

Hi Kay -

I wanted to take a moment to voice my concern about the proposed building in Southern Village. As a resident of the neighborhood, I am completely opposed to the development of this property for a number of reasons. First and foremost, the parking that is in that lot is needed in the "village" center area. It is nearly always at least fifty percent full and usually more so. I know that the proposed plan has included parking, but underground in a parking deck. As a woman, I avoid parking decks as much as possible. I feel significantly less safe in a parking deck than I do in an open space parking lot. Whether there are facts to support that parking decks are more often the scene of crimes, I do not know. I do know that I and other women with whom I've spoken about this project feel the same.

Secondly, I understand that what is being proposed is a medium density hotel, which by its nature houses transient people. The proximity of the elementary school, day care, and preschool to this building site makes the proposal nearly ludicrous. I know that I perhaps am sounding paranoid, and I may be, but it seems like we're opening the door to the unthinkable.

Finally, I oppose the development of this parking lot for aesthetic reasons. The village center has an open feel to it now. Indeed, barring going to one of the parks or the soccer field, it is the only place in the neighborhood to experience that open feel. Blocking that lot with even a two story (much less a four or five story) building would completely eliminate that feel. In addition, a tall building, built corner to corner, which is what I believe the developers have proposed, will cut out a tremendous amount of light, especially given that there is not a large set-back along the rest of the Market Street area. I would also hate to see a repeat of the Harrington Bank/Children's Clinic building. It looks like a building built on a median, which it essentially is.

I do have one final note. I understand that the argument for this project is to benefit the retailers along Market Street. It is not up to the residents of our neighborhood to forego the feel of the neighborhood where we purchased our homes for the betterment of the retailers. A huge hotel and underground parking deck would result in this community feeling more like downtown Chapel Hill and make the quaint village center to which many homeowners were so attracted nearly obsolete. Also, quite contradictory to this argument is that Weaver Street, the most successfully retail tenant in the Market Street area, relies heavily on that parking lot. It would be naïve to think that this project would not hurt it.

Thank you very much for your time.

Best regards,
Marcie Coyne
121 Graylyn Drive
933-0822

Dear Members of the Planning Department,

I read in the Chapel Hill News that the developers of Southern Village are asking for a re-zoning to allow them to build a 6 story building (condo or hotel or ?) in the "empty" space in the middle of the green.

Please don't do it.

The current parking lot usually has a lot of cars in it, so I think there is some strength to the argument that a parking lot is needed. But more importantly, there is empty office space in Southern Village already, there are plenty of residences on the market, and the N&O reports that there is an excess of hotel rooms in the Triangle area already. Our Chapel Hill area has lots of condos going up (from Lot 5 to the Greenbridge thing, to the 54 development to Carolina North, to the stuff just over the line in Chatham and Durham. This part of the Triangle doesn't need more.

In particular, we don't need more building in SV.

We especially don't need a 6 story building that would be 2x as high as everything else that is there now. It would make the open, spacious area that is the SV downtown/green, closed in and cramped. It would dominate the development visually, and size wise.

This is NOT the original vision of Southern Village - mixed residential, office, and retail with a school, daycare, church, doctor's offices - and a 6 story thing sticking up in the middle like a sore thumb.

If there is going to be such a building, it should be downtown in Chapel Hill, where our community is trying to attract business and residences to revitalize (I work near downtown, and I'm all for this!!). Chapel Hill just doesn't need more stuff in Southern Village.

A change in zoning would negatively impact the quality of the surrounding area, both residential and commercial. I thought that's what zoning was supposed to *protect*.

Sincerely,
Mary P. Metcalf
109 Meeting Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

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

From: Web Site

Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2008 4:04 PM

To: Town Council

Cc: rrizzo@nc.rr.com

Subject: Deny Southern Village Developer's Request to Build Parking Garage/Hotel/Condos and Change Zoning

Message sent by rrizzo@nc.rr.com

9/11/08

Honorable Mayor & Council Members:

As a parent, husband and homeowner in Southern Village(since 1995) who attended D. R. Bryan's public meeting on 9/9/08, I respectfully ask that you deny his request to modify or expand the existing zoning regarding the entire Southern Village and the commercial area. They are one and should be regulated as one entity as they co-exist, are dependent on each other and work as one.

The proposed underground and above ground parking garage that would be an integral but atrocious part of a hotel/condominium would drive away the majority of women and children who shop and walk presently in the commercial area because they would not feel safe. An immediate result of the construction would be a radical drop in store revenue eventually leading to bankruptcies and a deep reduction in tax revenues for the town.

Endangering the personal safety and well-being of hundreds of small children who are served now by the adjacent day care center, the Methodist Church's childrens programs and the Scrogg's Elementary School would result from the obvious hidden and dark parking inherent with underground and second and third story parking, and transient hotel guests. This Spring the Neighborhood Watch reported that a 10 year old girl walking home from school at 2:40p.m. was solicited by a man in a parked car near 300 Market Street. Before that a teenage girl claimed she was raped after meeting boys on the sidewalk in front of the the Lumina Theater.

At the 9/9/08 meeting it was also reported that drugs were being sold Friday, 9/05/08, at 9p.m. on the sidewalk in front of the Lumina Theater, which also contains a Chapel Hill police sub-station. Mr. John Fugo reported that over 40 security cameras and a guard monitor the commercial real estate. John(a partner of D. R. Bryan) has often tried to get a stronger commitment from the Chapel Hill police. Would 40 more cameras make a parking garage and hotel safe?

A six story hotel(higher than the Methodist Church steeple) immediately eliminating or restricting available daylight and the circulation of air would rapidly reduce the value of the Church and all of the adjacent properties. Towering buildings and shadows make people feel ill at ease and unsafe. The model on display at the 9/9 meeting misrepresents the height of the new garage/hotel and how it would actually destroy the identity and feeling of space between the existing structures. I ASK THAT YOU PERSONALLY VISIT THE LOCATION AND VISUALIZE HOW WRONG THIS PROJECT IS!

Naturally, if the value of the buildings and quality of shopping and visiting the commercial area declines, so does the value of the surrounding residential homes,

Ms. Pearlstein,

Please help stop the foolish plans for a Parking Garage/Hotel/Condos in Southern Village.

It is not wanted, it is not needed and it will ruin the existing businesses.

The sinister visual and psychological appearance of a parking garage will drive away the females and their children who now shop and eat here. 80 to 90% of the patrons at anytime of the day are females.

Church programs, the day care center and the elementary school serving hundreds of children will be endangered by the undesirables and unknowns that would come with a parking garage. You would not approve and support a structure that would attract vermin for health and safety reasons - do not approve a structure with below ground and multilevel second and third story parking.

Leave the parking lot as it is and do not alter the existing zoning laws and concept that establishes the Market St. area as an essential, compatible and integral part of the primary residential theme for Southern Village.

Do not let the need for additional tax revenues mislead you to an architectural abomination that will jeopardize the safety of our women and children.

Thank you for your thoughtfulness!

Bob Rizzo (110 Eastgreen Drive in Southern Village)

I have been a resident of Southern Village since 2005.

I am very much opposed to the construction of a hotel in the current location of the parking lot across from Weaver Street Market.

The key to the success to any village is the livability of the common spaces. Through Europe, and France specifically, the concept of a place ['a' is a short sound 'c' as an s] (open space) provides an uncluttered area to reflect and meet.

I have lived in France and was amazed at the comfort created by openness in the middle of the Village.

When I bought my house in Southern Village I had also looked in Merrimont and chose Southern Village due to the openness of the commercial area and the zoning that protected it from the cluttered development of other commercial buildings.

A good quality hotel is needed but it would be best suited on the other side of 15-501 so the Southern Village environment is not ruined.

At this point Southern Village is unique and popular because it is unique.

Please help to protect it from the same type of greed that has ruined the economy in the US and globally.

The human element must be preserved as part of an economic goal.

Please do not rezone the Southern village parking lot area.

Thank you

Scott Morrison
102 Eastgreen Dr.
Chapel Hill, NC
919-928-0220

Dear Ms. Pearlstein,

I'd like to express my concerns to you as a Senior Planner on the Chapel Hill Planning department about the DR Bryan proposal for development in Southern Village. I am concerned with the aesthetics of the project, the effect the project will have on parking in the Southern Village market street, its effect on the traffic flow around Scroggs school, and the nature of the project.

In terms of aesthetics, the project will virtually eliminate what is currently a great feature of Southern Village. The large oval of open space, even with half devoted to ground-level parking, gives the market street a wonderful character. Having lived in Boston, London, and the former Czechoslovakia, it is the survival of these wonderfully shaped open spaces ringed with buildings, whether they be quite large (as with Wenceslas Square in Prague) or small (as with Louisburg Square in Boston), that are so inspiring. A building in the middle that towers over the existing ring of buildings will clearly end the sense of open space and symmetry that makes walking market street and eating outside (at Pazzo's, Vita Dolce, and the Town Hall Grill) so very enjoyable. Worse, I understand that upon entering Southern Village from the main entrance (Main St) we will be faced with both exposed parking and dumpsters on Kildaire. That certainly seems like a depressing front door for Southern Village.

In terms of parking, parking is already getting tight in Southern Village as it currently exists. Even if the supply of parking increases with the development, it would be covered and thus likely not as safe as the current arrangement. Increased parking demand with the hotel and retail to be added in the project are likely to put a stress on parking that will make quick stops at the nearby shops (such as Weaver Street) much less attractive.

In terms of traffic flow, Kildaire in the morning is already reasonably heavily used with Scroggs drop offs. Adding traffic coming in the other direction on Kildaire (a hotel will likely have people coming and going around the same time as Scroggs begins) could turn what is currently an orderly flow and minor delay into a significant backlog of cars.

Finally, when it comes to the hotel, I understand it is to be reasonably large (90-100 rooms). That seems large enough for the eventual business approach and success or failure of the hotel to have a big effect on the character of the surrounding street life. While I look forward to learning more about the plans at the meeting tonight, I am sorry to think that the market street area is at risk of losing its wonderful layout, brisk but not crowded activity level, and primarily small-town character.

Best,

Scott-

=====

Scott Rockart
Assistant Professor
Duke University's Fuqua School of Business Box 90120 Durham, NC 27708-0120
919-660-7998 / 919-681-6244 (fax)
Email address: srockart@duke.edu

I do not wish to see a large hotel or condo building constructed on the parking lot at Southern Village as I believe such a building will harm the Town's Tax base.

The tax base will be impacted by this building because this building will destroy many of the existing businesses on Market Street by robbing them of available parking. I understand that the new building would contain parking, but it will all be inside, and very very scary. As a woman this does not help me. I do not like to park underground, and I never park in a parking garage if there is any other alternative. I know many Southern Village women who feel similarly. We feel more comfortable parking OUTSIDE, where there is excellent visibility and where we feel safe. Currently, I shop at Weaver Street Market quite a bit because I can park there in comfort and safety. Once the new building goes in, I will not be able to find a parking spot on the street and I will therefore drive down to Chatham County and shop at Harris Teeter. I believe that many of my friends will do the same, and this will take tax money out of Chapel Hill and out of Orange County.

It is difficult for me to believe that people are going to be willing to park in garage when they go to the movies. So I feel the Lumina will be adversely impacted by the loss of most of its parking as well. At present, I see large groups of people streaming over to the Lumina from the beautiful big safe, well-lit

TO: Kim Pearlstein
FROM: Deirdre Imershein Haj
RE: Proposed Southern Village Development
DATE: September 25, 2008

VIA EMAIL

Dear Town of Chapel Hill Planning Department Review Committee, the Honorable Mayor and the Council Members

I am writing to inform you of my extreme opposition to the proposed development intended by DR Bryan in Southern Village.

The height of the new structure is unacceptable as it will tower over the current buildings, including the church steeple, which make for the family friendly environment Southern Village currently maintains. It will make parking more difficult, increase traffic and even cut down on the sunlight that brightens Market Street and its shops.

Most dangerous is the proposed use of the building. First, a recent article (9/11/08) in the News & Observer stated that hotel occupancy in our area is *decreasing* at the very time new hotels have been built:

At least 1,900 new rooms are expected to open in the Triangle by the end of 2009 -- **the biggest increase in a decade**. At the same time, occupancy at area hotels averaged 63.2 percent in the first seven months of the year -- **a three-year low**, according to Smith Travel Research, a Tennessee company that tracks hospitality trends.

There is no *need* for such a hotel in our area. Further, many questions would then be raised about such an establishment. These questions become more prominent as our subdivision houses an elementary school, two blocks from the proposed building that serves approximately 500 youth from the age of 5-13. This makes the following questions imperative:

Will the new establishment serve alcohol?

Will adult movies be available in rooms?

Will concealed weapons be allowed inside?

How much will the traffic flow increase for Southern Village's considerable foot traffic, as well as the in and around the streets that feed into the subdivision from Culbreth and 15/501?

A study in the 1990's, "The Relationship Between Crime and Urban Location in Raleigh, North Carolina" by Elizabeth L. Davison (Appalachian State University) and William R. Smith (North Carolina State University) shows similar effects in our neighboring city Raleigh. It states:

Dear Town of Chapel Hill Planning Department Review Committee, the Honorable Mayor and the Council Members,

I have always respected D.R. Bryan for the design concept behind Southern Village. I wish for more such neighborhoods throughout the country. But, I feel that his proposal for developing a huge building on the current parking area in the heart of the Village, which I see as valuable open space, is wrong-headed. I would like it left (*as is*), a parking lot or OPEN space, i.e. no construction at all. Everyday I am reminded about how every last square inch has been squeezed out of my (*less than minimum*) driveway and (*less than minimum*) side yard only to further increase density. I feel like the only COMMON space we share is being pulled out from under us. Leaving this space "as is" offers breath to our shared Village Center, the only real public OPEN space remaining in this 600 plus family community.

Open space is not the only issue that concerns me. The allowable height requested in the re-zoning application would allow the structure to be 75' high on the east end of the site, drastically dominating the existing church steeple, which is a friendly landmark for our community. Their proposal is far from a neighborhood scale, and quite unfriendly. It is too much to ask.

As a home owner resident in Southern Village I respectfully ask that you deny the Developers' request to modify or expand the existing zoning regarding the entire Southern Village Center, commercial and common area.

I think that the developers' strategy is to ask for the extreme high density, only to hope to land on a 4-story scheme; I argue that NO DEVELOPMENT, ONLY OPEN SPACE is the only appropriate decision.

Cindy Selkirk

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

From: Daniel C. Lau [mailto:dan@unc.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2008 1:56 PM

To: JB Culpepper

Cc: chrismoss66@aol.com; Kate McAllister

Subject: Opposition to proposed Southern Village Center

Dear Ms. Culpepper,

My name is Daniel Lau and I am a graduate student at UNC as well as a long-term resident of Chapel Hill. I am a member of the Board of Directors of Copperline Square Condominiums, a member-at-large of the Southern Village Master Association, and the Condominium Committee Representative to the Southern Village Homeowners Association. I have lived in Chapel Hill since 1998, and in Southern Village since 2003 where I enjoy the high quality of life afforded by D. R. Bryan's vision when his company created Southern Village. As you know, Mr. Bryan and his associate, Mr. John Fugo, recently held two informational meetings with Southern Village residents, regarding their plans for the Village Core. Their intentions are two-fold:

1. Change the zoning of the Village Core from Neighborhood Commercial to Mixed Use-Village.
2. Build a 6-story multi-use building consisting of parking spaces, retail spaces, and either condominiums or a mid-tier, select service hotel.

I oppose their zoning change proposal in its current form. The current zoning regulations for the Village Core allow for finite square footage maxima for the residential, retail, and office space categories. Mr. Bryan argued that because square foot usage in the Village Core is near the maxima, space vacated by a retail tenant must be leased to another retail tenant, and the same is true for residential and office tenants. Mr. Bryan indicated that this has caused economic harm to his business because he has turned away prospective tenants that fall outside the category he needs to fill the spaces. However, changing the Village Core zoning to Mixed Use-Village removes these square footage maxima, enabling future development within the Core. This poses an undefined and unnecessary threat to the concept of a communal, open village center that Southern Village and Chapel Hill residents currently enjoy. I understand that this issue brings to light the balance between the needs of Southern Village homeowners versus the needs of a Southern Village business owner. One possible compromise is to create a special Mixed Use-Village category, one which specifies square footage maxima in terms of percentage of available square footage as opposed to finite caps. Creating a unique zoning category is not without

Elliot Baron
215 Westside Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
919.370-7900

October 26, 2008

Ms. Kay Pearlstein
Senior Planner
Town of Chapel Hill
306 N. Columbia Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Dear. Ms. Pearlstein;

I attended a meeting at Christ Church in Southern Village last Thursday, where D.R. Bryan presented his conceptual project for the Market Street Hotel Project to the Home Owners' Association BOD. It was well attended and a large number of neighbors were there to object to situating such a large structure on a parcel which presently affords open sight-lines, sunlight and blue sky across the commercial zone, whether one wants to define a surface parking lot as "open space" or not.

The entire proposal seems premised on erroneous interpretations of zoning and specifically how Floor Area Ratios apply under the dimensional matrix. I would like to dispute the following points in their proposal.

1. The highest designation of Mixed Use-Village that can apply is "MU-V Collector." In seeking to rezone from Neighborhood Commercial to Mixed Use-Village, the figures in their Concept Plan Proposal begin with values derived from the "Arterial" designation. More appropriately, the "Collector" designation would be the prudent zoning for Market Street, while Kildare and Aberdeen are clearly "Local." From a standpoint of compatibility, nothing in Southern Village even begins to approach the Primary Building Height permitted by Arterial (70 ft). Furthermore, it absolutely defies common sense to define Market Street as an artery.

2. There is no developmental right associated with the subject parcel at present, because no more commercial space can be added to the village center. In multiple presentations and in the "Statement of Justification," the developer repeatedly states that the original plan for the village center included a building on that property. This is totally irrelevant, since the final approved plan did not include a building there and the developers were the party that requested the amendment. Since Southern Village was a Planned Development, the developers were able to shift building masses and densities, as long as they stayed within the confines of the caps and other dimensional restrictions. D.R. may look at that parcel and see a vacant lot, but in reality, it has an invisible building. That building has been piece-mealed into the buildings which surround it.

3. Any proposed construction on the Market Street parcel must recognize that an existing Neighborhood Commercial FAR of .264 has already been applied and that developmental right has been transferred off site. Once the project was realized, floor areas and densities in some areas exceeded conformity, while others are built below maximum levels. At that point, accounting based on the initial credits becomes important for all proposed changes and all fungible aspect is lost. For example, the entire residential allotment was calculated on 15 units per acre. My house occupies a quarter acre. My large lot and others similar in size permitted apartments to be constructed at 40 units per acre, even though that density is nonconforming. I could not tear down my house and build three or four in its place, simply because that falls within allowable density. In effect, a Transfer of Developmental Right has occurred between my Sender Property and the overbuilt Receiver Property. In this regard, the subject

To: **Town Council**
Design Commission
Planning Department

September 24, 2008

It is an abuse of process for this project to waste the time of the public or the Design Commission.

The subject property is zoned Neighborhood Commercial, the stated intent of which is:
“to provide for the development of low-intensity commercial and service centers that are accessible by pedestrians from the surrounding neighborhoods, serve the daily convenience and personal service needs of the surrounding neighborhood, and are of such a nature as to minimize conflicts with surrounding residential uses.”

The Town of Chapel Hill authorizes the Design Commission to ***“review site analysis data and conceptual development plans, and offer recommendations to the applicant.”***

The first recommendation of the Design Commission should be for the applicant to propose a development which -- at the very least -- is legal. Scores of neighbors have spent hundreds of hours, organizing and worrying about the future of their neighborhood, homes and land values, because the developer seeks to receive an even greater economic rate of return, than the tidy profit that he has already realized, through the build-out of this project.

This proposal puts the cart before the horse, by asking the Design Commission to comment on a proposal which requires **rezoning and variances at the very least**. This is particularly troublesome if the Commission's comments were to become evidence of justification for the rezoning itself. If the Design Commission limits its comments on intensity and zoning, or variances, then the applicant could claim tacit approval, even though it is not within the purview of the Commission to comment on such matters.

Therefore, only projects which comply with the legal use of the land should be reviewed. **Why should the Design Commission extend itself by commenting on a project which does not comply with the law?** A motion to table this proposal would be in order, until a time certain that it complies with the legal use of the land.

In their application to the town, **the developer intentionally confounds** the zoning issue by referencing a request to rezone to MU-V, while misrepresenting the dimensional regulations that would apply to Maximum Building Height and Floor Area Ratio; as if the project complied with MU-V Arterial.

Market Street, Aberdeen and Kildaire are Local or Collector at best. The plan depicts a setback on Kildaire, which would comply with the Primary Building Height under the Arterial designation, but not under Collector. Kildaire Street is Local. In whose estimation is Kildaire considered Arterial?

Then come the issues of mass and scale. Only the town's newly designated **Town Center-3** would support the Floor Area Ratio of 3.5 for principal use, not even considering the additional 1.3 FAR required for structured parking. Out of 28 zoning districts within the entire town, this proposal could only be permitted on a few blocks of Downtown Chapel Hill. That is wholly inappropriate for the scale of development which brought most of us to Southern Village.

This proposal is not allowable under any of the MU-V designations. It is not entitled to any variances as evidenced by their own submitted lot description. There are no hardships. "Hotel" is not considered a "right of use." The owner has not been deprived of all "reasonable use of his property."

There is a fundamental misunderstanding of the definitions related to the words "**minimum**" and "**maximum**." Minimum means "not less than" and Maximum means "not more than." New construction should not require an additional parking reduction of 10%, especially when the Mixed-Use designation has already reduced that requirement by fifty percent.

On the Maximum side, provided the property is rezoned to MU-V, which would double the intensity that is presently allowed, it would seem ungentlemanly to request a use that is 700% greater than the applicant's own requested designation permits.

Limits should be absolute. One can build more than the minimum and less than the maximum. But language loses its meaning - and so does zoning - when contortionists have their way.

Hello Kay

My name is George C. Hartmann, and live at 108 Graylyn Drive in Southern Village (for 8 years). I just received an e-mail from Cindy Selkirk who said she visited with you today concerning DRBryan's proposal to build a large building in the Market Street Parking lot in Southern Village. Cindy explained that your office will collect citizen opinions about the proposal, and encouraged us to email you.

I have attended two DRBryan design charettes (in 2007) and an informational meeting he held last week. I personally think his proposal has merit and that it will contribute positively to Southern Village, provided the size/bulk of the building does not overpower the surrounding buildings, including the Methodist Church, and provided DRBryan can craft a suitable solution to the parking problem.

Regarding the building size, I think that at this point DRBryan is sending a mixed message, causing considerable neighborhood confusion. His 3-D slide-show drawings done by an architectural firm show a building just 4 stories high (at the Lumina theater) and owing to the site slope, 5 stories (at Harrington Bank) with roof setbacks to minimize the sense of bulk. On the other hand, the concept blueprint he has shown publicly specifies only a footprint and building height of 6 stories, with the implication the building could be a monumental six story box. Needless to say, people react negatively to such an ill-specified idea.

Regarding parking, DRBryan has proposed a two level parking deck, hidden behind shallow retail storefronts. With a tasteful design, I believe this could work.

My suggestion to you is that the Design Commission request that DRBryan make available an information package to Southern Village residents, so they can react thoughtfully to his concept plan. The package should provide sketches and "big picture" specifications, explain the parking deck solution, deal with whatever zoning changes he is seeking, and so on.

Thanks,

George

Dear Town of Chapel Hill,

I know all my neighbors are up in arms against any large development in the parking lot at Southern Village. In contrast, I fail to be alarmed by the developers plans for office space, condos, merchandising space, or hotel rooms. We already have parking garages underneath the north side commercial buildings and I don't know that they have become sinks for social problems as some are so sure will happen in the new space. Also, I think the more commercial activity the better. East Franklin Street has so many unoccupied storefronts because the rents are too high, the traffic is too limited, and the parking is to limited. None of this need be the case with more commercial development in Southern Village.

The developers of Southern Village have done a fantastic job on the whole and I love living there. If they think a hotel or other large development is economically viable in this economy who am I to think I know better. I trust their good sense, which has been amply demonstrated thus far in how they have managed the slow development of Southern Village's commercial district thus far. Why my neighbors think a hotel would attract "transients" I can't understand. I think football and basketball weekends would fill up a hotel at that location with pretty high class clientele. In general, it would be an ideal space for people to stay who have business at UNC given the fine bus service and would also be a good place to host a meeting. Those using the word "transient" to describe hotel patrons must not notice the people at the hotels they stay in when visiting another city.

By the way one reason I am not jumping on my neighbor's doomsday bandwagon is that their arguments are so outlandish and extreme they take away any likelihood of reasonable discussion of this proposal. Like the extreme and overly negative political ads on TV these days they have so little credibility I can't take them seriously. For example, pasting in the building under construction on Highway 54 beyond Glenn Lennox as what the new hotel will look like in the parking lot is very deceptive. Put in a drawing of the finished building provided by the development, if they have one yet, not some ugly shell of a building out of scale to the existing Southern Village commercial sector. Frankly, I'm insulted by tactics like these and wanted you to know that at least one long-time Southern Village resident does not share their extreme views.

--

Joseph Lowman
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
919.962.3993 jclowman@unc.edu

204 Eastgreen Dr.

To whom this may concern--

My husband and I, as well as our two young daughters, are nine years residents of Southern Village. I am writing to you now in order to voice my great dissent regarding the proposed hotel in SV's Market Street parking lot. Although I am a proponent of "condensed" urban living, my greatest problem with the proposed hotel development is its misplaced size! A structure standing 75 feet would not only be a general nuisance in a village of this nature, but more importantly, it would detract from the Market Street's beauty, namely, the existing church. To hide such a spectacular piece of architecture such as this church, would be an outright shame! Moreover, there is NO need for a hotel in this area; and as for "retail space" the neighborhood is unable to adequately fill what space is currently has available. Let's be honest here, shall we. What Southern Village doesn't need is another "unnecessary" business; what we DO need is some more packaging stores, sandwich shops, ice cream parlors, inexpensive hair cutteries, and the like. A hotel would serve very little purpose here, less we lose site of the nature of this small neighborhood.

Moreover, although I ride my bike on almost all occassions to and from our residence to Market Street, come winter time, I am more likely to drive my car to the gym on cold mornings, where parking is already relatively non-existent! Parking difficulty is not only unfair to the Village's residents, but to the few businesses here that do require parking --short term or extended-- it is a virtual economic nightmare. I understand that the proposed hotel would have underground parking, but this too is unrealistic for its spaces would be occupied by said tenants; although I have no idea would these tenants might be.

So although parking on Market Street is already a problem, my gravest concern regarding the hotel proposal is the inappropriateness of its presence. Development is necessary, no doubt, but sometimes ethereal and logistical concerns should prevail. In this case, there is NO DOUBT that a 75 foot structure would be no more than an eyesore at best. Please do not ruin, in the name of greed, what this neighborhood has worked so hard to create.

Thank you,
Jill and Michael Bone
504 Parkview Crescent
Chapel Hill, NC

From: Kate McAllister [mailto:kmcallister@gmf-law.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2008 12:24 PM
To: JB Culpepper
Cc: R.G. McAllister, M.D.
Subject: Southern Village Hotel/Condo Proposal

Dear Ms. Culpepper:

My name is Kate McAllister, and I was part of the 2007 Leadership Chapel Hill class to whom you presented planning and zoning information last fall. I am writing to you today because I live in Copperline Square, which is a two-building condo development just behind Weaver Street Market in Southern Village. I attended the session on September 8, 2008 arranged by developers D.R. Bryan and John Fugo to provide information to owners/residents regarding their attempt to gain approval for a zoning change request in order to construct a five to six-story hotel or condo building on the parking lot in the Village Center.

I want to register, in the strongest possible terms, my vigorous **opposition** to this zoning change request and attempt at construction. What they are proposing is simply unacceptable. It would ruin the character of the SV Village Center and would be a horrible eyesore. I do not believe that their notion of 'framing' the shops/office space along Market Street with this monstrosity has any merit. There would be enormous traffic and parking difficulties, and I am unconvinced that any development there would assist the existing retailers. We have a wonderful community feel in Southern Village, and a building in place of the parking lot would simply destroy that atmosphere.

I urge you to take notice of my opposition to the developers' plans. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kate McAllister
701-304 Copperline Dr.
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
919-942-3674

Kate McAllister, CLA, NCCP
Legal Assistant to Carlos E. Mahoney
Glenn, Mills, Fisher & Mahoney, P.A.
P.O. Drawer 3865
Durham, NC 27702
919-683-2135
www.gmf-law.com

Please file my comments as public record regarding the proposed parking deck and associated structure in Southern Village.

I am not in favor of the proposed removal of the Southern Village parking lot for a multi-story structure and parking deck. The proposed structure would be an overwhelming eye-sore as you enter the now quaint retail center in Southern Village. Even our name, Southern "Village", does not denote high rise buildings and parking decks. I believe the whole beauty and charm of the village center would be lost with such a plan. The allure of the green space which is used constantly for community events and activities would be overshadowed by the towering structure. This plan is simply not the right fit for our thriving village hub.

Of equal concern, I believe that the retailers and patrons would suffer the loss of "convenient" parking. Most of the storefronts offer quick, in and out, village services (like dry cleaning, Weaver Street Market, shipping store, pizza take-out) which are not conducive to deck style parking. The enclosed parking structure behind the retail buildings are not currently being used to anywhere near capacity. This is proof that patrons favor convenient, open lot parking in front of the retail space. As a woman, I would not feel as safe in an enclosed parking deck, especially after dark, as I would in a open, street level, lot.

I have been a resident of Southern Village for eleven years and have watched the retail hub grow and finally flourish. Like many of my neighbors, I support the retail stores on a regular basis because of safe and convenient parking. I urge the developers to remove this proposal and leave the space as is.

Submitted by: Kim Hanlon, 116 Graylyn Drive, Chapel Hill, NC 27516

to whom it may concern:

Please do not let a hotel be built in Southern Village!

There already are delivery trucks parked on main streets around the green space...The hotel will cause more congestion and traffic.

It will take away from the friendly open space that makes this area unique...The view of the Church steeple will be out of site of many who enjoy this beautiful structure.

Please do not permit a hotel in Southern Village.

Thank you

Linda Larriva

Please veto any permit to build a hotel in Southern Village.

It will spoil the beauty of this neighborhood and be a great inconvenience to the residents of the area..

Town square is already becoming a congested area...a hotel will cause more congestion, and infact ,it will discourage the residents from shopping in their own neighborhood...

thank you for your attention in this matter.

linda larriva
919-968-0460

As a resident of Southern Village, a member of the Weaver Street Co-op and the mother of children who attend Scroggs and Chapel Hill Day Care, I am opposed to the building of a 100 room hotel in downtown Southern Village. I am NOT opposed to building something new in downtown Southern Village. I would welcome a family friendly business like a kid's museum or an indoor playground or even more restaurants and shops. But a hotel that size poses a serious traffic problem, and, no matter how fancy, it will bring vice. That's what hotels are for, anonymity and vice. I don't want it. I also don't want it to bring down my property value either, given the current economic meltdown, we can't afford to toy with our property value.

Build the hotel on 15*501 outside of Southern Village proper.

Thank you.

Susan Davis

207 Westside Drive

CH, NC 27516

Kay,

I am resident in Southern Village. I regularly shop at Weaver Street Market in Southern Village. I do NOT support the building of a hotel on market street. I am against the bulding for multiple reasons. If you'd like more detail, please contact me.

enjoy

melinda abrams

Melinda Abrams, CPCC
melinda@lifepowercoaching.com
919.933.5248

BE MOVED 2008!
Share the Exhilaration!
www.lifepowercoaching.com

Dear Ms. Pearlstein,

I am writing to let you know how devastated I am to hear that a hotel chain is being considered put in Southern Village town center. I attended the meeting with the developer, DR Brian, a couple weeks ago and listened to what he had to say. His biggest reason, he stated, was that Weaver Street and The Lumina need a third anchor for business purposes. If this is in fact true, I don't believe a hotel is the answer. First of all, the developers across 15/501 have stated that they are going to put a hotel there, so why do we need one in the town center and one across the street? I just read a report that hotel stays are down this year and continuing to fall. Next, a hotel could add more crime to our neighborhood and would be right by our elementary school. It causes concern for the safety of our young children who walk to school everyday. This terrifies me. Even if it is a high end hotel, it still could bring in crime. Petifiles are not determined by wealth. I think this could be disastrous for our great neighborhood. I too have concern about "the ugly side of the hotel" so to speak. This hotel will be right in the middle of the town center, so where will the garbage etc. be? All of the other buildings have their garbage behind them. This would be quite a problem and they say they could hide it but I really doubt that. They definitely can't hide the smell! Finally, I am not apposed of putting a building in the parking lot of some sort, but NOT A HOTEL! Can't we give this some more time to be creative, if in fact we do need a third anchor? I feel this idea has not been thought out well. Please do not approve the zoning of this monstrosity. I haven't talked to one person who wants the hotel.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Mosteller

Ms Pearlstein

I live in Southern Village (have for 7 years). I have seen a lot of the development occur here. Overall, this community has seemed well thought out. Now I have been made aware that the developer plans to squeeze in development of the central parking lot in Market Street.

I don't know if you have frequented the shops/stores at Market Street as I have but these plans seem quite ridiculous. Part of the beauty of the market street area is the open center (the green and the parking lot). Putting any building there will be disruptive in a way and at a time where the surrounding shops can't survive the construction period. A kiss of death. Furthermore, the end result will be an eyesore and magnet for additional crime. We already have enough issues with the crowds at the Lumina on Friday and Saturday nights. It seems irresponsible to put the area at risk for the sake of money. Especially when there is a huge development going in across the street (across 15-501) where a more thoughtfully planned out hotel could be placed. Please do not go forward with the approval for the permits. Someone unbiased has to look at the big picture here. Any development seems a mistake. A large hotel seems an especially big mistake.

One other thing, it is my understanding that the developer of the hotel is also the landlord for the Weaver Street Market and surrounding shops. If that is true, those businesses are more than likely hesitant to speak out against the new plans
.....

Thanks for your time in this matter.
Shell Brownstein
919-932-3695

[mailto:mhudgens@bios.unc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2008 1:18 PM
To: Carlo Robustelli
Subject: No to Southern Village Hotel

Dear Carlo Robustelli:

I am writing you about the proposal to build a hotel in Southern Village. I understand the Mayor and Town Council will be reviewing this plan in November. I will be unable to attend the planning meeting but wanted to make my opinion heard.

I am opposed to this hotel. Every one of my neighbors that I have spoken with is also opposed to this hotel. There appears to be no demand or interest (and in fact quite a bit of opposition) to this proposal. The only party in favor of the development appears to be the developers who stand to make money from this project.

Southern Village is a great neighborhood. Simply put: it works. People are neighborly, the village shops are well supported and convenient. The new-urbanism concept is a great idea and Southern Village is an excellent example of a successful implementation of the this concept. Please don't let these greedy developers ruin our wonderful neighborhood.

Why not build the hotel directly across 15-501?

Sincerely,

Michael Hudgens
104 Eastgreen Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27516