

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2022 10:16 AM
To: Eric Plow
Cc: Colleen Willger; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; James Baker; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: RE: petition

Thank you for your correspondence with the Town of Chapel Hill. The Mayor and Town Council are interested in what you have to say. By way of this email, I am forwarding your message to the Mayor and each of the Council Members, as well as to the appropriate staff person who may be able to assist in providing additional information or otherwise addressing your concerns.

Again, thank you for your message.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Coffin



Jeanette Coffin
Office Assistant
[Town of Chapel Hill Manager's Office](#)
[405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.](#)
[Chapel Hill, NC 27514](#)
(o) 919-968-2743 | (f) 919-969-2063

From: Eric Plow <ericplow1@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 7, 2022 9:15 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: petition

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

I make the following petition for the Town Council to consider. Please let me know if I need to attend a meeting, virtual or in-person, to present this information.

First, a bit of background. When the STR ordinance was passed in June 2021, at least 2 members of the council stated that they wished that someone like myself, who has run STRs for 22 years with no complaints or problems, could somehow be accommodated. One of those members, Ms. Stegman, is still on the council. I believe that there is a good solution.

I had a meeting with the Planning Commission recently, and discovered that applying for a "rooming house" designation would allow me to comply with the ordinance. To apply for this use, I was informed that I had to go through the site review process, and when that was done, I have to meet 20 Foot Type C buffers around the property. The purpose of the buffer review, as I understand it, is to ensure that noise and disturbance abatement is ensured. There have been no noise or disturbance complaints for the past 22 years, so I am assuming that the existing driveway buffer on one side would be acceptable.

I don't think I will have any problem with the site review, but I was informed that after that was completed, a committee called the "CDC" would examine the buffers around my building. Three sides of the building have great buffers, but one side shares a joint driveway where the nearest building is several hundred feet away. The Planning Commission told me that sometimes the CDC can make allowances for situation like that, but they could not speak for the CDC.

Getting the site review is quite expensive, and I am sure you will understand that I don't want to go through that expense only to find out that my buffer is not approved. The area involved has not been changed for at least 40 years.

I am respectfully asking that you, as the Town Council, give permission to the CDC to review my buffers before the site review, and render a decision. Assuming, of course, that no change to the buffers will take place, which they haven't for 40 years. I believe such a review would only require a meeting of a few minutes. I would be willing to attend such a meeting, or I would be glad to meet the CDC on site for a visual review. I would also welcome the opportunity to meet one of the council members on site to view the actual property.

Below are some pictures of my property with a brief description. The last pictures show the location that has the joint driveway, and I am hoping that will be deemed a proper buffer. But as I said above, I would like to be assured that this is the case before beginning the site review process. I realize that this is in a different order than what is normally done, but doing so does not interfere with the overall intent of the process of the site review.

When facing the property from the right, where the front of the building is visible on the left,

I feel quite confident that the 2 pictures below will provide a more than adequate buffer for that side.





The picture below is from the rear side of the property.
Please note that the little path ends directly behind a commercial zone where the Root Cellar is located.
It is used daily by tenants residing at the Brookside 45-unit apartment complex next door as a short cut to MLK.



Below is the the view from the backside of the building.
Again, this should be more than an adequate buffer.



Below are two pictures from the side adjacent to the Brookside apartment complex, which consists mostly of student housing.

The first picture shows a buffer of a fence and some large bushes.

The second picture demonstrates how a buffer is impossible because we share a joint entrance driveway.

If you go up the hill and turn left, you are at the Brookside apartment complex.

If you turn right, you are at my parking lot.

I can't speak for the CDC, but given the unique situation that the joint driveway presents,

an exception should be considered for that side since the parking lots are an adequate buffer between both of the residential buildings.





I would greatly appreciate your prompt response to this request so that I can begin the site review process asap if the buffers are deemed acceptable.

Sincerely,
Eric Plow