Area. Industrial or Manufacturing Development is located along Lillington Highway (concrete plant), along Bragg Boulevard at Chapel Hill Road (old Spring Lake Sewage Treatment facility), along Main Street at Lacock Street (woodworking facility) and at Person Street (Omega Warehouse). Multi-family or manufactured housing parks are located along Bragg Boulevard, Lillington Highway, West and East Manchester Roads, Odell Road, Pine Tree Lane, Grogg Street, McCormick Street, Ruth Street, Graham Street, Duncan Street, Chapel Hill Road, and other scattered sites throughout the Study Area. Single-family developments (both site built and manufactured homes on individual lots) are located generally throughout the Study Area with major subdivisions along Bragg Boulevard (Deerfield and Manchester Forest Subdivisions), along Odell Road (Odell and Holly Hills Subdivisions), Vass Road (Bragg Estates), Lillington Highway (Woodland West and Hollandale). Other uses in the Area include farming (both cropland and timberland) and institutional uses such as churches, parks, government facilities, and schools.

EXISTING ZONING

The Spring Lake Study Area was zoned in two parts. The Town of Spring Lake was zoned in 1972 and the remaining portion of the Study Area (the unincorporated portion) was zoned in 1977 as part of Area 11 of the Countywide Zoning Program. Existing zoning in the Area consists of residential, commercial, manufacturing, office and institutional, and conservation classifications as shown in Map 5 – Spring Lake Study Area Existing Zoning.

The zoning district classifications within the zoned area outside the corporate limits of Spring Lake are CD-Conservancy District, the RR-Rural Residential District, the R10-Residential District, the R6A-Residential District, the O&I-Office and Institutional District, the C (P)-Planned Commercial District, the C1-Local Business District, the C3-Heavy Commercial District, the M1-Light Industrial District, and the M (P)-Planned Industrial District.

The CD-Conservancy District is designed to preserve and protect identifiable natural resources from urban encroachment. Areas zoned to this district are usually swamps, flood land, etc. The CD-Conservancy District comprises approximately 402 acres in the Study Area. The RR Rural Residential District comprises 2,549 acres of land and allows one dwelling unit per 20,000 square feet of land. This district yields a density of approximately 2.1 units per acre. The RR Rural Residential District also permits a mobile or manufactured home on an individual lot. The R-10 Residential District contains approximately 1,365 acres in the Study Area. The R-10 Residential District requires 10,000 square feet per dwelling unit and yields a density of approximately 4.3 dwelling units per acre. The R6A Residential District generally requires 6,000 square feet of land per dwelling unit but can yield a maximum density of 9.6 dwelling units per acre. This district is generally associated with multi-family housing and manufactured home parks. Manufactured home parks are only allowed in the R6A-Residential District. Public water and sewer is recommended for the application of this District. The O&I-Office and Institutional District is designed primarily for businesses rendering specialized services such as finance, real estate and brokerage; as well as traditional institutional functions both public and private, public assembly, religious, cultural and recreational activities and group housing. The district is normally small and is often situated between businesses and residential areas serving as a transition from more intense commercial uses to residential uses. The C (P)-Planned Commercial District comprises approximately 281 acres of land. It allows for a full range of commercial uses but requires the development plans to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board. The C3-Heavy Commercial District allows generally the same uses as the C (P)-Planned Commercial District except there is no plan approval required by the Planning Board. Approximately 160 acres of the Study Area is zoned C3-Heavy Commercial.
Approximately 57 acres of land within the Study Area is zoned C1-Local Business District which is designed to meet shopping needs of an immediate neighborhood by providing primarily convenience goods and services, such as banks, dry cleaners, offices, etc. The M (P)-Planned Industrial District permits uses confined to service wholesaling, manufacturing, fabrication and processing activities that can be conducted in an unobtrusive manner characterized by low concentration and limited external effects with suitable open spaces, landscaping, parking and service areas. This type of development is usually on very large tracts and Planning Board plan approval is required.

Approximately 118 acres of the Study Area are zoned M (P)-Planned Industrial. The M1-Light Industrial District is primarily designed for a wide variety of light industrial operations involving manufacturing, processing and fabrication of materials, operations involving wholesaling and bulk storage, other non-retail uses and certain public assembly and recreational uses. The general intent of the district is to prohibit residential, retail and heavy industrial uses of land. By their nature, the uses permitted in this district are generally not compatible with residential or shopping center uses. Access and compatibility with surrounding uses are the most important location criteria for light industrial districts. Approximately 45 acres of the Study Area are zoned M1-Light Industrial.
Map 4 – Spring Lake Study Area Existing Land Use
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Zoning districts within the Town of Spring Lake include the districts outlined above for the unincorporated area plus the R15-Residential District, the PND-Planned Neighborhood District, the R6-Residential District, the R6/MH (O)-Manufactured Housing District, the R5A-Residential District, the R5-Residential District, the CB-Central Business District, and the M2-Heavy Industrial District. The R15-Residential District comprises approximately 8 acres in the Study Area and is designed primarily for single-family dwelling units with a minimum of 15,000 square feet of land. The PND-Planned Neighborhood District is designed for the planned development of various residential densities concurrent with neighborhood-oriented uses in a single project. It consists of approximately 147 acres within the Study Area. The R6-Residential District consumes approximately 247 acres and is designed for a mixture of single family and multi-family dwellings. Approximately 152 acres in the Study Area are zoned R6/MH (O)-Manufactured Housing District. This district is an overlay district to the R6-Residential District for the purpose of allowing Class A manufactured homes on individual lots as single family dwellings. Its intent also is to increase the housing opportunities for individuals with low or moderate income. All regulations of the underlying zoning district must be met. The R5A and R5-Residential Districts are designed for multi-family housing with a maximum of 13.5 and approximately 24 dwelling units per net acre respectively. The R5A and R5-Residential Districts comprise approximately 24.1 and 25 acres respectively. The CB-Central Business District is intended to preserve the original Downtown Spring Lake Area as a compact, viable and convenient location for a wide variety of commercial and office uses. Residential uses developed to the R5A standards are also permitted. Display, sales and storage of goods are required to be conducted within an enclosed building. The yard requirements are generally based on the pattern of existing development in order to minimize dimensional non-conformities and to preserve the continued usefulness and essential character of the existing buildings located in the Downtown Area. The mixture of residential and non-residential uses is not permitted on the same floor. Site plan approval is required. The CB-Central Business District primarily covers the Downtown Area of Spring Lake and consists of approximately 51 acres. The M2-Heavy Industrial District is designed primarily for basic manufacturing and processing industries that normally create a high degree of nuisance and are not generally compatible with residential, commercial or service uses. The district is customarily located on large tracts of land with good access and is buffered from residential districts by other more compatible uses.

ZONING HISTORY

An analysis of rezoning cases submitted between 1980 and 1999 reveals that only 8% of all zoning activity in Cumberland County occurred in the Study Area. This relatively low percentage consisted of 230 tracts of land that were considered for rezoning during this 19-year period. Seventy-five percent of the area’s requests were located within the Town Limits of Spring Lake. Of the cases submitted for rezoning, 10 tracts were withdrawn, 10% (23 tracts) were denied and the remaining 86% (197 tracts) were approved for change.

Land use trends in the Study Area indicate that there has been considerable residential and commercial growth in the Area. As depicted in Exhibit 11 – Overall Land Use Increases, newly zoned Residential Districts (RR, PND, R15, R10, R6/MH (O), R6A, R6, R5A, R5) accounted for 31% of all zone changes from one land use type to another. Commercial Districts (C (P), C1, C3, CB) accounted for the largest gain, increasing by 55%. These transitions from non-commercial to commercial land uses indicate that there has been significant commercial growth in the Study Area. Further analysis has identified Main Street, Lillington Highway and North Bragg Boulevard as the primary thoroughfares whereby commercial growth has occurred. Residentially zoned districts accounted for 81% of the tracts that were rezoned to a commercial district. In comparison, commercially zoned districts represented 37% of all non-residential land rezoned to residential districts, followed by Office & Institutional Districts (O&I), which accounted for 23%.

Spring Lake Detailed Land Use Plan, CCJPB, February 2002
Another notable trend took place among Residential Districts. Fifty-nine cases, or 39%, of approved rezoning cases sought a change from one type of residential district to another. Shifts among the various medium density residential districts (R5A, R6, R6A, R6/MH (O)) accounted for 41% of these changes as illustrated in Exhibit 12 – Intra-Residential Land Shifts. Conversions from low-density districts (R10, R15, PND) to medium density districts represented 36% of the total number of intra-residential rezoning cases. Approximately 50% of transitions within the residential land use category may be explained by the increased demand for manufactured housing units in medium density districts. Residential Districts R10 (low density) and R-6 (medium density) were the primary districts reclassified to R6A, 38% and 30% respectively.

Residential District R6A and Commercial District C3 lead the number of overall zoning requests. Forty-five (20%) of all rezoning cases requested a change to a R6A district, which is the only conventional medium density district that allows mobile home parks. Eight of these cases were denied, leaving 19% granting authorization for a R6A zone change (see Exhibit 13 – Leading Zoning Requests). Heavy Commercial Use Districts (C3) and Planned Commercial Districts (C (P)) were also highly requested zones. Of the 36 applications submitted for rezoning to C3, four were denied and 32 were approved, which represented 16% of all approved rezoning cases. All 23 cases requesting a change to C (P) were allowed, these changes accounted for 12% of all approved cases in the Study Area.

Exhibit 12 - Intra - Residential Land Use Shifts

Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, May 2000
COMMUNITY FACILITIES

UTILITIES

Water Service

Water service is provided to the area by both public and private community water systems and individual wells. Water service in the Spring Lake Study Area is illustrated in Map 6 – Spring Lake Study Water and Sewer Service Areas. The public water system serves the Overhills area and the Town of Spring Lake. Water service began in Spring Lake in 1938, almost 13 years before it was incorporated. This system was built by the Federal government to accommodate the growth on the Military Reservation. After World War II, the system was sold to the private sector, and subsequently was purchased by Spring Lake in 1963. The source of the water is from four deep wells and the Public Works Commission (PWC). Spring Lake is located in a geological formation known as Surficial Sands, which is very characteristic of the Sandhills Area. This geological formation has the greatest potential in the County of supplying adequate groundwater by way of deep wells. In the Spring Lake Area, the Little River has a large sustained base flow, which indicates there is substantial groundwater storage in these Surficial Sands. The four wells supply over 600,000 gallons of water per day. While the yields from these wells are high compared to other wells in the County, past history reveals that they do go dry or their yield decreases. The Town has abandoned many wells in the past and continues to purchase about one third of its water from PWC.

This amount is expected to increase over time. During 1997 the Town water usage was .970 mgd. Figures show that in 1997, the Town pumped .707 mgd from its wells. This is less than the required daily use, thus the system will require other sources of water supply, either PWC or Harnett County. Currently, the Town has a contract with PWC to purchase a minimum of 200,000 gpd. The capacity of the system that connects to the PWC system is limited to 1.4 million gpd.

Between 1976 and 1999 water consumption in the Town has risen from 146,000,000 gallons to 320,798,700 gallons, reflecting a 120% increase. According to the Preliminary Engineering Report on Water System
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Improvements for the Town of Spring Lake, September 1999, the daily demand for water in 20 years is estimated to be 1.45 mgd. This is under the normal projected system growth of 2.71%. Annexations, extended service to new apartment complexes, the Overhills Community, Bragg Estates and numerous mobile home parks will add to this amount. In addition, the Town plans to develop an industrial park that could increase this projected demand. These additional service areas may increase the daily demand to 2.0-2.2 mgd. Private water providers in the Study Area are the Overhills Water Company serving the Overhills Subdivision and Bragg Estates Water Company, which serve the Bragg Estates Subdivision.

According to the Cumberland County Health Department, there are no hydrocarbon-contaminated sites in the Study Area.

**Sewer Service**

A public sewer system and individual septic tanks provide sewer service. Public sewer service has been provided to residents of the Town of Spring Lake since 1963. In the mid 1970’s the Town’s growth was limited due its inability to handle additional sewer. In 1978, the Town dedicated a new 1.5 million gallons per day wastewater treatment plant on the Little River. The existing and proposed sewer lines are illustrated in Map 6 – Spring Lake Study Water and Sewer Service Areas.

The sewage outflow has increased from 526,000 gpd in 1980 to 871,000 in 1999. This reflects a 66% increase over the 19-year period. During the years of 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998, the flow was 902,000; 985,000; 912,000 and 921,000 respectively. The outflow was reduced by the detection of extraneous inflow sources in the sewer system. If the system continues to increase at a rate of 66%, it will be near capacity in 2020. The Capital Improvement Plan calls for the treatment plant to be upgraded to treat 3.0 mgd in fiscal year 2016-2017.

The remaining portion of the Study Area (the unincorporated portion in the County) is served by septic tank. The soil data shows that approximately 75% of the Area has severe limitations for septic tank use, 11% for moderate, 10% with slight limitations and 4% is unclassified. This is illustrated in Map 7 – Spring Lake Study Area Septic Tank Suitability. According to the Cumberland County Health Department records, between October 1995 and January 1999, there have been 41 septic tank repairs in the Area. This data also shows that there were 10 new septic tanks installed in the Area over the same time period. This information is as shown in Map 8– Spring Lake Study Area Septic Tank Repair and Installation Data, October 1995 – January 1999.

**Electric Service**

Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L) and South River Electric Membership Corporation (SREMC) provide electric service to the Study Area. Carolina Power and Light Company serves the entire area except for a small portion in the northeast corner. South River Electric Membership Corporation serves the northeast corner between the Harnett County Line and McCormick Bridge Road. All of the electrical providers have had similar characteristics in the growth of their customer base, the increase in electricity use per customer, and the cost per unit increase per kilowatt. CP&L operates generators and nuclear power plants and sells electricity both retail to consumers and wholesale to other providers.

**Telephone Services**

Sprint Carolina Telephone, headquartered in Franklinton, North Carolina, provides telephone service. Sprint is a full service communications company poised for continued growth in technology and new subscribers. There will be considerable changes in the telecommunications industry in the future, but none of these changes should negatively impact the growth in the Study Area.
PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES

During 1974, Spring Lake established a Parks and Recreation Department to serve residents within the Town, later expanding its service area to include the Manchester Township. Park facilities in the Town include Mendoza Park, a community park; Odell Road, Wilson Avenue, and Town Hall Parks 1&2, which are neighborhood parks. These parks contain approximately 46 acres and are located as shown in Map 9 – Spring Lake Study Area Public Parks and Recreation Facilities.

The other facilities utilized by the Spring Lake Parks and Recreation Department are owned by the Cumberland County Board of Education, the Military installations, and a non-profit center. These facilities are Spring Lake Junior High School, Manchester Elementary School, Lillian Black Elementary School, Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, the Spring Lake Community and Cultural Center, and the Senior Citizen Center as shown in Exhibit 14- Other Facilities Utilized by the Spring Lake Parks and Recreation Department.

The Cumberland County Subdivision Regulations require developers to dedicate land area for recreational purposes for all new residential development or pay a fee in lieu thereof. When land is to be dedicated, a minimum of 500 square feet per dwelling unit is required when the land is above the floodplain; 1,000 square feet per dwelling unit when the land is in the floodplain; and 2,000 square feet per dwelling unit when the area is a water body. These regulations are designed to provide for the recreation and open space needs of the residents.

The Town of Spring Lake requires the dedication of 500 square feet per dwelling unit for all new subdivisions containing over 10 dwelling units. This dedicated land area cannot be land subject to flooding or used for other purposes (such as well lots). The minimum size for any recreation area is 5,000 square feet.

According to future plans of the County Parks and Recreation Department, there will be no major acquisition of parkland in the Study Area as shown on Map 10 – Cumberland County Future Parkland Acquisition Plan. The closest major County park is proposed to be at Pine Forest High School. The 1995 Annual Report for the Cumberland County Board of Commissioners and the Fayetteville City Council by the Open Space Study Committee recommended that a ratio of 8.75 acres per 1,000 people be achieved by 2010. The Board of County Commissioners adopted this report. There are no long-range park acquisition plans by the Town of Spring Lake. As noted previously, the County has provisions in its Subdivision Regulations that should provide either land or monies for the provision of some type of recreation and park area for residents in the Study Area.
Map 9 – Spring Lake Study Area Public Parks and Recreation Facilities
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Exhibit 14 – Facilities Utilized by the Spring Lake Parks & Recreation Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type Facility</th>
<th>Facilities Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Spring Lake Junior High School            | 612 Spring Avenue      | School        | 1. Football Field  
2. Two Baseball Fields  
3. Gymnasium  
4. Two Outdoor Basketball Courts            |
| 2. Manchester Elementary School              | 611 Spring Avenue      | School        | 1. Two Softball Fields  
2. Outdoor Basketball Courts  
3. Play apparatus and open play area          |
| 3. Lillian Black Elementary School           | South Third Street     | School        | 1. Two Softball Fields  
2. Play Apparatus and Open Play Area         |
| 4. Senior Citizen Center                     | 204 South Fourth Street|               | 1. Meeting Room  
2. Kitchen  
3. Bathrooms  
4. Recreation Room  
5. Ceramic Kiln Room  
6. Ceramic Arts Room  
7. Horseshoe Pits  
8. Shuffleboard Court  
9. Apparatus Equipment for Senior Games       |
| 5. Fort Bragg                                 |                        | Military Base | 1. Football Fields  
2. Baseball Fields                          |
2. All other Recreation Facilities            |
| 7. Spring Lake Community and Cultural Center | Ruth Street            | Community Center | 1. All of the Facilities                                                        |

Source: Spring Lake Parks and Recreation Department, 1999
FIRE SERVICE

Two fire districts provide fire service to the Study Area. These districts are the Spring Lake Fire District and the Manchester Fire District as shown in Map 11 – Spring Lake Study Area Fire Districts Service Area and Facilities. The Spring Lake Fire Department covers the majority of the Study Area. The Department was created in 1951 to serve primarily the Town of Spring Lake. The Spring Lake Fire Department is located in Station Number 22 at the intersection of Ruth and Morehead Streets adjoining the Spring Lake Town Hall. The Station consists of 7,397 square feet with 4,941 square feet for vehicle and equipment storage and 2,456 square feet for offices, living areas, and training areas. The sleeping/living areas in the station are capable of housing six (6) full-time firefighters. The present equipment includes three pumpers and one-ladder/aerial trucks.

The budget has grown from $25,450 in 1970 to $724,883 in 2000, reflecting a 2,748% increase. The number of responses has increased from 179 in 1980 to 995 in 2000, reflecting a 455% increase. The personnel at the Department include 35 volunteers and 13 paid full time firefighters. The insurance rating for the Department is a “5”. (See the “Rating Determination” section below for insurance rating procedures.)

The Manchester Fire District serves the areas that are outside the corporate limits of Spring Lake. The District can be defined as being bordered on the west by the Military Reservation and Moore County, on the north by Harnett County, to the east by the Westarea Fire District and the Military Reservation, and to the south by the Spring Lake Fire District. The Manchester Volunteer Fire Department was organized in 1963 to provide fire protection service to residents in the Manchester Fire District. The fire station (Station Number 14) is a 2,500 square foot structure located on S. R.1451 (Manchester Road) near the N. C. 210 intersection. In 1996, the fire services for the Manchester Fire District were assumed by the Spring Lake Fire Department. The Manchester Volunteer Fire District has an insurance fire rating of “9”. Residents that live in this Area pay higher premiums for fire insurance.

Rating Determination

One of the most important aspects of a fire department is its insurance rating. It is important because it determines the premiums paid to insurance companies by residents served in the district. When making improvements in fire protection services, it is important to understand what factors have the greatest impact on insurance ratings. Each fire department and its primary service(s) are assigned a numerical class rating from 1 to 10 by a rating agency based on a scale of one being the best possible rating and 10 is not rating. These ratings apply to all property with a needed fire flow of 3,500 gallons per minute (gpm) or less. Properties with a larger needed fire flow are evaluated individually and may receive a different insurance rating from the surrounding Fire district. In a Class 1 fire district, the insurance rate per $100 valuation is lower than in a class 2 or any other district.

In determining what Class will be assigned to a fire department/district, several factors are considered under receiving and handling fire alarms, the fire department, and the water supply system. For each of these factors the fire district in question is evaluated and assigned a certain amount of credit. These credits are then added to get the total number of credits received. The total credits are compared with maximum credits to determine the percentage of credit received as shown in the chart below. A Class 1 fire district is one, which has received a greater percentage of credit than any other classified fire district, and therefore the fire insurance rates are lower than in the other classes.

In most instances, the factor with the greatest impact on the total credit assigned is the credit for a water system (35% of the maximum). Normally the credit given for company personnel is the second largest factor, but it can be the most significant because it presently has no maximum credit limitation. Other factors, which have a large potential impact on the fire insurance class assigned a fire department, are credits for engine companies/pumpers (10%) and training facilities and opportunities (9%).

Spring Lake Detailed Land Use Plan, CCJPB, February 2002
Map 11 – Spring Lake Study Area Fire Districts Service Area and Facilities

LEGEND

- SPRING LAKE TOWN LIMITS
- STUDY BOUNDARY
- SPRING LAKE FIRE DISTRICT
- MANCHESTER FIRE DISTRICT *
- MILITARY RESERVATION FIRE DISTRICT #
- SPRING LAKE FIRE STATION

* IN 1999 SPRING LAKE FIRE DEPARTMENT ASSUMED RESPONSIBILITY OF THE MANCHESTER FIRE DISTRICT.

SOURCE: CUMBERLAND COUNTY JOINT PLANNING BOAD, FEBRUARY 2002
SCALE: NOT TO SCALE
### ISO RELATIVE CITY INSURANCE CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated Classification</th>
<th>Total Percentage Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.00 – 100.00+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80.00 – 89.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.00 – 79.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.00 – 69.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.00 – 59.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00 – 49.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.00 – 39.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.00 – 29.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.00 – 19.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00 – 9.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEATURE | MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE CREDIT

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving and Handling Fire Alarms</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>50.00+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence (A reduction in credit to reflect a difference in the relative credits for Fire Department and Water Supply)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit</td>
<td>100.00+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+This indicates that credit for manning is open ended, with no maximum credit for this time.

Source: ISO Commercial Risk Services

Other considerations used by insurance rating agencies include the location of fire stations, the number and distribution of firefighter equipment, the capacity of the water supply system, and the maximum spacing of fire hydrants. Fire station sites are recommended to be a minimum of 17,360 square feet and permits entrances to be constructed at both ends of the station. The site should be relatively level, well drained, and free of natural barriers to construction. The site should be located in or near areas of high intensity development (such as extensive business or industrial districts), near the center of its primary response area, and on a major collector street with good access to major thoroughfares. Additionally, the site should be buffered from residential land uses and other lower intensity development and be consistent with existing land use policies. Sites that the fire insurance agencies have suggested avoiding include hillsides or areas at the bottom of a hill where a significant number of responses must be made uphill, site near a traffic light or other areas of traffic congestions, and sites adjacent to impassable barriers such as rivers, bluff, railroad tracks, and limited access highways. Even though sites near traffic lights are not recommended, sites at intersections are recommended because they allow responses in more than two directions. Because many intersections have or will have traffic lights and have the potential for traffic congestions, such sites should be carefully evaluated. In any event it seems that a site on the down side of an intersection, where traffic is less likely to back up, would be preferable to a site where the traffic tends to back up.2

---

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

There are five schools located in the Study Area, they are: Spring Lake Middle School, W.T. Brown Elementary School, Manchester Elementary School, Lillian Black Elementary School, Mae Rudd Williams Elementary School, which are shown in Map 12 – Spring Lake Study Area School Location. High School students in the Area attend Pine Forest High School, which is outside of the Study Area. At the present time Pine Forest High School is over capacity. There are currently 1,754 students enrolled at the school, which has a capacity of 1,685 students. According to the Cumberland County Board of Education five-year projection, Pine Forest High School will have a population of 1,800 students. Data on the other impacted schools shows that Spring Lake Middle School has a current population of 660 students in a facility that can accommodate 754 students; W.T. Brown Elementary School has 576 students with a capacity of 896 students; Manchester Elementary School's current population is 488 students with a capacity for 448 students; Lillian Black Elementary School has a current population of 315 students with a capacity of 338 students; and Mae Rudd Williams Elementary School has a current population of 105 with a capacity of 118 students. The Cumberland County Board of Education uses the COHORT Projection Formula for projecting future school enrollment as the standard set forth by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. The COHORT Formula is based on a five-year history and does not take into account land availability, building trends, zoning, etc. The Cumberland County Board of Education predicts very little change or a decline in the growth rate for the five-year elementary and middle school's projection in the Spring Lake Study Area. W.T. Brown (located on Military property) is projected to have no change in its population unless there are programs offered at the school that may increase the enrollment of students outside the district; the Manchester Elementary School five-year projection is 450 students, which is right at its capacity; Lillian Black Elementary School has a projected population of 300 students, which is 38 students less than its capacity; the Mae Rudd Williams Elementary School five year projection is 110 students, which is eight students less than its capacity; Spring Lake Middle School’s five year projected population is 600 students, which is 154 students less than its capacity; and the Pine Forest High School five year prediction calls for 1,800 students which is 115 students over capacity, or 46 students more than the current enrollment. Pine Forest High School is the only school that will experience some minor growth. The Mae Rudd Williams School may be changed to a different use in the future.

MILITARY OPERATIONS

The military operations conducted at Pope Air Force Base and Fort Bragg has a direct impact upon the Spring Lake Study Area in terms of land use compatibility because of the adjacent location to the Study Area and operational effects such as potential aircraft crash areas, aircraft approach zones, aircraft and artillery noise areas, and height obstruction areas. Map 13 – Military Airport Operations That Impact the Spring Lake Study Area illustrates the primary effects, which are generated from aircraft operations of Pope Air Force Base. Any aircraft operation has the potential for a crash associated with each incoming or departing aircraft. Military and civilian planners identify at least three zones surrounding airfields according to the probability of a crash. The zone having the greatest potential for aircraft crashes is known as the Crash/Clear Zone. This zone is 2,000 feet wide and extends approximately 3,000 feet from of each end of the runway. The second most critical zone is referred to as Approach Zone I (APZ-1) and carries a significant risk for a potential crash. This zone is 3,000 feet wide and extends at least 5,000 feet from the end of the clear zone. Approach Zone II (APZ-2) is less critical than APZ-1 but still has the potential for aircraft crashes. This zone is 3,000 feet wide and extends approximately 7,000 feet from the APZ-1 Zone.

Noise generated from military operations includes noise associated with aircraft takeoffs, landings and flyovers and artillery blasts conducted on the firing ranges. Again, planners have identified specific geographical areas that are directly impacted by military operations. These areas are labeled as Noise Level and Accident Potential Zones (NAPZ) and are ranked 1 – 5 according to the intensity of the noise and accident potential associated with operations. According to this exhibit, as the NAPZ increase numerically, the noise and accident potential decreases.

Height restrictions are another factor to be considered when considering military operations. A height restriction is defined as any object or structure which extends further than 500 feet above ground at the site of the structure or which penetrates the imaginary surface. This is defined as a concentric series of imaginary surfaces surrounding the airfield.
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All of these effects are taken into consideration during the preparation of a detailed land use plan. Both military and civilian planners are primarily concerned with the health, safety and welfare of civilian and military personnel as well as ensuring that the day-to-day operations of the military installations and surrounding communities are functioning smoothly. One of the primary ways of achieving this balance is to propose future land use that will be compatible with military operations. One of the major objectives of land use compatibility is to reduce the risk of having a large concentration of population within the crash/clear and accident potential zones surrounding the airfields. Examples of non-compatible land uses within a crash/clear zone include, but are not limited to: medium or high density residential neighborhoods, schools, churches, movie theaters, retail sales, hazardous waste or flammable storage facilities, etc. Compatible land uses within a crash/clear zone could include, but are not limited to the following: billboards, farming and greenhouses, golf courses, parks and playgrounds, public utility, sanitary landfills, signs, etc. The list of compatible land uses increases as the zones progress away from the airfield. For example, NAPZ – 4, which is the outermost accident potential zone, permits most uses. Single-family residential units are allowed if they are built to specifications that would reduce noise levels and are site built. No manufactured homes or mobile home parks are considered compatible within this zone.

At the present time, there is some discussion about extending the runway one-half mile into the Town of Spring Lake, which would have a major impact upon the Town. If this runway expansion becomes a reality, the Spring Lake Detailed Land Use Plan will be updated to reflect this change and planned accordingly.
MAP 13
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ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

HYDRIC SOILS AND WETLAND AREAS

The U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency jointly define wetlands as, “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soils conditions.” Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bottomland forests, floodplains, wet meadows, and pocosins. The Clean Water Act of 1977 authorized the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency to administer and enforce Section 404 of that Act, which requires anyone depositing dredged or fill materials into the “waters of the United States, including wetlands,” must apply for and receive a permit for such activities. The local Army Corps of Engineers District Office determines if an area is wetland based on three indicators: vegetation, soils, and hydrology. Vegetation indicators mean that plant species specific for wetland areas exist on the site. Soil indicators denote hydric soils, which have characteristics developed under conditions where soil oxygen is limited by water saturation for long periods, on the site. Hydrology indicators refer to the presence of water, either above the soil surface or within the soil for a sufficient period of the year to significantly influence the plant types and soils that occur in the area. All three factors must be present for an area to be classified as a wetland.

Wetlands are important and should be protected in order to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the residents; provide recharge areas for groundwater; serve as a filter trap for sediments, pesticides, and other non-point source types of pollutants; provide non-structured flood control; provide a rich source of timber; provide a buffer zone between upland activities and valuable aquatic systems; provide a buffer against shoreline erosion; and provide food and shelter for a great variety of wildlife.

Within the Study Area approximately 11% of the land area has hydric soils as a major component and 6% could possibly exhibit hydric soil characteristics or have wet spots as shown in Map 14 – Spring Lake Study Area Hydric Soils. This means that this area exhibits a strong possibility that one of the variables for determining if wetland exists is prevalent. Any development plans in this area should be coordinated with the Army Corps of Engineers before any land disturbing activities are undertaken. Another factor that exhibits the possible prevalence of wetlands is the floodplain area as shown in Map 25 – Spring Lake Study Area Floodplain. This area, according to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is within the designated 100-year flood line and will be inundated in a 100-year storm.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM ISSUES

The Spring Lake Study Area has some designated Prime Farmland and State and Locally Important Farmland. Prime Farmland, as defined by the U. S. Department of Agriculture consists of soils that are best suited to producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. The soils need only to be treated and managed using acceptable farming methods, has adequate moisture, and a sufficient growing season. Prime Farmland soil produces high yields with minimal inputs of energy and economic resources, and farming these soils results in the least damage to the environment. In Cumberland County, approximately 16% of the total land area (66,700 acres) is classified as Prime Farmland. Within the Spring Lake Study Area, approximately 12% (826 acres) of the total land area is classified as Prime Farmland. A large portion of this Prime Farmland is located in areas already developed (Overhills and Deerfield).

State and Locally Important Farmland consists of soils that have characteristics, in one or more ways that do not fit the definition of Prime Farmland. They are suited for producing crops economically when managed according to modern farming methods, but require that management practice such as drainage to control excessive water, and more fertilization. In Cumberland County, approximately 30% (127,300 acres) of the total land area meets the definition of State and Locally Important Farmland. In the Spring Lake Study Area, approximately 14% (956 acres) of the area is classified as State and Locally Important Farmland. This data is reflected in Map 16 – Spring Lake Study Area Farmland Characteristics and Bona Fide Farms.
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Additionally, current data by the County Tax Office shows there are 29 bona fide farms in the Study Area. This comprises about one percent of the total bona fide farms in the County.

Current trends in the farming industry are reflected in the Study Area. The number of farms is decreasing, as is the number of acres being farmed, and the number of farmers. However, the average farm size is increasing. The number of family farms is decreasing while the number of farm corporations is increasing. All of these trends are expected to continue well into the future.

The overall goal of the Farmland Plan, as outlined in the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan, is to “protect and preserve natural resources, the environment, and the rural character; enhance and protect farming and the agricultural industry; and enhance and protect the quality of life of rural residents.”

The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan addressed farming and agri-business as a vital economic force in the County that needed to be protected from urbanization. The Plan recognized that there were farming areas in the County that would have to be conceded to urban development and no farmland protection measures would be applicable to these areas. The Plan defined Farmland Protection Areas, identified measures to protect farmland and recommended that the following be established as protected areas: rivers, streams, creeks, and drainage ways abutting farming operations. Other protection efforts include the provision of Class “C” Private Streets only under certain conditions; formulation of a Farm Advisory Committee; requiring a disclosure notice on final plats and deeds of property in the Farmland Protection Area advising property owners of subjection to farming operations; measures to provide and enhance farming opportunities for young people; and the active preservation of farmland and rural character. Due to the number of farms, the amount of Prime and State and Locally Important Farmland, and the growth direction of the Town of Spring Lake, the Spring Lake Study Area should not be in the Farmland Protection Area.

Based on the State’s criteria for large scale hog farming operations, there are locations within the Study Area that may permit large-scale swine operations as shown in Map 17 – Areas Designated Suitable for Swine Operations in the Spring Lake Study Area.

WATER FEATURES

Watercourses and Water Bodies
For purposes of this Study, water features are defined as watercourses and water bodies. Watercourses include rivers, creeks, streams, drainage ways, and canals. Generally, watercourses carry runoff from development, farming operations and natural areas. Drainage ways and canals collect and remove excess surface and subsurface water from development, farming and natural areas. This drainage way and canal water is channeled to streams and creeks, which empty into rivers. The Lower Little River is the primary watercourse in the Study Area. Water bodies are lakes and ponds, having three primary functions: storing drinking water, recreation, and irrigation. There are no water bodies in the Study Area utilized to store drinking water. Most of the water bodies were created to provide irrigation for crops and may be classified as “farm ponds”. The location of watercourses and water bodies in the Spring Lake Study Area is as shown in Map 18 – Water Features and Little River Intakes #1 & 2 Water Supply Watersheds.

Watersheds
There are two water supply watersheds on the Little River, referred to as the Little River Intake #1 and the Little River Intake #2 as illustrated in Map 18– Water Features and Little River Intakes #1 and #2 Water Supply Watersheds. Both supply raw drinking water to Pope Air Force Base. The watershed area is classified as WS-III, which is defined as waters protected as water supplies which are generally in low to moderately developed watersheds, discharges are restricted to a limited number of treated domestic wastewater (sewage) or industrial non-process waters specifically approved by the Environmental Management Commission; no new discharges in the Critical Area; local non-point source pollution control programs are required. All of the watershed areas are located within the Military Reservation. The Little River Intake #1 Watershed consists of approximately 3,812 acres with 166 acres in the Critical Area and 3,646 acres in the Protected Area. The Little River Intake #2 Watershed consists of 155,309 acres stretching across Cumberland, Harnett, Hoke, Lee, and Moore Counties. Approximately 7,705 acres of this watershed are within Cumberland County. All of the Critical Area, consisting of approximately 246 acres, is within Cumberland County.
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**LEGEND**

- **SPRING LAKE TOWN LIMITS**
- **STUDY BOUNDARY**
- **MILITARY RESERVATION**
- **AREA NOT SUITABLE FOR SWINE FARMS**

**DISCLAIMER:**

This illustration is for general information only and is not site-specific. A more detailed site analysis would need to be conducted prior to consideration of a swine farm.

This information only considers buffering around residential units, schools, churches, and recreational areas. The floodplain and hydric soils were not taken into account with the buffer.

**SOURCE:** CUMBERLAND COUNTY JOINT PLANNING BOARD AND CUMBERLAND COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR'S, FEBRUARY 2002

**SCALE:** NOT TO SCALE
Map 18 – Water Features and Little River Intakes #1 & 2 Water Supply Watersheds

LEGEND
- SPRING LAKE TOWN LIMITS
- STUDY BOUNDARY
- WATERCOURSES AND WATER BODIES
- CRITICAL AREA
- WS III - WATERSHED AREA BALANCE
- WS-IV - WATERSHED AREA BALANCE
- MILITARY RESERVATION

SOURCE: CUMBERLAND COUNTY JOINT PLANNING BOARD, FEBRUARY 2002
SCALE: NOT TO SCALE
INTRODUCTION

The northern area of Cumberland County in the Spring Lake/Manchester vicinity, settled in the mid-eighteenth century, followed a similar historic development to many other frontier regions. In the 1730's settlers from the Scottish Highlands arrived in eastern Cumberland County where farms were surveyed and established adjacent to the waterways. Settlement occurred at the confluence of two creeks, Cross Creek and Blounts Creek, that both flowed into the Cape Fear River. Originally chartered in 1754 from part of Bladen County, Cumberland County continued to develop an agrarian economy.

Throughout the 19th century mills and other industry developed along waterways throughout the County, including the Little River in the Manchester area. Manchester, incorporated in 1895, had a population of 1,000 in 1900, although it no longer survives. Spring Lake was chartered in April 1951. Most of the built environment postdates that date. Although early town settlement started around 1920, little remains from that time. Much of the historic area around the Study Area has become government property over the years.

During 1918 the War Department began construction on Camp Bragg, a new military installation, in the northwestern portion of the County. Camp Bragg was finished in 1919, and Pope Air Field was established at that time with the County developing an economic dependence on the military. Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base continue to have a strong social and economic impact in the County. Today the economy is a blend of the historic economy of the region, with a mix of agriculture, industry and service that supports a metropolitan area.

METHODOLOGY

The staff of the Cumberland County Planning Department conducted a historic resources survey of the Spring Lake/Manchester Area to assess the cultural resources extant in the Study Area as they relate to the history of the Area prior to 1935. The survey was conducted by a combination of research and fieldwork. The methodology used included: a search of written sources as they relate to the history and development of Cumberland County; a review of the old survey files for possible historic site locations; a review of the National Register of Historic Places site files to ascertain the locations of any properties listed on the National Register in the Study Area; the examination of the USGS Topographic Quad maps for the locations of recorded historic buildings and sites; a windshield survey of the Study Area in an attempt to identify properties eligible for the National Register, if any; and informant interviews.

The different methodologies yielded little significant information on the Spring Lake area. According to the 1979 survey conducted of the County by the State Historic Preservation Office consultant, there are no properties identified in the Area as potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The windshield survey resulted in the identification of a few remaining early nineteenth through early twentieth century vernacular buildings in the Study Area. The residential architectural styles, which were identified, included the Federal/Greek Revival; the I house; the folk Victorian, which includes the pyramidal roof house; the Victorian L House; and the bungalow, popularized in the Prairie School of the Midwest and the Colonial Revival. The foundation of the agrarian heritage of the area is seen in the few remaining farm sites, barns and outbuildings that survive on the landscape. In addition, institutional buildings, one church and one school were identified in the Study Area. Two cemeteries associated with churches are also located in the Study Area.

PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT

The Spring Lake/Manchester community and its environs reflect the change that was occurring throughout the history of Cumberland County. Few vernacular residential, commercial and industrial architectural resources, and farm sites were located within the Spring Lake/Manchester Area. The general time-period for these
buildings are the early twentieth century through the nineteen fifties, from around 1920s through the 1950s given the styles, building materials and condition. Two nineteenth century buildings remain, however they are in deteriorating conditions.

Unfortunately, the architectural resources, including house and farm sites, identified as historic during the windshield survey had undergone extensive alteration. No sites were observed that would be eligible for listing in the National Register as most have been altered or are in an advanced state of deterioration. This would preclude them for consideration of eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

PAST PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

THE CUMBERLAND COUNTY 2010 LAND USE PLAN
The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan contains the general framework for the revitalization and future development of the County as well as a general land use map. This map outlined eight land use categories for the Area as shown in Map 19 – Spring Lake Study Area 2010 Land Use Plan. This Plan has a hierarchy of land use intensity that begins with the least intense, Suburban Density (2 units per acre), on the outer reaches of the Area near McCormick Bridge Road followed by Low Density Residential (2.1 to 6 units per acre) along the N. C. 210 Corridor and the outer fringes of the Town; and to Medium Density Residential (6.1 to 15 units per acre) within the Town of Spring Lake, where public water and sewer is available. Commercial development is concentrated in a node at intersection of the proposed Spring Lake By-Pass and N. C. Highway 210. Existing strip commercial areas along Bragg Boulevard and N. C. 210 are acknowledged. The Plan recommends that no new strip commercial areas be created. Other commercial development is located in Downtown Spring Lake. Open Space is located along the flood plain areas of Little River and Tank Creek.

The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan defines an Urban Services Area and a Municipal Influence Area. The Urban Services Area is the area where development is promoted because this area is most likely to have the urban services such as water, sewer, garbage pick-up, police protection, fire protection, street lighting, etc. All of the Study Area falls within the defined Urban Services Area as illustrated in Map 20 – Designated Urban Services and Municipal Influence Area.

The Municipal Influence Area allows a municipality to have its development standards enforced in an area outside of its corporate limits. Usually this area is most likely to receive urban services from the municipality and eventually become part of the municipality. The Cumberland County Board of Commissioners must approve this Municipal Influence Area. The majority of the Study Area is within the Town of Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area with the exception of a small area in the northeastern portion as shown in Map 20 – Designated Urban Services and Municipal Influence Area.

1981 SPRING LAKE LAND USE PLAN
During 1981, the North Carolina Division of Community Assistance completed a land use plan for the Town of Spring Lake. This Plan outlined existing conditions and made projections that included population and economy, housing, community facilities and services, natural environment, historic sites, plans, policies and regulations. It outlined goals and objectives for public participation, transportation, economic development; health, safety and welfare; recreation and cultural development; preservation and conservation; and planning and management. The 1981 Plan proposed a plan implementation program consisting of annexation; residential growth; commercial growth; industrial growth; intergovernmental cooperation and coordination; and financial assistance resources. The 1981 Spring Lake Land Use Plan generally recognized existing development and made very few future land use projections. This was probably due to the fact that the Plan only covered the area within the Town limits predicted very few areas for commercial and industrial expansion.
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CITIZEN INPUT

VISION SESSION

A Spring Lake Community Meeting was held on December 7, 1999 at the Spring Lake Town Hall in order to introduce to the Citizens their role in developing the Spring Lake Area Detailed Land Use Plan and solicit their input towards the Plan's development. Attendees of this meeting were asked to state issues of concern and express their “visions” for the future of the Study Area. Additionally, they were asked to complete a questionnaire that gave additional insight to concerns and issues that are important to them. A complete report of the Citizen’s input data can be obtained from the Planning Staff.

This section will provide a summary of the citizens’ responses at the Vision Session held during the Community Meeting. These responses were expressed as Future Visions, Positive, and Negative Things About the Study Area.

The residents’ future vision of the Area included mass transit, recreation facilities, a medical facility, a reservoir, natural gas service, cheaper fluorinated water not from an outside source, more classical schools with adequate transportation to them, simpler route to the interstate, a high school, fixed existing water lines, cleaned up environment, more area for Spring Lake to grow, the Pope Air Force Base runway extended south into Fort Bragg rather than north into the Town, movie theater, high-tech and up-scale jobs with higher pay, upscale eating places, an industrial park, affordable safe housing, shopping mall, and fewer mobile homes.

Positive aspects of the Area were the library, good traffic flow, three good roads leaving and entering the Town, no vagrancy or street people, quiet, slow progress in the right direction, attractive new subdivisions, mobile homes, good location for military retirees with close proximity to Womack Hospital, the Post Exchange, etc., affordable economy, fast food, pawn shops, motels, churches, small Town atmosphere, people, and the rural character.

The list of negative things about the Area, listed by the vision session attendees included water system, fire and police department responses, sewer rates, lack of recreation for youth, few sidewalks, animal control, antiquated storm water system, improper drainage, street flooding, lack of place to pay phone bill, need new post office, need traffic light at Vass Road and North Bragg Boulevard, need traffic light at Deerfield Subdivision and North Bragg Boulevard, poorly maintained roads in the Town, no high school, substandard schools, property taxes too high, no quality restaurants, trailer courts, too many pawn shops, no entertainment, no local quality newspaper, no opportunities for good paying jobs, litter, junkyards, little theater no longer exists, and uncleaned Laketree Lake.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Residents attending the Vision Session were asked to complete a questionnaire in order to obtain additional information that would be helpful in the preparation of a Land Use Plan. Out of approximately 87 persons who attended this Community Meeting, 64 questionnaires were completed and returned. The Questionnaire addressed quality of life issues, their likes and dislikes, influence on development, and general characteristics of the respondents.

The first part of the questionnaire provided information that reflects the Citizens’ perception of their quality of life. The top five issues that were very important in determining the quality of life in the Area included fire protection, police protection, water system, sewerage system, education, clean air and water, and community appearance. The residents’ assessment of their personal quality of life showed that 38% felt it was getting better, 33% felt it was staying the same, and 16% felt it was getting worse. Their response to the quality of life in Spring Lake showed that 50% said it was fair, 30% good, 6% poor, and 2% excellent. The top five items in the Town they felt enhanced the quality of life were library, fire protection, police protection, garbage.
collection, schools, and the sewer and water system. On the issue of property taxes 63% said they were too high, 27% said they were acceptable and 2% said they were low.

The second part listed the residents Likes and Dislikes. The Likes included small town atmosphere, the people, proximity to Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, library, senior center, police force, location, new growth, lots of restaurants, shopping, affordable living, churches, and development potential. Dislikes included the lack of recreation facilities for kids and young adults, teens walking streets late at night, police and fire departments slow response time, high water and sewer costs, poor drainage system, traffic, lack a mass transit, speed limits are either too high or not posted on residential streets, small post office, little or no sidewalks, liter, not enough fire hydrants, unkempt mobile home parks, run down properties, dirty appearance, abandoned trailers, property tax too high, Main Street store fronts, no where for the Town to grow, fast food restaurants, lack of zoning enforcement, poverty, the lack of private enterprise confidence to invest in the Town, poor image, apathy, Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base noise, unstable population, and slum lords.

The third part addressed influence upon development. The residents' response indicated that citizens should have the most influence on development (63%), community/church organizations (22%), elected officials (22%), developers (16%), Planning Board (14%), environmentalists (9%), and farmers (5%) respectively. (The respondents were asked to pick multiple answers.) When asked how planning decisions had impacted them, 33% indicated that it had affected them negatively, 28% positively, and 20% not at all. Over 77% of the respondents attended the Vision Session due to direct mail, 29% from the television, and the rest through networking and the local paper.

The final part of the questionnaire indicated some general characteristics of the respondents. The group was comprised of 44% African Americans, 42% White, 3% Hispanic, and 2% other. Over 80% lived in a single family home, while 8% lived in a manufactured home, and 2% in other. Approximately 92% owned their homes. Seventy-seven percent lived in the Town of Spring Lake, while 11% lived in the unincorporated area of the county, and 6% lived in Fayetteville. Approximately 48% have lived in the Study Area over 20 years, while 20% have been there between 11-20 years. Thirty-six percent stated that they expect to live in the Area 20 years or more, while 30% was unsure due to the possible extension of the Pope Air force Base Runway. Over 85% were high school graduates and above. The employment data showed that 38% were retired, 34% worked full-time, 16% worked part-time, 14% were self employed, 5% were home makers, 3% were Military, and 2% were students or disable. Their place of employment shows that 23% work in Cumberland County 14% outside the County, 13% in the Spring Lake area, and 13% at Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base.
RECOMMENDATIONS

GOALS

During the initial Planning Committee meeting, the Staff facilitated the Committee in confirming the boundaries for the Study, conducted a “crash” course on land use planning, and outlined its tasks. The first task for the Committee was to develop a set of goals the Plan should achieve. Once generated, the Committee ranked the goals in their order of importance. They are as follows:

Utilities
Provide and control the provision of utilities and services, including the source of an adequate supply of fresh water; expansion of water and sewer service to areas of the greatest need (both residential and non-residential to areas to spur economic growth) and the availability of natural gas with reasonable costs.

- Maintain several alternative sources of fresh water.
- Develop a long-range water and sewer plan for the Study Area.
- Explore options for the provision of natural gas service to the Study Area in a cost-effective manner.

Future Growth
- Pursue efforts to expand the land area for the future growth of the Town of Spring Lake.
- Attract new and younger population.
- Extend the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area to include the entire Study Area.
- Protect and preserve the small town atmosphere.

Economic Development
Provide an atmosphere that promotes the expansion of residential, industrial, and commercial development that is dynamic, diverse and capable of providing a full range of economic and business opportunities in the Study Area.

- Develop a Capital Improvement Program to ensure orderly expansion of public infrastructure and services needed to accommodate economic growth with emphasis on transportation, water, sewage, storm drainage, and other public services.
- Promote economic cooperation and coordination between all levels of public and private agencies.
- Identify and reinforce the existing economic forces influencing the Study Area.

Industrial
Provide an atmosphere and incentives that will attract clean, high tech, high paying industries to the area.

- Provide adequate land and suitable locations for industrial development.
- Give priority in public financial incentives to private projects with the greatest potential employment and long-term tax revenue that meets the overall industrial goal of the Study Area.
- Give priority to public facility improvements for projects that will stimulate private development having the greatest employment and long-term tax revenue benefits.

Commercial
Provide a variety of commercial development, which includes new, relocating, and expanding commercial activities that is responsive to market needs and appropriately located and designed to be safe, attractive, and compatible with its surroundings.

- Promote a concept of locating commercial development in nodes such, as existing strip centers along major thoroughfares, or at the intersection of thoroughfares and discourage the creation of any new strip commercial areas.
- Provide sufficient land area at a variety of locations to support new or expanding commercial development.
- Create a commercial atmosphere that fosters small business and business start-ups.
Central Business District
Improve the image and perception of the Central Business District for employment, shopping, entertainment, and housing; assist in the preservation and expansion of the District through providing technical and financial assistance.

- Develop a master plan for sidewalks and pedestrian amenities that integrate and coordinate with the existing and planned circulation system both within and outside the Central Business District.
- Promote the development of housing in and near the Central Business District; especially the redevelopment of under utilized land and the reuse of older structures.
- Promote the reuse and revitalization of obsolete commercial facilities in the Central Business District through incentives and public assistance.
- Establish a private/public partnership consisting of the Town of Spring Lake, Central Business District property owners and merchants, civic organizations, and citizens with a specific mission to enhance the Central Business District.
- Develop a Central Business District Design Plan.

Residential
Provide a wide variety of housing types and prices for all area residents, including the elderly, which are attractive, safe, and affordable.

- Promote the maintenance and preservation of existing housing through code enforcement and compliance programs.
- Provide and control the location, type, standards, and visual appearance of manufactured homes and manufactured home developments.
- Enhance the residents’ living environment in mobile/manufactured home developments.
- Review existing regulations and policies for cost cutting measures without jeopardizing the health, and safety of the citizenry.
- Promote the development and maintenance of an adequate supply and variety of affordable housing to meet the needs of the elderly and handicapped.
- Provide flexibility for innovation and creativity in the design and layout of residential development.
- Encourage quality high-density residential development in and near the Central Business District or other areas where adequate public facilities are available.

Health And Emergency Services
Provide adequate emergency services to all residents in the Study Area including police, fire, emergency medical facilities and services (rescue), clinics, and nursing homes.

Town Image
Improve the visual image of the Town of Spring Lake.

- Encourage attractive and efficient design of the built environment.
- Improve the appearance of major corridors into the Study Area through development controls, landscaping, signage regulation, and working with the Appearance Commission and other civic groups.
- Develop or revise ordinances that address the visual appearance of the Town of Spring Lake such as a landscape and tree ordinance, sign regulations, junk vehicle, litter, property maintenance ordinances, etc.
- Utilize open spaces, urban spaces, and landscaping to soften, beautify, and improve the image of Spring Lake.

Planning
- Develop specific detailed plans for targeted neighborhoods
- Coordinate planning and zoning activities with other jurisdictions in the Area to insure future development patterns, transportation networks, and urban services and facilities are provided in an efficient manner.
- Seek out State and Federal programs that provide financial resources for infrastructure development.
Promote citizen participation as an integral part of the planning process and related activities.
Reevaluate the General Plan for the Study Area every five years.

Environmental
Preserve and protect the Area’s environmentally sensitive areas and natural resources.

- Identify stream-ways and water bodies and provide natural area protection buffers.
- Protect the underground water supply from contamination.

Educational Facilities And Services
Promote high quality comprehensive educational facilities and services that are continuously refined and improved to meet the diverse needs and potentials of all Area residents.

Park and Recreation Facilities And Services
Provide for all residents, regardless of age, income, sex, race, or national origin the opportunity to experience a wide variety of pleasant, constructive leisure-time (passive and active) activities and cultural activities, by means of public and private facilities and programs.

- Designate the Lower Little River and other stream-ways as environmental corridors to be protected and developed as major recreation and open space areas for pedestrians.
- Encourage more private sector development of leisure time activities such as movie theaters, bowling alleys, etc.
- Develop a long-range parks and recreation plan.
- Require the provision of open space areas in new development or a fee in-lieu thereof.
- Utilize the open space network to link shopping, cultural, educational, workplaces, residential areas, and parks facilities together.
- Utilize the Study Area’s natural resources to spur and encourage economic development.

Transportation
Provide a network of streets and highways, mass transit, bicycle trails, greenways, and sidewalks to allow for the efficient movement of people and goods throughout the Study Area.

- Identify, acquire, dedicate, and reserve rights-of-way for future thoroughfares and collector streets
- Control street and driveway access along major thoroughfares to enhance their efficiency
- Support and expand the bus transit system, including bus pull-offs and shelters in the Study Area.
- Support the long-term potential for light rail transit service connecting the Spring Lake Area to Fort Bragg, Pope Air Force Base, the City of Fayetteville, and Cross Creek Mall.
- Develop a network of pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, nature trails, greenways, bicycle trails, etc. to shopping, residential areas, recreation, governmental, and cultural facilities.
- Upgrade and improve the existing minor street network within the Town of Spring Lake as an impetus for revitalized and infill development.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The broad general recommendations outlined in the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan are applicable to the Spring Lake Study Area. These concepts include the Urban Services Area concept, the Municipal Influence Area concept (MIA), the Designated Entrance Corridors concept, and the Nodal/Corridor Urban Form concept.

Urban Services Area
The Urban Services Area concept, proposed in the 1971 Cumberland County Land Use Plan and re-endorsed in the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan, is applicable in the Spring Lake Study Area. The Urban Services Area defined an area where higher density development will be promoted based on the fact that urban services exists, is proposed, or will be proposed in the next twenty years. These urban services include public or community water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, street lighting, police and fire protection, recreation, and garbage collection. All of the Study Area is included in the Urban Services Area. It is generally presumed that the Town of Spring Lake will provide these services.
**Municipal Influence Area**

The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan recommended the establishment of a Municipal Influence Area concept (MIA). The purpose of this concept was to give the municipalities in the County some control over development outside of their corporate limits since none of the municipalities in the County have extra-territorial jurisdiction. Under this concept a municipality’s development standards can be enforced in a defined area approved by the Board of County Commissioners. This allows the municipality to retain its individuality; to plan and program the extension of public services and facilities in an effective and efficient manner; it forces the municipalities to address future annexation and growth plans and intra-municipal boundaries before they become issues; and it makes future annexations into the municipality more efficient and cheaper. The Town of Spring Lake is limited in the direction of its growth by being primarily surrounded by the Military Reservation and the Rockefeller property. The primary growth corridor for Spring Lake is by way of Lillington Highway or generally to the northeast. The recommended Municipal Influence Area for Spring Lake is as shown in Map 20 – Designated Urban Services and Municipal Influence Area.

**Nodal / Corridor Urban Form**

The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan established the Nodal/Corridor concept as the basis for developing the County. The continuation of this concept is recommended in the Spring Lake Study Area. Under this concept, high intensity development (commercial and industrial) will be concentrated in nodes at the intersection of major thoroughfares or along major thoroughfares in areas where urban services exist. No new strip commercial development is recommended.

The advantages of the nodal/corridor urban form are that it provides convenient access for residents to retail and employment areas, helps define and provide neighborhood identity, allows for a wide variety of housing types and densities, preserves agricultural areas, promotes a strong central business district, supports efficient mass transit service, provides for efficient and economical public services, and provides a positive visual image and interest along thoroughfares.

**DESIGNATED ENTRANCE CORRIDOR**

The first visual images of a community usually determine one’s impression of the community. The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan recommends that all municipalities enhance the visual appearance of their entrance ways through landscaping, sign control, circulation measures as outlined in the Manual on Street and Driveway Access, land use compatibility, etc. Further, all new development along the major entranceways into Spring Lake should plant street trees. These areas are as follows: Murchison Road (N.C. 87/210), North and South Bragg Boulevard (N.C. 24/87), Lillington Highway (North N. C. 210), Vass Road, and Manchester Road as shown in Map 21 – Spring Lake Designated Entrance Corridors. Special treatment should also be considered for the enhancement of Main Street.

**WATER AND SEWER PLAN**

The Spring Lake Planning Committee ranked utilities as the number one goal that the Plan should address. It is important that the Town have a definite plan as to where new facilities will be installed as well as improvements to existing facilities. The Cumberland County Comprehensive Water and Sewer Plan Update, 1990 stated that the incorporated towns in the County be the lead operating agency in their respective areas using their powers to contract with the County, PWC and other jurisdictions for facilities.

During 1999, the Town adopted the Preliminary Engineering Report Water System Improvements for the Town of Spring Lake, September 1999. This report outlined the existing conditions of the water delivery system and a proposed an action plan for improvements. It also suggested that the Town pursue other sources of water due to its eventual elimination of the Town’s wells and limitations on the amount of water available from the Fayetteville Public Works Commission. The alternative source is the Harnett County Water System. It also recommended that the Town seek funding for the improvement projects suggested in the document.
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During August 1999, the Town of Spring Lake adopted a Twenty Year Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Program. This Plan outlined water and sewer improvements for the Town over the next 20 years; the proposed projects are illustrated in **Exhibit 15 - Proposed Water and Sewer Projects** below.
## Exhibit 15 – Proposed Water and Sewer Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water System Projects</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Year Proposed</th>
<th>Possible Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 8” Water Line Extension From Wastewater Plant Across Lower Little River</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>FY 1998-99, FY 1999-2000</td>
<td>Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hydraulic Model</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>FY 1999-2000</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 12” Line North on NC 210 from Chapel Hill Road To Pine Knoll Road</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>FY 1999-2000, FY 2000-2001</td>
<td>State Grant, State Loan, Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 12” Line North on NC 210 from Pine Knoll Road To Harnett County with Meter and Pump</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>FY 1999-2000, FY 2000-2001</td>
<td>State Grant, State Loan, Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 12” Line on Manchester Road from NC 210 to NC 87</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>FY 2000-2001, FY 2001-2002</td>
<td>State Grant, State Loan, Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 750,000 Gallon Elevated Storage Tank on Manchester Road at Industrial Park</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>FY 2002-2003, FY 2003-2004</td>
<td>State Grant, State Loan, Fund Reserve, BB &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extend 12” Line from Manchester Road Along Vass Road to Bragg Estates</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>FY 2005-2006, FY 2006-2007</td>
<td>State Grant, State Loan, Fund Reserve, BB &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Replace 10,000 1f Cast Iron and Asbestos Cement Lines in Old Town Area</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>FY 2010-2011, FY 2011-2012</td>
<td>Fund Reserve, BB &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Replace 10,000 1f Cast Iron and Asbestos Cement Lines in Downtown Area</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>FY 2012-2013, FY 2013-2014</td>
<td>Fund Reserve, BB &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Replace 10,000 1f Cast Iron and Asbestos Cement Lines in Old Town Area</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>FY 2015-2016, FY 2016-2017</td>
<td>Fund Reserve, BB &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Replace 10,000 1f Cast Iron and Asbestos Cement Lines in Downtown Area</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>FY 2012-2013, FY 2013-2014</td>
<td>Fund Reserve, BB &amp; T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Wastewater System Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Year Proposed</th>
<th>Possible Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 15&quot; Line from WW Plant Across Lower Little River</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>FY 1998-99/FY 1999-2000</td>
<td>Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Replace Line at Public Works</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>FY 1999-2000</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perform Town-Wide I/I Study</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>FY 2000-2001</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Install Equalization Basin and Equipment</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>FY 2002-2003</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grogg Creek Interceptor</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>FY 2002-2003/FY 2003-2004</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/BB&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop Industrial Park</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>FY 2003-2004/FY 2004-2005</td>
<td>State Grant/Fund Reserve/BB&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide Sewer to Overhills and North Hwy 210 Area</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>FY 2004-2005/FY 2005-2006</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Extend Sewer to Bragg Estates</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>FY 2008-2009/FY 2010-2011</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extend Sewer to Harnett County with Pump Station, Force Main</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>FY 2013-2014/FY 2014-2015</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Upgrade WWTP to 3.0 MGD</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>FY 2013-2014/FY 2016-2017</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Replace/Repair 7,500 1f Collection Line in Old Town Area</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>FY 2017-2018</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Replace/Repair 7,500 1f Collection Line in Downtown Area</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>FY 2019-2020</td>
<td>State Grant/State Loan/Fund Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other issues addressed in the Plan include Water Conservation and Education, a Water Loss Reduction Program, an Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) Monitoring and Reduction Program, a Cost Effective Analysis / Best Management Plan (BMP).

---
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TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Circulation recommendations addressed both vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Vehicular circulation issues pertain to the road network. While the current traffic situation in the Town is generally adequate, there is a need to look at future traffic problem areas. The major traffic arteries into the Town have had some major improvements. Bragg Boulevard has been widened in the Town and is now being widened to Sanford; Lillington Highway has been widened to five lanes through the Study Area; and Main Street has been paved. Minor thoroughfares and realignment should now be addressed.

Pedestrian circulation issues pertain to sidewalks and pedestrian trails. One of the strong themes in the future growth of Spring Lake is a strong concentration on making the Town more pedestrian friendly. The Downtown theme of promoting the area as the center of “international cuisine” is based on a strong pedestrian population. Methods of tying the residential areas, parks and recreation areas, shopping, the Downtown, and schools together requires the use of sidewalks and pedestrian trails. Many of the pedestrian trail areas can be developed while helping maintain the natural resources, providing recreation areas, and enhancing the economic development of the Town by utilizing the protected areas along the streams and creeks that meander through the Area. These protected areas are called greenways. The circulation plan recommends that both improvements to the road network and the introduction of a greenway/pedestrian trail concept along with the addition of sidewalks on key streets. The location of these recommendations is as shown in Map 22 – Spring Lake Study Area Recommended Transportation Plan.

Street Improvements
In order to improve the existing and future vehicular circulation in the Town, the following street improvements are recommended:

- Realign Chapel Hill Road with McKenzie Drive at North Bragg Boulevard and upgrade Chapel Hill from North Bragg Boulevard (N.C.24/87) to Lillington Highway (N.C.210);
- Upgrade Ruth Street from North Main Street to Graham Street;
- Extend Lake Tree Street to Ruth Street; and
- Extend Chapel Hill Road east to McCormick Road, upgrade McCormick Road, and extend it to Murchison Road (N.C. 87) at the N. C.87/24 crossover at the stoplight. Tie the entrance to W.T. Brown Elementary School to the extended McCormick Road.

Pedestrian Improvements
Pedestrian circulation is a very important part of the land use planning efforts. A pedestrian friendly atmosphere is one of the critical elements in the redefinition of the Town of Spring Lake. Pedestrian circulation methods are integrated into the economic and recreational segments of the Town. These circulation methods include greenway/pedestrian trails and sidewalks. Recommended improvements and additions to these elements are as follows:

Greenway/Pedestrian Trails
- Develop a greenway/pedestrian trail along the Lower Little River from the Bragg Estates Subdivision to McCormick Bridge Road;
- Develop a greenway/pedestrian trail along the tributary that runs from the abandoned railroad right-of-way through Lake Tree to Tank Creek (Could utilize the major power line easement that traverses the area from Graham Road to the substation on West Manchester Road);
- Develop a greenway/pedestrian trail along the tributary that runs from Spring Lake to the Lower Little River;
• Develop a greenway/pedestrian trail along the abandoned railroad right-of-way from just north of Vass Road to the Veteran's Cemetery on Murchison Road; and

• Develop a greenway/pedestrian trail along the tributary that runs from the Lower Little River to Spring Lake Middle and Manchester Elementary Schools and eventually to McCormick Road Extension.

**Sidewalks**

• Provide sidewalks along the existing and realigned Chapel Hill Road from North Bragg Boulevard (N.C. 87) To Lillington Highway (N.C. 210);

• Provide sidewalks on both sides of Main Street from North Bragg Boulevard (Cedar Point area) to south Bragg Boulevard;

• Provide sidewalks along the extension and upgrading of McCormick Road from Lillington Highway at Chapel Hill Road intersection to south Bragg Boulevard. And at the N.C. 87/24 crossover at the stop light;

• Provide sidewalks along Ruth Street from Main Street to the proposed greenway/pedestrian trail along the abandoned railroad right-of-way;

• Provide sidewalks along both sides of Bragg Boulevard from Murchison Road to the Deerfield Subdivision;

• Provide sidewalks along both sides of Lillington Highway from Bragg Boulevard To Chapel Hill Road;

• Provide sidewalks along Spring Avenue from Bragg Boulevard to McCormick Road (Chapel Hill Road Extension) and from Bragg Boulevard to Main Street;

• Provide sidewalks along Pine Tree Lane from Lillington Highway (N.C. 210) to Spring Avenue;

• Provide sidewalks along Wilson Avenue, S. Sixth Street, and Fourth Street;

• Provide sidewalks along McNeil Street from Chapel Hill Road to Rose Street and along Rose Street from McNeil Street to Bragg Boulevard; and

• Provide sidewalks along Second Street from Bragg Boulevard to Lake Street.
RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN

Spring Lake Study Area Land Use Plan
The Spring Lake Citizen Planning Committee, with facilitation from the Planning Staff, developed a recommended land use plan for the Study Area. The Plan calls for Planned Commercial development along Murchison Road, Bragg Boulevard (N.C. 24/87), Lillington Highway (N.C. 210), West Manchester Road, and along Vass Road to the northern edge of the Approach Zone One (APZ1) from Pope Air Force Base. Most of the commercial areas currently exist. The Plan is designed to allow for existing commercial development and provide expanded depth so that when these areas are redeveloped there would be sufficient land area to provide proper egress and ingress, landscaping, parking, and internal circulation. The group endorsed the Nodal Corridor Urban Form Concept and provided large commercial areas at the intersection of major thoroughfares. These nodes are at Chapel Hill Road and North Bragg Boulevard, Manchester Road and North Bragg Boulevard, and Vass Road and North Bragg Boulevard. The entire commercial areas proposed along the major thoroughfares are Planned Commercial, which requires plan approval by the Board of Aldermen.

Light Commercial development is proposed at the intersection of Manchester Road and Lillington Highway, McCormick Bridge Road and Lillington Highway, along Lillington Highway at Ross Road, and along Lillington Highway at Chapel Hill Road. All of these light commercial areas are located in nodes.

Planned Industrial use is proposed on the south side of West Manchester Road and across the Little River to the southern line of the APZ1 zone of Pope Air Force Base. Planned Industrial proposed in this area is designed to protect the integrity of Pope Air Force Base’s operations. Other Planned Industrial development is located at the Town’s sewer treatment plant and along Lillington Highway just north of Chapel Hill Road to accommodate existing uses. Light Industrial development is proposed on the south side of East Manchester Road to accommodate a proposed industrial park and along Lillington Highway at the Little River. An additional light industrial area is recommended along Lillington Highway just south of River Bend Apartments.

The Plan recommends that an area be set aside and denoted as Downtown. This area is unique and requires more detailed study. A more in depth examination of this area is in the Recommended Downtown Plan Section below. The Downtown Area is defined as the Area along Main Street for a one-lot depth on the west side to a one lot depth off Bragg Boulevard on the east side, south to the Bragg Boulevard intersection and north to Rainbow Court.

Office and Institutional use is proposed on the east side of Southwinds Boulevard at Odell Road, at the Cumberland County Branch Library and the Central Services Facility, and at the Spring Lake Governmental Complex environs.

High Density Residential development is proposed on the west side of Southwinds Boulevard at Odell Road and west of the defined Downtown Area to the Reservation and north to Ruth and Elizabeth Streets. Medium Density Residential is recommended between Odell Road and the southern APZ1 boundary line, south of Goodyear Subdivision, along both sides of Chapel Hill Road between Mimosa Drive and the commercial area on Bragg Boulevard, along Lillington Highway at the River Bend Apartments site, along Lillington Highway at Grogg Street eastward to the Reservation at McCormick Road, an area generally bounded by Spring Avenue, Pine Tree Lane, North Grogg Street, and the Cedarwoods Shopping Center, and an area bounded by Spring Lake Junior High and Manchester Elementary Schools, Rutherford Street/Pate Avenue, Third Street and the commercial area along Lillington Highway.

Low Density Residential development is recommended in the Goodyear Subdivision, Odell Subdivision, Manchester Forest Subdivision, Bragg Estates Subdivision, the Deerfield Subdivision, areas northwest and northeast of Deerfield Subdivision along N.C. Highway 87, the Holland Subdivision, Woodland West Subdivision, the McNeil Street Area, the area north of Chapel Hill Road to the Little River, all the area north of Manchester Road except the area in the APZ2 zone of Pope Airfield, the Overhills Subdivision, all the area east of Lillington Highway north of Chapel Hill Road to a southern tributary of the Little River and east to the Fort Bragg Reservation except a light commercial node along the highway, the area between McCormick Road, Grogg Street and Morrison Avenue, and all the southeastern most portion of the Study Area to the Fort Bragg Reservation.
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Suburban Density Residential use is recommended under the APZ2 zone area of Pope Air Field, all the Study Area west of the abandoned Railroad right-of-way except Bragg Estates, all the north eastern portion to the Harnett County Line across Lillington Highway and points east to the Fort Bragg Reservation. Governmental use is recommended for the area around Town Hall and all the school sites. Open Space is recommended for the 100-year flood area along all streams and rivers, drainage areas with ten (10) feet on both sides without the 100-year flood area designation, and all parks and recreation areas.

**Spring Lake Addendum Area Land Use Plan**

Subsequent to the completion of the Spring Lake Area Citizen Planning Committee Plan, a request was made to include a recently added area to the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area (MIA) in the Study (see Addendum Section). A general Staff review indicated that the Area is growing and that some urban services are beginning to be introduced also. The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan anticipated this growth. This Area will be addressed in more detail during the development of the 2030 Land Use Plan. It was decided that rather than delay the Spring Lake Plan until a more detailed Plan was prepared for this Area, the current 2010 Land Use Plan (with a few modifications to accommodate some existing development and zoning, is sufficient for the Area at the present time. Map 23 – Spring Lake Area and Addendum Area Proposed Land Use Plan illustrates the recommended Plan.

**RECOMMENDED DOWNTOWN PLAN**

The Spring Lake Citizen Planning Committee identified an area they called Downtown Spring Lake. Downtown is a special area that requires comprehensive planning with the individual stakeholders and merchants. While it is not the intent of this report to provide a specific plan for Downtown, it is intended to provide a framework that can be utilized to develop a specific Plan.

The first step in enhancing the Downtown area is assessing its current condition. This includes identifying the land use, the condition of the structures, accessibility, the image, business unity, market orientation, vacancy rate, marketing, circulation, identity, etc. After inventorying the Downtown area the next step is to develop a strategy or process to address the problems.

Part of the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan included the Downtown Element, which outlines a process to guide the enhancement of all the downtowns in the County. Nationally known firms of Hyatt-Palma, Inc. and The Real Estate Services Group of Washington, D.C formulated this process. These two consultants have worked with downtowns of varying sizes all over the United States.

The most successful downtown enhancement efforts are those where a public-private partnership defines a business plan using a strategic thinking process. The process is carried out to define the best course of action (the business plan) to implement for improving the economic health of the downtown. This process involves:

- Defining the preferred future vision for the district;
- Identifying the current strengths and weaknesses of the district;
- Understanding the commercial district’s market;
- Choosing the strategies that best address the district’s needs; and
- Cooperatively implementing those strategies.

This process should be developed by a partnership with the primary focus of enhancing the Downtown. The partnership should include the Town of Spring Lake (Mayor, Aldermen, Town Manager, department heads, etc), the business sector (property and business owners, real estate agents, developers, financial institutions, and utility companies), organizations (Chamber of Commerce, Convention and Visitor’s Bureau, etc.), and representatives of the community who will be affected by changes made or who can be instrumental in making the effort a success (media, loyal customers, churches, residents of adjacent neighborhoods, etc). The first role of the public/private partnership members is to be good partners. They must realize that they are ambassadors of this venture and must be willing to spearhead and actively assist in the shaping of the downtown enhancement effort.

---
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Once the partnership has assessed the Downtown environment, defined the vision of success, and gained an understanding of the Downtown’s market, it must identify and select enhancement strategies. Strategies are the policies, initiatives and actions that are adopted to skillfully manage the enhancement of the Downtown. The strategies selected should meet the following criteria:

- Relate to and address the issues that are facing the Downtown;
- Be ethical, legal, technically sound and politically savvy;
- Be manageable for the young partnership;
- Be timely and important to the success of the Downtown;
- Be visible and have public relations value;
- Be worthy of expending scarce resources for their implementation;
- Be realistically attainable within the budgetary limitations of the partnership; and
- Results in enhancing the Downtown in a win-win situation for the private and public sectors.

Specific strategies should be developed to address the specific needs of the Spring Lake Downtown based upon the issues identified by the partnership. These issues may include:

- Variety of Businesses
- Physical Appearance of Buildings/Private Property
- Image

The creation of a variety of businesses can be achieved through various strategies. 1) Market research and market analysis should be conducted. The findings of the market analysis should be used to shape the enhancement program and should be widely distributed to those in and related to the downtown. 2) Business recruitment strategy provides for the recruitment of additional businesses downtown. 3) Business clustering provides a method of grouping together a certain mix of businesses in a way that enables them to benefit from each other’s sales, customers and markets. This strategy is one of the cornerstones that make malls successful. 4) An economic theme strategy uses the business clustering strategy to create a critical mass of a particular type of good or service in the district. Over time the Downtown becomes known for that theme. Ultimately, all marketing efforts and physical improvements in the district are implemented to reflect the economic theme. 5) Shared retail space is another strategy that addresses the issue of variety of businesses. This is achieved by allowing multiple individual business owners sharing a single retail space. In all cases, the individual businesses maintain separate books. The presentation and sale of goods is intermingled and sold in a single transaction or kept in separate portions of the space and sold from different cash registers. 6) Creative business creation is a strategy that allows for aggressive Downtown enhancement by creating needed businesses through creative means. This may include forming locally owned limited partnerships and co-ops to own, develop or operate retail businesses.

The physical appearance of buildings/private property can be addressed by 1) enhancing the facades of private property. This strategy stresses the importance of creating buildings that leave a favorable impression on the customers. This can be achieved by encouraging building maintenance and upgrading, creating financial incentives for rehabilitation, establishing an awards program for renovated properties, and defining design standards for new construction. 2) It is also important for the public sector to provide attractive public spaces to enhance the Downtown efforts. 3) A real estate development demonstration is a strategy to enhance the physical appearance of the Downtown. This can be achieved by focusing on a key building or piece of property that is vacant or deteriorated. The building or property is rehabilitated by either working with the current owner or forming a partnership to purchase the building or property. The goal of the demonstration is to set an example of the quality and demonstrate the feasibility and positive impacts of such efforts. Adaptive reuse projects are another strategy used to address the issue of physical appearance of buildings/private property. 4) Adaptive reuse involves looking at out of date structures as opportunities and putting them to uses that although different from their original purposes, add new life to the Downtown. An example of adaptive reuse projects includes using second stories above retail space for offices and/or housing.
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The issue of image can be addressed with many strategies. 1) Public relation is a strategy that can address the Downtown’s poor image in the eyes of the public. 2) Networking strategy involves cooperation and communication among the business owners in the Downtown. By sharing concerns and information, they can improve their self-image as a business community and convey this positive change to their public. 3) Formal marketing campaign strategy should be utilized by expanding their public relations efforts by initiating a full fledged marketing campaign that is comprehensive, long term and well capitalized. 4) Creating Downtown literature as a strategy should be an integral part of the enhancement efforts. This literature should be aimed at a variety of audiences and include Downtown directories, visitor guides, newsletters, walking tours, etc. It is important this literature be of high quality design and production. 5) Another strategy to address the image issue is safety/security. In many cases, the Downtown's negative image includes the perception of the area as unsafe. Efforts should be undertaken to make the area safe if it is unsafe or initiate a public relation campaign to reassure the public that the perception is not true.

The Spring Lake Planning Committee recognized that the Downtown has an international mixture of restaurants and markets. They felt like this was a theme that can separate the Spring Lake Downtown area from other areas in the County. This international restaurant theme must include a pedestrian-based circulation system with key vehicular parking located in strategic areas. The pedestrian circulation system should be extensive in the Town to provide patron access to all other amenities and services in the Town. The Downtown circulation system should also have “watering holes” or “oasis” for the pedestrian use and enhance the attractiveness of the area.

**REHABILITATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

There are many areas in the Study Area that need rehabilitation. This rehabilitation should include street improvements, water and sewer improvements, drainage improvements, new housing construction, and housing rehabilitation. While there are many areas in the Study Area that have scattered substandard housing, there are other areas that are predominantly blighted. The areas delineated are as shown in Map 24 – Spring Lake Study Area Recommended Concentrated Rehabilitation Areas.

Area “1” is located generally east to west between Grogg Street and Pine Tree Lane, and north to south from Holloway Street to Cedarwoods Shopping Center, and the Lakehurst Rental Condominiums, to the Reservation. The Area is located primarily within the County and has a predominance of sub-standard and dilapidated mobile homes and mobile home parks. Area “2” is totally within the corporate limits of Spring Lake. It can be defined as being bounded on the east by General Seitz Drive, South Fifth Street and North Sixth Street; on the west by Monroe Street, the rear of the commercial property along Bragg Boulevard, North Fourth Street and North Fifth Street; on the north by Lake Avenue, Spring Avenue and Parker Street; on the south by Pettit Street, Rutherford Street, and Pate Street. Much of this area has a mixture of single mobile home units, mobile home parks, and duplexes. Many of these units are abandoned. Area “3” is located in the original part of the Town and is defined on the north by Ruth Street; on the south by Person Street, on the west by the abandoned railroad right–of–way, and to the east by Main Street. Mostly sub-standard homes and duplexes with some individual mobile homes and mobile home parks intermixed characterize this area. Area “4” is located on the Southside of Rose Street at the McNeil intersection.

**Public Assistance And Grants**

**County Assistance**

The Study Area has many issues that need addressing. Most of these issues are beyond the resources of Spring Lake and the County in terms of other priorities. Efforts should be made to seek outside resources that can address economic development issues, housing development and rehabilitation, infrastructure improvements, and other needs.

The County offers a variety of programs to effectively address community development needs throughout the County. Cumberland County Community Development (CCCD) is a County department whose mission is to improve the quality of life for County residents through the annual administration of over $3,000,000 in Federal and State grant funds. The 1998 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) states that, “As an Urban County Entitlement designated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Cumberland County receives on an annual basis Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Home Investment Partnership Act (HOME) and Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds. These
funds are to be used in our designated area, which includes the Towns of Falcon, Godwin, Hope Mills, Spring Lake, Stedman, Wade and the unincorporated areas of the County."

During 1995, a study was performed to determine crucial needs within the County, once established these needs were prioritized and printed in the County Consolidated Plan. Substandard housing, the poor affordable housing stock and infrastructure improvements associated with sewer and water extensions were all determined to be high priority needs. The second highest needs were in the realm of public services and included social and mental health services, elderly care, youth services and day care facilities. Economic development and education were identified as a priority three need in the County.

To address the needs described in the Consolidated Plan, the County offers a variety of public assistance. Assistance is offered in the form of grants, low interest loans and social services. **Exhibit 16 – Cumberland County Public Assistance Programs** summarizes the CCCD programs available and each of their 1998-1999 allocations. In recent years, there has been approximately $3,400,000 in CDBG funds used toward public services and facilities in the Spring Lake Area. These appropriations have funded improvements to Town Parks, assisted in the provision of sewage extensions and the construction of a family resource center. Additional CDBG and HOME funds have also been provided to residents in the Study Area to address affordable and substandard housing needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>1998-1999 Allocations*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities Program</td>
<td>These programs are designed to assist nonprofit organizations in the acquisition, rehabilitation and/or new construction of buildings that house public service agencies.</td>
<td>$2,954,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Program</td>
<td>Available to assist nonprofit agencies with start up or expansion funds in order to provide services to the community. Eligible activities include the provision of job skills training, health services, mental health services, youth services transportation or other services identified in CCCD’s Consolidated Plan.</td>
<td>$430,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>Facilitates the provision of infrastructure to areas lacking public water, adequate drainage and sewer service. Improvements to existing systems are also eligible activities. Funding is available for planning and implementation of these services.</td>
<td>$1,583,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care &amp; Supportive Housing Program</td>
<td>The Cumberland County Continuum of Care (COC) is designed to assist service providers in the community develop and implement strategies to address the various issues that affect the homeless population. The goal is to provide services needed to move a person from homelessness into permanent housing.</td>
<td>$1,609,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Available for public facilities needed to serve a specific business, or as direct loans to private businesses for equipment purchases or for new or expansion construction.</td>
<td>$339,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Programs</td>
<td>Various programs are provided reduce substandard housing and provide affordable housing and assist in emergency repair needs to low and moderate-income residents. Includes (CDBG &amp; HOME Funds).</td>
<td>$3,398,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Homebuyer Assistance</td>
<td>This program spurs an increase in home ownership by low to moderate-income households by providing loans up to $5,000 for down payment and/or closing cost assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable Housing</td>
<td>To address the need for affordable housing, CCCD works with local developers in the construction and/or rehabilitation of single-family or multi-family housing units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Homeowner Rehabilitation</td>
<td>This program provides aide to assist homeowners in bringing their homes up to minimum housing standards. All rehabilitation program funds are in the form of loans with repayment determined on the applicant’s ability to meet financial obligations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emergency Repair</td>
<td>Funding up to $5,000 per unit is available for small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>1998-1999 Allocations*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO)</td>
<td>housing rehabilitation projects that address households with immediate health and safety risks under the Emergency Repair Program. Assistance I offered in the form of grants with no repayment required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds available to nonprofit organizations to assist in the development and promotion of affordable housing--rental and homeownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter Grant Program</td>
<td>The goal of this program is to provide safe and decent housing to all county residents and address the needs of the homeless population.</td>
<td>$339,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Figures may include previously allocated funds that were not fully expended by the end of the fiscal year.

State and Federal Assistance
There are also a vast number of Federal and State programs that are available to assist communities and their residents. These resources address such areas as rehabilitation of private homes, mortgage insurance, expanding community facilities, preservation of historic sites, revitalizing downtown areas and spurring economic development in rural communities.
APPENDIX

PREFACE

Subsequent to the completion of the Spring Lake Area Detailed Land Use Plan, the Board of County Commissioners approved the extension of the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area (MIA). The Area, which was approve November 20, 2000, consists of approximately 6,000 acres, beyond the initial boundaries of the Spring Lake Study. The Town requested that this additional area be included in the Spring Lake Study Area. Since the Area is generally zoned and developed in accordance with the Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan, it was decided that there is no need to impede the progress of the Spring Area Study to do an in depth detailed study for this additional area. When the Planning Board conducts a study in the northern portion of the County this area will be included in that study.

INTRODUCTION

The area is defined by an area bounded on the west by the Spring Lake Area Detailed Land Use Plan area, to the north by Harnett County, on the south by the Military Reservation, Elliot Farm Road, and Elliot Bridge Road; and to the east by the adopted Urban Services Area Line, known as the Addendum Study Area, as illustrated in Map 1 – Spring Lake Study Area Boundary. This area contains approximately 6,000 acres.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

POPULATION AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Examination of population and economic characteristics is a necessary step in developing a detailed land use plan. The U.S. Census provides detailed information that can be used to examine general, social, and economic characteristics of a population for a defined area. The Census information is provided in geographic areas such as County, Census Tract, and Block. For purposes of this Study, the data has been gathered according to Census Tract because this geographic area most accurately represents conditions within this Study Area. Comparisons have been made between Census Tract 37, which covers an area that includes the Study Area Addendum and the County as a whole. Available Census data such as age; labor force and income cohorts were selected in order to present existing conditions and growth trends that have occurred within the Study Area since 1970.

3 For practical purposes, data for Census Tract 37 will be labeled as “Study Area” even though the Study Area Addendum is smaller that the entire Census Tract.
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According to 1990 Census data, the total population of Cumberland County is approximately 274,566 persons. According to Exhibit 1A – Comparison of Age Characteristics 1990, the total population of the Census Tract that falls within the Study Area is at least 4,177 persons. This is approximately 2% of the total County population. This data also illustrates that the three age cohorts within the Study Area as well as the total County share similar percentages. This information is further illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>% Of Total County</th>
<th>% Of Total Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 19</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 64</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of this data indicates that for both the Study Area as well as the County as a whole, the majority of the population (at least 61%) is between 20 and 64 years of age. At least 32% of the population is between 0 and 19 years of age. A small percentage (at least 7%) is 65 years of age and older. Closer examination of this data indicates that the Study Area has a slightly larger number of persons 65 years of age and older than the overall population of Cumberland County.

This characteristic is interesting when compared to trends of age characteristics that have occurred since 1970. According to Exhibit 2A – Change in Age Characteristics 1970 – 1990, the Study Area experienced an increase in total population of approximately 85% between 1970 and 1990, while the total population of the County experienced an approximate increase of 29%.
Trends also indicate that the overall population of the County aged significantly during this twenty-year period. The number of persons 65 years of age and older increased at least 138%, compared to an approximate increase of 101% within the Study Area during the same time-period. The exhibit also illustrates that the 0 – 19 age cohort experienced a decrease in the County as a whole, while the Study Area experienced an increase. The County population experienced a decrease of approximately 1%, while the Study Area experienced a 30% increase. Within the 20 – 64 age cohort, the County population shows an increase of at least 46%, while the Study Area experienced an approximate increase of 137% for the same time-period.

Due to the fact that at least 61% of the total Study Area population is between 20 and 64 years of age, examination of Labor Force characteristics is appropriate. Exhibit 3A – Labor Force Characteristics 1990 illustrates that approximately 72% of the total number of persons in the County eligible for the Labor Force (16 years of age and older) is currently in the Labor Force, while 70% is representative for the Study Area. Of the total number of persons in the Labor Force, 71% are within the Civilian Labor Force and 29% are in the Armed Forces. These percentages apply to the County as a whole. Within the Study Area, approximately 94% of the total number of persons in the Labor Force is classified as Civilian and at least 6% are classified as Armed Forces.
The Labor Force characteristics have been impacted by the aging trend that has occurred within the population over the last twenty years. According to Exhibit 4A – Changes in Labor Force Characteristics 1970 – 1990, the number of persons eligible for the Labor Force (16 years of age and older) increased approximately 116% within the Study Area, compared to 42% for the total County population. The total number of persons actually in the Labor Force increased at least 89% within the Study Area and 52% for the overall County. A significant increase in the number of persons within the Civilian Labor Force occurred between 1970 and 1990 for both the Study Area and the County as a whole, 205% and 112% respectively. Within the Study Area there was a 71% decrease in the number of persons in the Armed Forces, compared to a 10% reduction County-wide. Additionally, the County experienced an increase of at least 23% of the number of persons not in the Labor Force, compared to a 31% increase within the Study Area for the twenty-year period.
Income characteristics are linked to the current Labor Force data. **Exhibit 5A – Income Characteristics 1990** compares the income cohorts of the Study Area and the County overall. According to this exhibit, the distribution of income among families is similar for the Study Area and the County. This data is further illustrated in **Exhibit 6A – Comparison of Income Characteristics Between the Study Area and Cumberland County** below.

*Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, March 2000*
Examination of this data reveals that the majority of income ranges earned by families within the Study Area are similar to the County as a whole. This data indicates that the Study Area has a slightly higher income level than the County. Approximately 78% of the total families within the Study Area earn an annual income of $15,000 dollars or more, compared to 74% of the total families within the County. At least 26% of the total number of families within Cumberland County earns between less than $5,000 to $14,999 dollars annually compared to approximately 22% for the Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>% Of Total County</th>
<th>% Of Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 or more</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cumberland County Joint Planning Board, March 2000

Summarizing this data reveals several trends that have occurred within the Study Area between 1970 and 1990:

- The Study Area experienced an 85% increase in population while the County experienced a 29% increase;
- A significant increase in the number of persons between the ages of 20 and 64 occurred within the Study Area;
- The Study Area experienced a higher increase in the total number of persons eligible for the Labor Force, the total number of persons in the Labor Force, the total number of persons in the Civilian Labor Force and the total number of persons not in the Labor Force, compared to the overall population of the County in the same categories;
- The Study Area experienced a greater decrease in the total number of persons in the Armed Forces than the County for the same time period; and
- The overall income of the families within the Study Area is slightly higher than the total County population.

According to the TAZ information the estimated population within the Study Area is 1,111 persons. This estimate is based upon the total number of housing units multiplied by 2.7 persons per household (PPH).

**HOUSING**

There are at least 452 total housing units within the Addendum Area. According to Exhibit 7A – Addendum Area Housing Study, approximately 91% of the total housing units are single-family stick-built homes (411 units). At least 9% of the total housing stock (41 units) is defined as manufactured housing units.
Data is available from the Cumberland County Tax Office that reflects when a residential structure was built. This data is illustrated in Map 1A – Addendum Area Residential Structures Year Built and Exhibit 8A – Addendum Area Residential Structures Year Built Table.

### Exhibit 8A – Addendum Area Residential Structures Year Built Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Addendum Area</th>
<th>Total County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>% Of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 – 2001</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 – 1999</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 – 1990</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 – 1980</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 – 1970</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 – 1960</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 – 1959</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930 – 1939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to 1930</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this exhibit, the Study Area experienced a significant amount of residential growth between 1980 and 1999 (approximately 77% of the total residential structures). At least 9% of the total structures were built between 1970 and 1980 and at least 6% were built between 2000 and the present time. Approximately 5% of the total residential structures within the Study Area were built prior to 1970. The County as a whole has seen consistent growth in residential structures from 1960 through 1999, resulting in at least 80% of the total residential structures having been built during this time frame. This growth seems to be concentrated within subdivisions located along Elliott Bridge Road, Elliott Farm Road and Johnson Farm Road.

Examination of the residential growth data also indicates that most of the residential development within the Area is relatively new and therefore should be in good condition. A field survey indicates that approximately 96% of the total residential structures are in standard condition; 2% are considered substandard; and 2% are considered dilapidated.
TRANSPORTATION

The transportation elements impacting the Area consist of the Thoroughfare Plan, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. There are no railroads, mass transit, or river transportation in the Study Area.

Thoroughfares System

Thoroughfare plans for the Area include the Proposed Spring Lake By-Pass that is located just on the Fort Bragg Reservation along the southern portion of the Area. It connects eastward to the Outer Loop near Pine Forest High School and westward at North Bragg Blvd. (N.C. 24/87). The Plan also proposes a connector road between McCloskey Road and Johnson Farm Road. A connector road extending Wolfpoint Drive is proposed between Ramsey Street (U.S. 401) and Johnson Farm Road. There is also a proposed connector road between McCormick Bridge Road and Tom Hart Road. These proposed improvements are as illustrated in Map 2A – Addendum Area Existing Thoroughfare Plan. Johnson Farm and Tom Hart Roads are classified as minor thoroughfares.

Other Transportation Modes

Other transportation modes include bicycle, pedestrian, and mass transit. The long-range Fayetteville Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, 1999 does not project any facilities in the Area. Sidewalks may be constructed as part of the subdivision process since the Area is located in the Spring Lake Municipal Influence Area that requires sidewalks on one side of a street. On the proposed Countywide Transit Plan, there are no plans to extend transit service to the Area.

EXISTING LAND USE

Land uses within the Addendum Area consist of single-family residential development, which includes stick-built houses, single-wide and double-wide manufactured homes; industrial uses including two utility substations, a water tower a cellular tower, and a cemetery; commercial, consisting of a convenience store; governmental that includes the fire tower; open space, which includes the 100-year flood area located along the Little River; and agricultural that accounts for large tracts of vacant land and approximately 33 bona fide farms. The land use categories are illustrated in Map 3A – Addendum Area Existing Land Use.

According to this map single-family residential development is concentrated along Elliot Bridge Road (within Ellerslie and Hunter’s Ridge Subdivisions) and along Elliot Farm Road. Additionally, there are a few residential structures located along Johnson Farm Road at the intersection of Elliot Farm Road and Johnson Farm Road; several residential units along Bluebird Lane; and two units on McCormick Bridge Road. The industrial uses are located on the northern side of Johnson Farm Road (southern boundary of the Addendum Area). The commercial development is located at the intersection of U.S. 401 and Elliot Bridge Road. A U.S. Forest Service fire tower is located off of Elliot Bridge Road and is classified as governmental. Lands that are classified as open space are located within the 100-year floodplain, which is located along the Little River, which serves as the northern boundary of the Addendum Area. The remaining land within the Area is classified as agricultural. This classification is located within the northeast and southeastern portion of the Study Area (bordering Ellerslie and Hunter’s Ridge Subdivisions on the north, northeast and southern boundaries); within the central portion of the Area (between Elliot Farm and Elliot Bridge Roads) and within the western portion of the Study Area (eastern side of McCormick Bridge Road and northern side of a portion of Johnson Farm Road).

EXISTING ZONING

The Addendum Study Area consists of all zoned area. In 2001, approximately 995 acres (16%) of the Study Area was zoned as part of the last zoning area in the County. The remainder of the Area was zoned as Area 15A in February 1989 and 15B in October 1997. Zoning districts in the Area consist of A1 and A1A Agricultural Districts; the R-30, RR, R15, R6, and R5A Residential Districts; the C (P) and C3 Commercial Districts; and the M2 Manufacturing District as shown in Map 4A – Addendum Area Zoning. The percentage of each zoning district reveals that approximately 35% of the Study Area is zoned A1-Agricultural, 1% A1A-Agricultural, 39% R15-Residential, 3% RR-Rural Residential, 1% R30-Residential, 2% R6-
Residential, .7% R5A Residential, 1% C (P)-Planned Commercial, .2% CD-Conservation, .1% C3-Heavy Commercial, PND-Planned Neighborhood Development and .03% M2-Heavy Manufacturing. Since the Area was zoned, there have been no re-zonings.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

UTILITIES

Water Service
Water service is provided to the Area by both public systems and private wells. The Public Works Commission (PWC), Harnett County Water System, and the Town of Linden Water System provide public water to the area as shown in Map 5A – Addendum Area Water Service. PWC has a 16-inch water main that extends up Ramsey Street to Bienville Drive. The Town of Linden’s Water System consists of an 8-inch line that extends from the Town south on Ramsey Street to Elliot Bridge Road. Neither of these systems have service lines that extend into the Study Area. The Town of Linden provides water to the properties that front Ramsey Street. The Harnett County System has an 8-inch line that runs along Elliot Bridge Road from the Harnett County line to Ramsey Street and a 6-inch line along Elliot Farm Road from Johnson Farm Road to Akins Drive. Additionally, there are service lines belonging to the Harnett County system that serve the Ellerslie and Hunter’s Ridge Subdivisions.

The remaining portion of the Addendum Area is served by individual wells. The geologic information for the area indicates that the Study Area is in the Tuscaloosa Aquifer Formation. Wells tapping into the Tuscaloosa Formation generally have low yields. The Study Area is located on the eastern edge of the Sandhills, which contains highly permeable, loose, Surficial Sands that allow rapid infiltration of precipitation to the water table. The Sandhills Aquifer is thicker toward the extreme northwestern portion of the County and is gradually thinner toward the east. This is important because where the aquifer is thin the well yields are low (+5gpm) whereas in thicker areas yields can be more than 300gpm. The hydro-geologic characteristics of the Sandhills Aquifer allow wells to be placed reasonably close together. High yield wells in the Sandhills Area should be placed a minimum of 1,000 feet apart. Well yields in the northern portion of the Study Area are in the thinner portion of the Sandhills Aquifer, thus having the lowest well yields. This area has the highest concentration of development and is served by the Harnett County Water System.

Sewer Service
Sewer service in the Area consists of septic tanks. The soils data shows that approximately 70% (4,168 acres) of the Study Area has severe limitations for septic tank use, approximately 27% (1,624 acres) has slight limitations, about 2.5% (152 acres) has moderate limitations for septic tank use, and less than 1% (21 acres) is unclassified. This is shown in Map 6A – Addendum Area Septic Tank Suitability. According to Cumberland County Health Department data supplied to the Public Works Commission (PWC), there have been 14 septic tank repairs and 49 new septic tanks installed in the Addendum Study Area between 1995 and 1999 as Shown in Map 7A – Addendum Area Septic Installation and Repair Data 1995-1999.

There is public sewer provided by the Public Works Commission along Ramsey Street up to Pine Forest Middle School. According to the Public Works Commission of the City of Fayetteville Sanitary Sewer Master Plan 1997, the Study Area will receive improvements including the Little River Outfall and Pump Station that is anticipated to be completed between 2002 and 2006; and the Ellerslie II Phase II and the McCormick Bridge Outfall to be completed between 2007 and 2016. Future sewer in the Addendum Area is as shown in Map 8A – Addendum Area Projected Future Sewer Improvements.

Electric Service
Electrical service is provided to the Area by South River Electric Membership Corporation (SREMC) and Carolina Power and Light Company (CP&L). SREMC serves most of the Area with the exception of a small strip along Ramsey Street that is served by CP&L.
Other Services
Other services considered in the Study include telephone and natural gas. Telephone service is provided by Sprint. There is no natural gas service to the Study Area. The closest natural gas service is located at the intersection of McArthur and Andrews Roads. There are no plans to extend natural gas service to the Area.
Map 3A – Addendum Area Existing Land Use
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PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

There are no County-owned parks within the Study Area. Presently, there are two County-owned parks: Arnette, which is located on N.C. Highway 87 in the south-central portion of the County, and Lake Rim, located on N.C. Highway 401 South in the western portion of the County. All other County recreation activities are conducted within private, civic and religious facilities. According to the Cumberland County Parks and Recreation Department 10-Year Service Plan, which was developed in 1995 and revised in 1999, proposes a District Recreation Center to be constructed in the Pine Forest Region. This district Recreation Center is recommended to be located on school grounds through construction of building additions to the existing gym. This District Center would be staffed on a full-time basis to provide administrative and technical assistance, as well as planning, scheduling and supervision of community-based recreational programs and activities, including evening and weekend programs. The Parks and Recreation Department 10-Year Service Plan also addresses the need for several 30 – 50 acre sized district parks throughout the County. These parks would be designed to provide picnic areas, nature/walk trails, athletic fields/courts, children’s playgrounds and possibly swimming pools. The Plan suggests that a district park should be located in the northern portion of the County. Although the Pine Forest schools are not within this Study Area and the exact location of the northern District Park has not been determined, the Study Area residents would benefit from having these facilities located within close proximity to the Study Area. As mentioned previously, the County Parks and Recreation Program utilizes existing schools for recreation facilities and programs. There are no schools located within the Study Area, nor are any civic or private facilities used for such purposes. However, there is a large private lake located on the east side of Elliot Farm Road that has a great potential for recreational use.

The Cumberland County Subdivision Regulations require developers to dedicate land area for recreational purposes for all new residential development or pay a fee in lieu thereof. When land is to be dedicated, a minimum of 500 square feet per dwelling unit is required when land is above the floodplain; 1,000 square feet per dwelling unit when the land is within the floodplain; and 2,000 square feet per dwelling unit when the area is a water body. These regulations are designed to provide for the recreation and open space needs of the residents.

The Town of Spring Lake requires the dedication of 500 square feet per dwelling unit for all new subdivisions containing over 10 dwelling units. This dedicated land area cannot be land subject to flooding or used for other purposes (such as well lots). The minimum size for any recreation area is 5,000 square feet.

FIRE SERVICE

The Westarea Volunteer Fire District provides fire protection to the area. The District was organized in 1958 to provide fire protection services to an area north of Fayetteville and west of the Cape Fear River. At that time, it included service to Spring Lake and Manchester Township (outside the Military Reservation). Since that time Spring Lake and Manchester Township has created their own fire districts. Some of Westarea’s original service area has been lost to the City of Fayetteville through, annexation.

The District is served by the Westarea Volunteer Fire Department housed in three buildings (Stations #10, 15, and 20) within the district as shown in Map 9A – Addendum Area Fire District Service Area. Each station serves a sub-area within the district as well as backups to the other stations in the district. Budget data shows that the Department spending has increased from $465,201 in 1988 to $715,585 in 2000, a 54% increase. Fire responses have increased from 666 in 1988 to 1,033 in 2000 or 55%. The number of paid firefighters has decreased from 10 in 1988 to 4 in 2000, resulting in a 60% decrease. The number of part-time paid firefighters increased from six in 1988 to 16 in 2000. The Station’s number of volunteer firefighters declined from 80 in 1988 to 70 in 2000, which represents a 14% decrease over the 12-year period. Equipment is allocated in accordance with each station’s specific needs for their individual area of primary responsibility.

Station # 10 is located at 4820 Rosehill Road containing approximately 9,000 square feet. It is responsible for the southern portion of the District. It is almost completely surrounded by Fort Bragg and the City of Fayetteville. It has a fire rating of “5”.

Spring Lake Detailed Land Use Plan, CCJPB, February 2002
Station # 15 (Carver's Creek Fire Station) is located at 6989 Raleigh Road, adjacent to Pine Forest Junior High School. It serves the northwestern and middle portions of the District, which includes the bulk of the Study Area. The Carver’s Creek Station was constructed in 1978 and is approximately 5,660 square feet. It has a fire rating of “5”.

Station #20 is located on Main Street at Academy Street in the Town of Linden. It serves the northeastern section of the District. It was built in 1978 and contains approximately 4232 square feet. It has a fire rating of “9S”.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

There are approximately 500 students who live in the vicinity of the Elliott Farm/Elliott Bridge Road area. Of those 500 students, 230 are in elementary school, 130 are in middle school, and 140 students are in high school. The schools that serve this area are Raleigh Road Elementary (K-1), Long Hill Elementary (2-5), Pine Forest Middle (6-8), and Pine Forest High (9-12). The location of these schools is as shown in Map 10A – School Locations Impacted by the Addendum Study Area.

Due to the overall slowdown in Countywide growth, we expect these schools to remain at near capacity levels. However, this area is suited for expansion should economic conditions improve. Among the factors that could lead to possible growth include Military personnel increases, expanded sewer service into the area, and the opening of US-13 from I-95 to Fort Bragg (portion of the Outer Loop). With that in mind, a new elementary school is listed on the Cumberland County School’s Long Range Facilities Improvement List. Demographic trends will be closely monitored in this area to determine if this future elementary school is needed.
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

HYDRIC SOILS AND WETLAND AREAS

Hydric soils are scattered throughout the Study Area. They are typically located along stream and drainage areas. Except for a major concentration south of Tissington Street off Elliot Farm Road, hydric soils have a minor impact on the use of the land in the Study area. An analysis of the hydric soils in the Area, as shown in Map 11A – Addendum Area Hydric Soils reveals that 8% of the Area has hydric soils or hydric soils as a major component and 1% could possibly exhibit hydric soil characteristics or have wet spots. This means that these areas exhibit a strong possibility that one of the variables for determining wetland exists. All development plans in these areas should be coordinated with the Army Corps of Engineers before any land disturbing activities are undertaken. It should be noted also that this data is based on general soil types and will require specific onsite determination. Flood information for the Area shows that there is a 100-year flood area along the Little River. The designated 100-year flood area is as illustrated in Map 12A – Addendum Area Floodplain.

AGRICULTURAL AND FARM ISSUES

Agricultural and farm issues impacting the Addendum Area include the number of farms, the quality of the soil for farming and the possibility of locating a hog farm in the Area. There are 32 bona fide farms in the Addendum Area according to the county Tax Records. Prime Farmland is found on 12% (826 acres) of the Area while 14% (956 acres) consist of State and Locally Important Farmland as shown in Map 13A – Addendum Area Farmland Characteristics and Bona Fide Farms. There is a potential for locating swine operations in the Area as shown in Map 14A – Areas Designated as Suitable for Swine Farms in the Addendum Area. Currently, there are no large swine operations in the Area.

WILDLIFE HABITAT

There have been several sightings of the Red Cockaded Woodpecker within the Area. It is believed that several of the large wooded tracts of land could serve as foraging areas for these endangered birds. Future projects funded by public funds within the Study Area could be impacted by the existence of this habitat.

WATER FEATURES

Water Features and Water Bodies

The primary water feature in the Area is the Little River that separates Cumberland and Harnett County. There are five streams or tributaries that flow northward into the Little River as shown in Map 15A – Addendum Area Water Features and Watershed Impacted Area. There is a large private lake just off Elliot Farm Road that could be used for recreation or other purposes. Numerous farm ponds are scattered throughout the Area.

Watersheds

The upper reaches of the Cape Fear River Water Supply Watershed, which is classified as WS-IV has a minor impact on the Addendum Area. The watershed area ends at Johnson Farm and Elliot Farm Roads. A small portion of the watershed area extends into the Study Area at the intersection of Ramsey Street and Elliot Bridge Road as shown in Map 15A – Addendum Area Water Features and Watershed Impacted Area. Watershed regulations will have very little impact on development in the Study Area.
HISTORIC RESOURCES

There is one structure within the addendum area that has historical significance. Ellerslie, which is located on Elliot Bridge Road, is one of a few surviving examples of Eighteenth Century domestic architecture in the upper Cape Fear Valley region. It is a coastal cottage built around 1790 by George Elliot. The original appearance was altered in the 1850’s when a Greek Revival addition was added to the south elevation. The land on which the plantation house is located overlooks the Lower Little River. The acquisition of this property was through a state grant and by 1801 George Elliot had acquired over 5,000 acres of land. The house was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1974. Currently, Ellerslie remains in the Elliot family.
Map 13A – Addendum Area Farmland Characteristics and Bona Fide Farms
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DISCLAIMER:

THIS ILLUSTRATION IS FOR GENERAL INFORMATION ONLY AND IS NOT SITE SPECIFIC. A MORE DETAILED SITE ANALYSIS WOULD NEED TO BE CONDUCTED PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF A SWINE FARM.

THIS INFORMATION ONLY CONSIDERS BUFFERING AROUND RESIDENTIAL UNITS, SCHOOLS, CHURCHES, AND RECREATIONAL AREAS. THE FLOODPLAIN AND HYDRIC SOILS WERE NOT TAKEN IN ACCOUNT WITH THE BUFFER.

MAP 14A – Areas Designated Suitable for Swine Farms in the Addendum Area
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THE CUMBERLAND COUNTY 2010 LAND USE PLAN

The Cumberland County 2010 Land Use Plan contains the general framework for the revitalization and future development of the County as well as a general land use map. This map outlined eight land use categories for the Study Area as shown in Map 16A – Addendum Study Area 2010 Land Use Plan. According to this map there is a hierarchy of 6 land use categories according to intensity of use within the Study Area. The description of these land use categories begins with the least intense land use category: Open Space Recreation and Environmental Corridor, which is located along the Little River that serves as the boundary between Harnett and Cumberland Counties, as well as the northern boundary of the Study Area. Suburban Density Residential (2 units per acre) is located from McCormick Bridge Road (the western boundary of the Study Area) southward to Johnson Farm Road; eastward along Elliott Farm Road and Elliott Bridge Road to Ramsey Street (the southern boarder of the Study Area); northward along the eastern boundary of the Study Area to the northern boundary of Hunters Ridge Subdivision; westward along the subdivision boundary to a tract of land west of Elliott Bridge Road; then northward along a parcel line to the Little River (the northern boundary of the Study Area). Low Density Residential (2.1 to 6 units per acre) is located along Elliott Bridge Road within the Ellerslie Subdivision and the adjoining tract to the north of the subdivision. Medium Density Residential (6.1 to 15 units per acre) is located adjacent to the northernmost low density residential along Elliott Bridge Road and extends northward to the Little River (northern boundary of the Study Area). Additionally, there is Medium Density Residential located on the west side of Elliott Bridge Road extending southward from the Little River to the Suburban Density Residential classification. There is some Heavy Commercial located on the south side of Elliott Bridge Road adjacent to the Medium Density and Suburban Density Residential classifications.
Map 16A – Addendum Area 2010 Land Use Plan
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