

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** hockeycat58@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:39 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Against the zoning Text Change

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Honorable Planning Board Members:

I am opposed to the changing of the text in the Land Use Management Ordinance Text Amendment – Definition of Shelter on the grounds that it needs further study and legal review to define affordable housing.

There is a Town and County Land Use Plan that should be reviewed and consulted prior to making such changes and there is no documentation or public record that clearly states that this was done. The Council initiated this based on the idea of creating "affordable housing." However, this does not create affordable permanent residences, so based on the denial of a recent development, this is a misapplication of that term. The intention of creating affordable housing does not cover shelters operated by private organizations according to the Statute. It appears to cover only dwelling-units and a bed is not defined as a dwelling-unit anywhere in the code.

Affordable Housing has been interpreted to mean more than 700 square feet of space per a family of 4 according to the recent ruling against 54 East. By that measure a single bed does not constitute affordable housing.

There may be a reason to change this ordinance (that is why this needs further, detailed analysis), but "creating affordable housing" may not stand up to a legal challenge as the term has not been defined to mean "adding a bed." It is likely that the Chapel Code will have to be amended to define "affordable housing" as providing an additional bed.

This request needs to be referred back to Council for further study based on the following:

- 1) Per the public record, no citizen requested it
- 2) There has been no significant public discussion and study of the impact of the change this implies to the definition of affordable housing
- 3) There is a significant question of whether a "bed" can be defined as "affordable housing" - Without a definition, it is likely that the a legal review will be required to determine if that was the intent of the term "affordable housing." The Statute in 3.8.x (where X are the subsections) seems to define affordable housing as a dwelling-unit - not simply a bed.

In the absence of a clear citizen-initiated request, full discussion of the impact of the change and the lack of a clear Town Ordinance, along with rulings against other developments based on the interpretation that 700 square feet was not sufficient to be called "affordable housing" the only option is to defer this for further study and a full legal review.

Thank you,

Steve Wells  
 Chapel Hill

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Qingqi Chen [qqchen@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:39 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Email to Planning Board

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To: [pmason@townofchapelhill.org](mailto:pmason@townofchapelhill.org)

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend tonight's planning board meeting in person. However, I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. Please see the attached presentation I gave to the town council last night that factually links homelessness to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Qingqi Chen  
303 Parkside Drive, Chapel Hill, NC 27516.

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** lyao01@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:29 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** My Opposition to Changing Land Use Management Ordinance for Shelter

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Sir/Madam:

I learned about the meeting tonight about amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose such change. I think such change is too hasty and fails to heed community responses. We can not do a town-wide change just to accomodate individual interest group.

I can not attend tonight's meeting due to scheduled activity at Chapel Hill High School. Please take my input.

*"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with ot without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."*

Thank you.

Lixin Yao

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Lijun Chen [lijunc@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:56 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Oppose the amendment of the definition of shelter

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend tonight's planning board meeting in person because of sick kids. However, I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan.

As strongly as I oppose the propose to move shelter to Homestead Road which would bring up huge security issues and great concerns to the residential area and community, I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Lijun Chen

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Margaret Hung [mh34102@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:08 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Amendment of Proposed Homeless Shelter

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Mr. Mason:

I am a resident of New Parkside Drive in Chapel Hill and I strongly oppose the proposed amendment of the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) as follows:

*"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."*

This amendment would enable the location of larger size shelters in our residential neighborhood which can have a number of undesirable consequences.

Planning in a democracy is a consultative process involving the community. The community needs social services but great care and thought has to be put into its location so as to equitably serve the community without creating problems in the existing social fabric of residential areas. Disproportionate location of a large number of social service facilities in North West Chapel Hill alone would not server all the residents of Chapel Hill and we already have Freedom House and a shelter for Women as well as an Old Age Home in our neighborhood.

There are also legal, taxation and financial issues involved. Any depression in the property values would affect both homeowners and the Town adversely. There are also legal and liability issues involved in housing a large population of homeless people in the midst of a residential neighborhood close to an existing shelter for women and a park frequented by children.

Therefore, I am strongly against the proposed amendment.

**Margaret Hung, MLS, EA**  
**421 New Parkside Drive**  
**Chapel Hill, NC 27516**  
**[mh34102@msn.com](mailto:mh34102@msn.com)**

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Lin Gu [lin\_gu2004@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:07 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** homeless shelter for men

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Lin Gu

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** lin H [lhd2007@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:12 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the proposed amendment of the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO)

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I agree with my neighbor Joy Valentine and Tina CoyneSmith to strongly against this proposed amendment: "Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."

Thanks  
Lin Hu  
Parkside resident

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Xu, Gang [Gang.Xu@ATKearney.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:08 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Oppose the text change for the shelter

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Mason,

I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose the recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Gang Xu  
306 New Parkside Drive  
Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
Phone: (919) 260-3684

This message and all attachments are confidential. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you believe this message has been sent to you by mistake, please notify the sender by replying to this transmission, and delete the message and its attachments without disclosing them.



**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Margaret Hung [mhung123@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:11 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Opposition to Amendment Land Use Management Ordinance for the Proposed Homeless Shelter

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend tonight's planning board meeting in person as I am running a program at my child's school. However, I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. Please see the attached presentation I gave to the town council last night that factually links homelessness to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,  
Wu-yen Hung, Resident of Parkside Community

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Lyu, Christopher [lyuc@BATTELLE.ORG]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:10 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** proposed text amendment for the definition of "shelter"  
**Attachments:** CoyneSmith Presentation 10-19-09.ppt

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Mason and Members of the Planning Board,

I am sending you this e-mail to register my strongest opposition to the proposed text amendment that would amend the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) as follows:

*"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of ~~by not more than twenty-five (25)~~ homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."*

I am very concerned that this amendment puts no upper limit on the number of people who can be at the shelter, which will result in an overcrowded condition and adversely impact its operations and the surrounding areas – including my neighborhood. Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. Attached is a slide presentation presented by one of our neighbors to the town council last night that factually links homelessness to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. A greater number of gathered homeless people equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter. Your kind attention to my concern is greatly appreciated.

Best Regards,

Christopher Lyu  
 218 Glenmore Road  
 Chapel Hill, NC 27516

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Joy Valentine [joyvalentine@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 12:48 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** amendment to the definition of "shelter"  
**Attachments:** homeless\_shelter\_guidelines.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Mason,

I am a resident of New Parkside Drive in Chapel Hill and I strongly oppose the proposed amendment of the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) as follows:

*"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."*

This amendment would enable the location of larger size shelters in our residential neighborhood which can have a number of undesirable consequences.

I would like to invite your attention to a study on the location of homeless shelters done by the City of Gilroy in California (copy attached). As you can see from the attached document, undesirable factors for a shelter's location include nearness to another shelter, nearness to common facilities like parks, nearness to residential areas etc. all of which are applicable in the instant case.

As you are aware a large proportion of the homeless are not homeless by choice but due to other factors such as substance abuse, mental illnesses, depression, criminal behavior etc. and housing a large number of people with such behavioral tendencies in the midst of a residential area without adequate thought or planning as to how to manage other issues such as crime prevention, littering, loitering etc. would create more problems than it would solve.

Planning in a democracy is a consultative process involving the community. The community needs social services but great care and thought has to be put into its location so as to equitably serve the community without creating problems in the existing social fabric of residential areas. Disproportionate location of a large number of social service facilities in North West Chapel Hill alone would not serve all the residents of Chapel Hill and we already have Freedom House and a shelter for Women as well as an Old Age Home in our neighborhood.

There are also legal, taxation and financial issues involved. Any depression in the property values would affect both homeowners and the Town adversely. There are also legal and liability issues involved in housing a large population of homeless people in the midst of a residential neighborhood close to an existing shelter for women and a park frequented by children.

I am therefore strongly against the proposed amendment.

Best regards,  
 Joy Valentine  
 103 New Parkside Drive  
 Chapel Hill, NC 27516

**PURPOSE**

The City of Gilroy, through its General Plan Housing Element and Community Development Block Grant Action Plan, recognizes that there is a homeless population within Gilroy that requires assistance through the provision of emergency food, job training, and emergency shelter. A variety of agencies within Gilroy assist in the provision of food and job training to the homeless. However, few agencies provide shelter to homeless individuals and families. These *Homeless Shelter Guidelines* set forth criteria to allow homeless shelters to locate and operate in Gilroy, so that the needs of Gilroy's homeless citizens can be addressed. These guidelines shall apply only to homeless shelter facilities serving more than six clients, since facilities serving six or fewer clients are considered residential uses. These guidelines shall not be applied in such a way that they prohibit or discourage homeless shelters from being located in the City of Gilroy.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REQUIRED**

The operation of all homeless shelters within the City of Gilroy shall be contingent upon receiving Planning Commission approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Each CUP shall be valid for a determinate length of time, as specified in the CUP approval. Approval of the CUP shall be based upon the shelter's compliance with the following guidelines:

**Location Considerations**

One of the most critical factors involved in developing a homeless shelter is ensuring that it is properly located. It is therefore necessary to identify both desirable and undesirable locations for homeless facilities. Qualities of desirable locations include:

- Closeness to public transportation
- Closeness to professional services, such as doctor's offices, barber shops, and legal offices
- Closeness to grocery stores
- Closeness to job development centers
- Closeness to providers of services often utilized by the homeless (i.e. medical clinics, food banks)

Qualities of undesirable locations include:

- Nearness to residential areas
- In industrial areas
- Nearness to adult entertainment facilities
- Near areas with a high concentration of bars and/or liquor stores

**Therefore, the following criteria shall be used to locate a homeless shelter:**

1. Homeless shelters may be located in any zoning district.
2. Homeless shelters serving Singles should be located a minimum of 1,000 feet from schools, parks, day care centers, and adult businesses.
3. Homeless shelters should be located a minimum of 600 feet from other homeless shelters. It is preferable that homeless shelters are located a minimum of 2 miles from other homeless shelters.
4. Homeless shelters should be located within 0.25 miles of a public transportation system.
5. Homeless shelters should be located near job development centers, medical clinics, and food banks.

Joy Valentine 10-20-09

**Management of Shelters**

All proposed homeless shelters shall be required to submit a management plan, which will be reviewed through the Conditional Use Permit process. Shelter management plans shall address, but not be limited to addressing, the following issues:

- Clearly defined forms of transportation to and from the shelter, including bus and pedestrian routes
- Client supervision
- Food Service
- Client services
- Program for ensuring good relationships with properties surrounding the shelter
- Conflict resolution
- Crime prevention
- Control of loitering
- Control of littering
- Length of client stay
- Number of staff, and duties to be performed by staff

**Number of Clients Served**

Shelters shall be limited to a maximum of 140 beds.

**Recreational Areas**

Homeless shelters should provide for recreational areas outside of the shelter. If families are housed in the shelter, a play area for children should be provided.

**Required Parking**

Required parking for shelters will be established based on the individual needs of each facility. As a rule, shelters that include services for families will be required to provide more parking than shelters that provide services exclusively to homeless individuals.

**Exterior Lighting**

Lighting of the property on which the homeless shelter is located should be designed to provide a minimum maintained horizontal illumination of at least one foot candle of light on the parking surfaces and walkways.

**Hours of Operation**

Homeless shelters shall remain open 24 hours a day.

**Separation of Clients**

Homeless shelters shall provide for separation of families from individuals and special needs clients.

**Provision of Services**

Each homeless shelter shall provide the following services:

- Food service
- Job counseling
- Alcohol and drug addiction screening and counseling
- Domestic abuse counseling
- Health Care
- Mental Health Care
- Case Management

**Alcohol and Drug Use Prohibited**

All homeless shelters shall create a zero tolerance policy for alcohol and illicit drug use among its clients and staff. The policy shall include a provision that shelter clients who are suspected to be under the influence of illicit drugs and/or alcohol shall be subject to drug testing, as allowed by State and Federal law. A copy of this policy shall be provided to the Planning Division for review and approval.

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Anli Shundi [newkidtown@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 12:53 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** opposing change to shelter's definition

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi,

Herewith I'm opposing the proposed change to the shelter's definition to remove the upper limit on residents number.

The original limitation is meaningful and for a good reason. This is a town and not a big city.

Removal of the upper limit would make any shelter a magnet for out-of-town occupants to such shelter.

Whereas the shelter management has a noble goal (provide for the homeless) they overlook broader issues affecting the rest of the community. The planning should make no such mistake

Anli Shundi  
109 Harrison Ct

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** lwang1@duke.edu  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 4:04 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Cc:** nosshelter@googlegroups.com  
**Subject:** I am against the the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment for Homeless Shelter

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am one of many residents living nearby the proposed location of Men's Homeless Shelter. I want to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. Last night, Tina presented a set of convincing data to show the factually links homelessness to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. Here two links to the articles that has shown how a homeless shelter has completed changed neighbourhoods in Vancouver and in New York(<http://www.planetizen.com/node/39420#> and <http://www.nysun.com/real-estate/homeless-center-roils-a-brooklyn-neighborhood/83831/>).

We definitely do not want this happen in Here because this is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill as well.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Ling



**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Benedict Fernandes [hkcpambd@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 12:53 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Opposition to text amendment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Mason,

I would like to register my opposition to the proposed text amendment of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) as follows:

"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."

Thanking you,  
Benedict Fernandes

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Tina CoyneSmith [xenatc@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 12:45 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Opposition to Text Amendment--Please copy for planning board  
**Attachments:** CoyneSmith Presentation 10-19-09.ppt

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Phil,

Thank you for your help earlier in explaining the planning board process to me. Based on our conversation, I ask you to copy this email, and any others you receive this afternoon from concerned citizens, and present them as formal opposition to the text change amendment being discussed at tonight's meeting. Tina

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend tonight's planning board meeting in person as I am running a program at my child's school. However, I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. Please see the attached presentation I gave to the town council last night that factually links homelessness to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Tina CoyneSmith  
[xenatc@gmail.com](mailto:xenatc@gmail.com)

Tina Coyne-Smith 10/20/09

**The Case Against the Proposed Site  
For the IFC Men's Shelter**

Presentation Given to the  
Chapel Hill Town Council  
By Citizens of Chapel Hill

19 October 2009

Thank you for your time!

**Who we are:**

- Organized group of concerned local residents in Chapel Hill
- Opposed to the re-location of the Community House men's homeless shelter to the proposed site at MLK and Homestead Roads.

We speak in accordance with section 3.2 of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill: Community Character--Strategies and Action for Neighborhood Protection

*"Plans should be developed as a collaborative process between Town (Council and Staff) and local residents.*

*Residents will assist in assessing neighborhood strengths and needs, articulating a positive vision for the future, and developing an action plan to address local issues."*

2

**We Oppose the Proposed Site of the IFC Men's Homeless Shelter for three reasons:**

1. Proximity of the shelter to a park, residential neighborhoods, and daycares, afterschool programs, and schools
2. Unintended consequences of the shelter that raise safety concerns
3. Inequitable distribution of human services in NW Chapel Hill incurred by placing the shelter at the proposed site

3

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

**Proximity to Homestead Park  
Raises Safety Concerns:**

Homestead is one of the largest and busiest parks in the Chapel Hill Parks and Recreation System:

- Families on the playground
- Rainbow, YMCA, and Chinese School soccer
- YMCA tee-ball and baseball
- School, church, and adult baseball and softball leagues
- Community gatherings and birthday parties at the picnic shelter
- Swim teams at the aquatic center
- Dog park users
- Joggers and walkers on trails
- Basketball court users
- Skateboard park users
- Batting cage users

4

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

**Proximity to Schools and Daycares  
Raises Safety Concerns:**

- The proposed shelter location is within 1,000 feet of two (2) pre-schools
- The proposed shelter location is within 1,000 feet of two (2) after school programs.

5

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

**Proximity to Residential Developments  
Raises Safety Concerns:**

- Parkside
- Parkside II
- Northwood
- Northwoods
- Old Northwoods
- Vineyard Square
- Rainbow Heights
- North Forest Hills
- Windsor Park
- Larkspur
- Chapel View/Chapel Ridge apartment complexes

6

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

### Proximity to At-Risk Populations Raises Safety Concerns:

- Freedom House
- HomeStart Women's and Children's Shelter
- Rainbow Heights Neighborhood

*We are helping the residents of these areas. The shelter's residents add unnecessary challenges to their already challenging situations.*

7

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

0.25 Mile Radius shaded in green  
Blue Marker represents proposed men's homeless shelter

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

0.5 Mile Radius shaded in blue  
Blue Marker represents proposed men's homeless shelter

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

### Why is proximity to these areas an issue?

In Orange County there is a direct link between homelessness and:

- Crime
- Substance Abuse
- Mental Illness

*While homelessness can affect any of us due to illness to divorce or job loss, many of the homeless population are proven substance abusers and/or mentally ill, conditions which cloud their reasoning and ability to function normally and safely in public areas, let alone in a residential neighborhood.*

10

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

### In Orange County homelessness is Directly Linked to Crime, Substance Abuse, and Mental Illness

- 30% of homeless individuals in North Carolina were found to be released from the criminal justice system
- 23% of the homeless population in Orange County were found to be severely mentally ill
- 37% had chronic substance abuse issues.

From the Orange County Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness: (Section 2.2, The Nature of Homelessness in North Carolina and Orange County)

11

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

### In Orange County homelessness is Directly Linked to Crime, Substance Abuse, and Mental Illness

From the website of the Orange County Sheriff's Office (www.co.orange.nc.us/SHERIFF/sexoffenders/offenderpics.htm)

- On October 16, 2009 two (2) registered sex offenders list the homeless shelter as a primary residence

From section VIII of the The North Carolina Sex Offender and Public Protection Registration Programs

An offender who is required to register shall not knowingly reside within 1,000 feet of the property on which any public or non-public "school" or "child care center" is located. A "childcare center" is defined by N.C.G.S. § 110-86(3) as an arrangement where, at any one time, there are three (3) or more preschool-age children, or nine (9) or more school-age children receiving child care.

*The daycares and afterschool programs within 1,000 feet of the proposed site fit this definition.*

12

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

In Orange County homelessness is Directly Linked to Crime, Substance Abuse, and Mental Illness

From the Chapel Hill Police Department:

Since January 1, 2009...

- 39 Police reports filed for issues at 100 West Rosemary
- 25 arrests related to 100 W. Rosemary

13

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

In Orange County homelessness is Directly Linked to Crime, Substance Abuse, and Mental Illness

From the Developer's Concept Plan (page 2, Goals and Objectives):

"Community House's beneficiaries are homeless men facing a myriad of challenges including chronic mental illness, substance abuse, and health issues."

It is at best unfair, and at worst dangerous, to place these populations in such close proximity.

14

**Opposition 1:  
Proximity**

Proximity is an issue because it conflicts with Section 8A of Chapel Hill's Comprehensive Plan for Land Use and Development

From the Chapel Hill Comprehensive Plan section 8A:  
*Development opportunity areas include... selected sites along Airport Road that are either undeveloped or developed below their zoning capacity*

*Effects on community character and established land uses will need to be taken into consideration, for example:*

- Transportation impacts
- Visual character, in particular views from public roadways
- Interface with adjacent residential neighborhoods

The proposed shelter location degrades the community character and quality of life in adjacent residential neighborhoods.

15

**Opposition 2:  
Unintended Consequences**

**Unintended Consequences  
Raise Safety Concerns**

- Homeless men who are denied entrance to the shelter may take shelter in Homestead Park and/or nearby housing developments.
- Emergency beds and floor space as well as the planned Robert Nixon Free Clinic for the Homeless (to be located at the shelter) will draw an additional homeless population to Homestead Park.
- The HomeStart women's and children's shelter is supposed to be a safe haven for women and young children. The shelter creates a less secure environment for the residents of HomeStart.
- There is no plan for the homeless women who currently accompany the men staying at the shelter who won't have a place to stay.
- According to the Chapel Hill Police department (response to a citizen's phone inquiry) there is currently no plan to increase police presence in Homestead park and the surrounding neighborhoods as currently exists near the Rosemary Street location.

16

**Opposition 2:  
Unintended Consequences**

**Unintended Consequences  
Raise Safety Concerns**

Moving the shelter to the proposed location hurts populations that the town is already trying to help.

- Citizens of Rainbow Heights, the nearest public housing development, believe the proposed location will create additional trouble for their children and families.
- Rainbow Heights has a small community park and community residents worry that this will be an attractive location for homeless loitering.

17

**Opposition 2:  
Unintended Consequences**

**Unintended Consequences  
Raise Safety Concerns**

Currently neither the IFC nor the town of Chapel Hill plan to take responsibility for managing the unintended consequences of the proposed shelter location.

Quotation from the IFC in the Chapel Hill News:  
So I [Mark Schultz, editor of the Chapel Hill News] asked Moran [Director of the local IFC] what happens to the homeless men who don't buy into the restrictions, the ones who just want to crash, even if that means a mattress on the floor. "That's a good question," he said. "And the way I will answer that is how will the county respond to that? Who takes ownership of that?"

18

**Opposition 3:  
Inequitable  
Distribution**

### Inequitable Distribution of Human Services

There are three main transportation corridors identified in Chapel Hill:

- Highway 54
- 15/501-Fordham Boulevard
- Martin Luther King Boulevard

Highway 54 and 15/501 host few human services

19

**Opposition 3:  
Inequitable  
Distribution**

### Inequitable Distribution of Human Services

Public housing and social services such as the IFC Men's Homeless shelter should be integrated throughout all of Chapel Hill, not concentrated in one area of town

Currently near the proposed site:

- Freedom House, a substance abuse and mental health facility that provides out-patient services with two half-way houses for recovery
- HomeStart, a shelter that provides emergency services for women and children.
- Robert and Pearl Seymour Center, a center that provides meals and other services for senior citizens
- Much of federally funded public housing in Chapel Hill is concentrated downtown and along MLK Blvd. The area includes a public housing complex with twenty-four duplexes

20

The main challenge of Chapel Hill's Comprehensive Plan is stated as:

"A fundamental challenge for the future is:  
how do we manage change  
in a manner that best promotes the  
overall well-being of the community"

Moving the shelter to MLK and Homestead  
does NOT promote  
the overall well-being of the community.

21

## Thank you for your time!

We respectfully encourage you to  
**vote against**  
moving the shelter to the proposed site  
at the intersection of  
Martin Luther King Boulevard and Homestead Road.

Presentation Contact: Tina Coyne Smith, 933-8863, xenate@gmail.com

22

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Weiguo Zhang [zhang033@mc.duke.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 12:42 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** definition of "shelter"

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Mr. Mason:

I am a resident in Chapel Hill. I am writing this email to express my opposition of the proposed text amendment.

"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with ot without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."

Weiguo Zhang

426 New Parkside Drive  
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Z. gao [gaonc@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 4:30 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment on men's homeless shelter

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Planning Board,

Planning officials and regulators should mandate limits on the size of the proposed men's homeless shelter.

I express here my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment that is to be discussed tonight.

Thank you,  
Zhimin Gao  
A Chapel Hill tax payer

---

Hotmail: Trusted email with powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)



**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Barbara Wells [arabrabneslin@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 12:45 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** opposed to amending the definition of shelter in appendix A of LUMO

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Phil:

I am opposed to amending the definition of shelter in our current LUMO document. I don't think we should change this regulation at this time.

Thank you  
Barbara Wells  
Parkside

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Jen Bishop [jenbishoprtp@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 12:43 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Opposition to shelter definition change

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi Phil!

I wanted to send you an email to register my opposition to the text change to the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO). Last night at the council meeting, a large group of concerned citizens registered their opposition to the shelter move. The council urged both sides to sit down and talk before any further action was taken. I would like to see this change tabled until some of these discussions occur, so that the residents can see that their input does matter and that the process doesn't just continue on, regardless of the concerns of the residents.

I wish I could be at the meeting tonight, but I have young children and I am also a bit under the weather.

Thanks so much for your consideration,

Jennifer Bishop  
919-423-3549

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Parul Galloway [PGalloway@WakeRad.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:49 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Proposed amendment

Dear Planning Board,

We are unable to attend the meeting this evening, but would like to voice our opposition to the proposed amendment for the land use management regarding the homeless shelter maximum residential number. We feel this would endanger the safety of our neighborhood and surrounding community. Please say no to this amendment.

Thank you.

Charlie and Parul Galloway

**Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.**

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Lisa Volk [LVolk@abped.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:52 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Tonight's Planning Board Meeting

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend this evening's planning board meeting. Please note for the record that I STRONGLY oppose the proposed text amendment definition of "shelter" (Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance) that will be discussed at tonight's meeting and encourage you to recommend to the town council to NOT change the existing definition of the shelter.

Thank you.

Lisa Volk

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Steve W. [srwhite@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:25 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Opposition to Admendment to change definition of "shelter"

Phil, this is too inform you of my opposition to the proposed text amendment to remove the upper limit of occupancy for the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO).

Regards, Steven R. White  
111 Maddry Ct  
Chapel Hill, NC

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Chang James [jamesttchang@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:09 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Proposed Amendment of "shelter" Definition

Dear Mr. Mason,

I am a resident of Northwoods in Chapel Hill and I strongly oppose the proposed amendment of the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) as follows:

*"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."*

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

James Chang  
[jamesttchang@yahoo.com](mailto:jamesttchang@yahoo.com)

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around  
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** marc joseph [marc\_h\_joseph@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:10 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Opposition to the Land Use Management Ordinance Text Amendment

Dear Chapel Hill Planning Board,

My name is Marc Joseph and I reside in the Parkside neighborhood of Chapel Hill. I am writing you today to communicate my objection to the proposed text change from 25 occupants to 50 occupants. My objection is based on the following reasons:

1. The text change refers to the shelter presented by the IFC in "concept form" at the Oct 19, 2009 Public Hearing. Being that the IFC's concept plan has not been approved by the Town Council I believe this text change is baseless, premature and unnecessary.
2. The proposed site is in close proximity to existing daycare centers, fragile populations served by HomeStart and Freedom House, neighborhoods and Homestead Park make this site less than ideal based on a lack of planning by both the IFC and the Town to address the unintended consequences that accompany such a facility. Examples of unintended consequences include but are not limited to:
  - increased crime in and around the facility (supported by current statistics from the Chapel Hill Police Department on calls to the shelter's current location)
  - persons denied entry to the facility might take up residence in the areas surrounding the proposed site including Homestead Park
  - increased risk to those inhabiting the HomeStart women's and children's shelter less than 1/2 mile away
3. The Background section of the Draft Memorandum dated November 16, 2009 and written by Gene Poveromo, Development Manager and Phil Mason, Principal Planner (attached) refers to expediting the Concept Plan and Special Use Permit for the proposed relocation of the shelter to the corner of MLK Blvd. and Homestead Road. Given citizen opposition, pointed questions from the Town Council regarding the shelter's operations and unintended consequences, and a statement from Chris Moran that the SUP application would be delayed, I do not see a basis to move forward with the amendment at this time.

Thank you for your consideration,

Marc Joseph

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Anne KORFAS [annekorfas@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:23 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT - DEFINITION OF SHELTER

Hi Mr. Mason,

I am sure by now you now know the concerns of residents of Parkside (and many who utilize all the surrounding facilities) with regards to the proposed homeless shelter.

I am unable to attend the meeting that discusses the proposed text amendment regarding the definition of "shelter". I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THIS TEXT CHANGE.

I have 3 children who love living in this area as well as taking advantage of all that it has to offer. My oldest, who turns 12 this February, is desperate to start becoming more independent. He is requesting a lot more freedoms such as riding his bike alone to a friends' house or meeting buddies to play basketball at the park. The thought of him never having these opportunities (or any child for that matter) because of safety issues saddens me.

Certain residents of these homeless shelters have illnesses that result in behaviors that are sometimes beyond their control....life-threatening to themselves and people around them. Certain illnesses such as drug usage or schizophrenia cloud judgment of what is right and wrong. Does it make sense to have such behaviors so close to many young children?

I understand that many people out there have struggles that we cannot comprehend. I am grateful that they have places that they can go to for help. But what I also cannot comprehend is the logic behind placing such a facility (and trying to enlarge it at that) near a playground, soccer fields, aquatic center and one of the larger neighborhoods in Chapel Hill.

Sincerely,  
Anne M. Korfes



**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Tim Salemy [timsalemy@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:11 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** homeless shelter next to children's park = bad idea

*"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."*

- 1) We need to \*not\* make this more ambiguous by removing the upper-limit.
- 2) We need to define hours of hours of operation to be 24/7.
- 3) Occupancy needs to be extended to include "occupying physical space" i.e. not just taking up a bed.
- 4) We need to define what supervision means.

I wonder how many IFC members driving this change have children that use the park. I am betting it is close to 0. This whole thing is a bad idea.

If this has to happen then at the very least put a 24/7 police substation in the same buliding.

Tim Salemy, Chapel Hill

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Darren Bell [dbell@saacademy.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:11 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Land Use Management Ordinance Text Change

To: [pmason@townofchapelhill.org](mailto:pmason@townofchapelhill.org)

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend tonight's planning board meeting in person as I have previous family obligations. However, I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential, parks and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. The amendment would allow for a greater number of individuals with substance abuse, criminal and mental illness issues to congregate near parks and facilities increasing the risk of crime. This has been well documented by the citizens of Chapel Hill with supporting facts from the Chapel Hill Police Department.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Darren L. Bell  
[dbell@saacademy.com](mailto:dbell@saacademy.com)  
Student-Athlete Academy  
Academics+Athletics=Excellence

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Bob Page [tealwing2002@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:17 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** Change in definition of shelter proposed at tonight's planning board meeting

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Cherie and Bob Page

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Ming [mzen2000@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 3:07 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Cc:** noshelter@googlegroups.com  
**Subject:** My opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment for Homeless Shelter  
**Attachments:** Chapel Hill Planning Board Agenda 10 20 09 .doc; LUMOTA Def of shelter PB 10 20 09.pdf

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am unable to attend tonight's planning board meeting in person this evening. However, I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

I was at the public hearing yesterday about IFC proposal to relocate homeless shelter to a new site on Homestead Road. I was shocked that IFC presentation was not based on facts but on assumptions and misleading statements or merely on good faiths. I do support its mission to help disadvantaged folks in the needed time, but I believe that the choice of this new site is reckless. While several speakers from IFC sides made the false statements that no incident had happened with the shelter for the past 25 years. Quote from the Chapel Hill Police Department indicated that just since January 1, 2009: 39 Police reports filed for issues at 100 West Rosemary (its current location) and 25 arrests related to 100 W. Rosemary, who is lying? These numbers could have been significantly inhibited due to public watching eyes from the crowded and busy downtown area. The number can easily be doubled or tripled if it moves to this proposed location. Does our town have enough resources and will plan to send patrolling policemen to every corner of the nearby streets and park to ensure the public safety?

Here are some reasons I believe that relocation to this proposed site is dangerous and disastrous:

Homestead is one of the largest and busiest parks in the Chapel Hill Parks and Recreation System:

- Families on the playground
- Rainbow , YMCA, and Chinese School soccer
- YMCA tee-ball and baseball
- School, church, and adult baseball and softball leagues
- Community gatherings and birthday parties at the picnic shelter
- Swim teams at the aquatic center
- Dog park users
- Joggers and walkers on trails
- Basketball court users
- Skateboard park users
- Batting cage users

There are also about dozen of big neighborhoods surrounding the proposed new site for this shelter, including

- Parkside
- Parkside II
- Northwood
- Northwoods
- Old Northwoods
- Vineyard Square
- Rainbow Heights
- North Forest Hills
- Windsor Park
- Larkspur
- Chapel View/Chapel Ridge apartment complexes

Inequitable Distribution of Human Services

Public housing and social services such as the IFC Men's Homeless shelter should be integrated throughout all of Chapel Hill, not concentrated in one area of town  
 Currently near the proposed site:

- Freedom House, a substance abuse and mental health facility that provides out-patient services with two half-way houses for recovery
- HomeStart, a shelter that provides emergency services for women and children.
- Robert and Pearl Seymour Center, a center that provides meals and other services for senior citizens
- Much of federally funded public housing in Chapel Hill is concentrated downtown and along MLK Blvd. The area includes a public housing complex with twenty-four duplexes
- It is unfair to put even more this type of service to this area and this new shelter proposal could be the last straw to crash this part of our town.

One strange thing to me was that one leader from downtown businesses who supported the shelter relocation had claimed that this new site (far away from its current downtown site) was the best site for downtown businesses, does it translate that its current location is very bad for downtown business? If so, how come this proposal was brought up without any impact study of this proposed new site on nearby park, businesses and a dozen of big neighborhoods? It can have a profound effect on public safety for park users and surrounding residents, it also can dramatically depreciate the tax base of all these big neighborhoods' properties, which finally will cause much bigger unexpected damage to our town future revenue.

In orange county homelessness is directly linked to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. From the orange county ten year plan to end chronic homelessness (Section 2.2, The Nature of Homelessness in North Carolina and Orange County):

- 30% of homeless individuals in North Carolina were found to be released from the criminal justice system
- 23% of the homeless population in Orange County were found to be severely mentally ill
- 37% had chronic substance abuse issues.

As a scientist, we make judgments based on facts, not on assumptions, misleading/lies. Please do not become the promoters who create one particular disadvantaged corner of our town where every citizen will feel shame of it!

We strongly encourage you to vote against the plan of moving the shelter to the proposed site at the intersection of Martin Luther King Boulevard and Homestead Road and block the land use management ordinance text amendment for Homeless Shelter tonight.

Best,

A Chapel Hill Resident



Ming Zeng

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Debra Levin & Jonathan Hartlyn [debjon@nc.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 3:02 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** opposition to Homeless Shelter

To: [pmason@townofchapelhill.org](mailto:pmason@townofchapelhill.org)

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

As a 29 year resident of Chapel Hill that currently lives in the Northwoods V neighborhood, I wish to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

The Town has not been able to control pan handling issues with this population downtown. We have no confidence or assurance that the homeless frequenting this new location near schools, parks, the senior center and day-cares will be managed well. The facts are the homeless population suffers from substance abuse issues, mental health problems and crime at a higher proportion than the rest of the population.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,  
Deb Levin

**Phil Mason**

---

**From:** Betsy Polk Joseph [bp@mulberrytreeconsulting.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 2:59 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** thank you for your consideration

Dear Mr. Mason,

I echo the sentiments of Ms. Valentine's email and well as others sent to you by my friends and neighbors in Northwest Chapel Hill and am against the proposed amendment .

Respectfully,

Betsy Polk Joseph  
 509 Lonebrook Drive  
 919.932.9370

Dear Mr. Mason,

I am a resident of New Parkside Drive in Chapel Hill and I strongly oppose the proposed amendment of the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) as follows:

*"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with ot without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."*

This amendment would enable the location of larger size shelters in our residential neighborhood which can have a number of undesirable consequences.

I would like to invite your attention to a study on the location of homeless shelters done by the City of Gilroy in California (copy attached). As you can see from the attached document, undesirable factors for a shelter's location include nearness to another shelter, nearness to common facilities like parks, nearness to residential areas etc. all of which are applicable in the instant case.

As you are aware a large proportion of the homeless are not homeless by choice but due to other factors such as substance abuse, mental illnesses, depression, criminal behavior etc. and housing a large number of people with such behavioral tendencies in the midst of a residential area without adequate thought or planning as to how to manage other issues such as crime prevention, littering, loitering etc. would create more problems than it would solve.

Planning in a democracy is a consultative process involving the community. The community needs social services but great care and thought has to be put into its location so as to equitably serve the community without creating problems in the existing social fabric of residential areas. Disproportionate location of a large number of social service facilities in North West Chapel Hill alone would not server all the residents of Chapel Hill and we already have Freedom House and a shelter for Women as well as an Old Age Home in our neighborhood.

There are also legal, taxation and financial issues involved. Any depression in the property values would affect both homeowners and the Town adversely. There are also legal and liability issues involved in housing a large population of homeless people in the midst of a residential neighborhood close to an existing shelter for women and a park frequented by children.

I am therefore strongly against the proposed amendment.

Best regards,  
Joy Valentine  
103 New Parkside Drive  
Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
Phone: (919) 338 2966  
Fax: (919) 490 5971  
Skype: joyvalentine



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

From: elena martsen [mailto:lmartsen@yahoo.com]  
 Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2009 5:04 PM  
 To: Phil Mason  
 Cc: mzen2000@hotmail.com; noshelter@googlegroups.com  
 Subject: My opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment for Homeless Shelter

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

As a resident of Parkside community already burdened by consequences of Freedom House expansion I would like to voice my deep concern and protest against proposed men's shelter relocation.

I have to mention once more that many people in our neighborhood protested against the Freedom House expansion yet few of the citizens supported it. A few months later majority of those avid supporters moved out, period. The truth is, aside from being hypocrites on public meetings, nobody wants to welcome people with criminal background, sex and substance abuse history, mental illnesses to their neighborhoods.

As a matter of fact, people with similar background (from the Freedom House) already wandering our streets and park and my children do not feel safe. The proposed relocation project invites more troubles to come and the question is not "if" but "when" they come and who is going to protect us.

It is sad that some individuals treat interests of a small group of people as superior to the interests of thousands of community residents and guests of the Homestead park. As we all know residents of every proposed site for shelter relocation actively protested against it and their concerns were heard. Are our communities in any way inferior ones?

I would like to ask everyone of you to answer the very simple question: How would I feel if such thing would happen in my neighborhood? I hope that all of you will give an honest answer and vote against the proposed location for the shelter.

Sincerely,  
 Elena Martsen.

---

**From:** Li Xu [mailto:leexustar@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 4:54 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Subject:** No to the proposed land use management ordinance for the proposed shelter

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am writing to you to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

I am strongly against the proposed move of the men's homeless shelter to the highly residential Homestead area. As a honest human being, I want to say not all people are the same and all data lead to the fact that homeless population has significantly higher rate in crime, substance abuse and mental illness. Building the shelter next to the homestead park and residential areas where my kids and many other kids playing around is dangerous.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely, Li Xu

---

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

From: ammappa@email.unc.edu [mailto:ammappa@email.unc.edu]  
 Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2009 5:13 PM  
 To: Phil Mason  
 Cc: karupiah\_jayaraj@unc.edu  
 Subject: NO TO THE SHELTER.

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I am one of many residents living nearby the proposed location of Men's Homeless Shelter. I want to voice my strongest opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. Last night, Tina presented a set of convincing data to show the factually links homelessness to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. Here two links to the articles that has shown how a homeless shelter has completed changed neighbourhoods in Vancouver and in New York (<http://www.planetizen.com/node/39420#> and <http://www.nysun.com/real-estate/homeless-center-roils-a-brooklyn-neighborhood/83831/>).

We definitely do not want this happen in Here because this is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill as well.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

KARUPIAH JAYARAJ  
 200 NEW PARKSIDE DRIVE  
 CHAPEL HILL, NC 27516

---

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

Deeply concerned about the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight I respectfully voice my strongest opposition to it.

The Town has not been able to control pan handling issues with this population downtown. We have no confidence or assurance that the homeless frequenting this new location near schools, parks, the senior center and day-cares will be managed well. The facts are the homeless population suffers from substance abuse issues, mental health problems and crime at a higher proportion than the rest of the population.

As a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, I am opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to remove the maximum residential occupancy for the definition of shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of special use permit consideration.

Allowing the definition of shelter to be changed will ultimately endanger public safety and general welfare as it allows for larger gatherings of a homeless population in residential and commercial areas. Thus the amendment is not in the best interests of the comprehensive plan. A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. This is not in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Vinod K. Prasad, MD, MRCP (London)  
108 Harrison Court, Chapel Hill, NC

---

**From:** dtocci [mailto:dtocci@nc.rr.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 10:05 PM

**To:** Phil Mason; Town Council

**Cc:** lynnmsw@nc.rr.com

**Subject:** Opposition to Proposed IFC shelter and Proposed text amendment to "Shelter" definition: Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO)

Dear Members of the Planning Board and Chapel Hill Town Council

I am another of the many residents living nearby the proposed location of Men's Homeless Shelter. I want to voice **my strongest opposition** to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight and overall opposition to the proposed IFC locatoin at Homestead Road and MLK Jr. Blvd.

As elected officials, I believe Chapel Hillians believe our Town Council members will always apply rational thought and common sense to guide their decision making for the continued betterment of the overall community and not for the good of one being, entity or special interest.

There was a reason the ordinance was written to for a maximum of 25 temporary occupants. I urge the Council to consider why the ordinance was built around this limit.

This amendment change is not in the best interest of the overall Chapel Hill community and **only serves the purpose of "pushing" through IFC homeless shelter plans** at Homestead Road and MLK Jr. Blvd with little regard to due process or any impact studies.

This latest "modification" of a standing ordinance serves only to further "**grease the skids**" for the IFC leadership to expedite the request of approval without due diligence and **WITHOUT an impact study** continues to fulfill my belief that due process will be short cut in an effort to approve the proposed IFC.

**I strongly encourage you to recommend that the town council NOT amend** the definition of shelter, and more specifically, I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Last night, a local resident (Tina CoyneSmith) presented to the Town Council a set of convincing data to show the factually links homelessness to crime, substance abuse, and mental illness. **A greater number of gathered homeless human beings equals more crime, substance abuse, and mental illness.** With no plan offered to monitor, patrol or otherwise ensure the continued harmony of the Homestead area, those of us living in the area find NO comfort in good faith gestures, or statements which can just as easily be forgotten.

**FACTS WE CAN'T IGNORE:**

( Orange County Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness )

- \* 30% of homeless individuals in North Carolina were found to be released from the criminal justice system
- \* 23% of the homeless population in Orange County were found to be severely mentally ill
- \* 37% had chronic substance abuse issues.

And, more importantly, **the Town Council should ask itself** how can facts of this nature NOT impact on adjacent parks, public facilities, pre-schools, and neighborhoods?

**MORE FACTS WE CAN'T IGNORE:**

Since January 2009:

- \* Chapel Hill police department have 39 Police reports filed for issues at 100 West Rosemary (IFC current location) and 25 arrests related to 100 W. Rosemary St.

*How does increasing the size of a shelter NOT create the potential for increased police dispatches?*

**AND STILL MORE FACTS WE CAN'T IGNORE:**

Various Sex Offender websites list between 2 to 4 men with official address of the IFC (100 W. Rosemary). How does increasing the size of a shelter NOT create the potential for a portional number of sex offender?

Not to mention, in a proposed shelter within 1000 feet of two preschools, **which I believe is against the law for a sex offender to be within such proximity to children.**

<http://sexoffender.ncdoj.gov/>

<http://www.co.orange.nc.us/SHERIFF/sexoffenders/offenderpics.htm>

<http://www.nsopw.gov/Core/Conditions.aspx>

**PLEASE READ these ARTICLES. Do Not Make Your Decisions within the vacuum of Chapel Hill experiences.**

The articles show how a homeless shelter has completed changed neighbourhoods in other parts of the U.S.. These article are "real world" effects on poor decisions made by community leadership.

<http://www.planetizen.com/node/39420#>

<http://www.nysun.com/real-estate/homeless-center-roils-a-brooklyn-neighborhood/83831/>

The Chapel Hill residents definitely do not want this to happen and could not possible be in line with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill as well.

In this year of public elections for Chapel Hill Council and Mayor seats, I can assure you the residents of **Chapel Hill's**

**northwest corridor are paying close attention** to the various Chapel Hill committees and Council members playing

a role in the outcome of all aspects related to the IFC shelter move.

Regards,

Douglas Tocci

Chapel Hill Resident Opposed to IFC Shelter Relocation at Homestead Rd and MLK Jr. Blvd.

**From:** Dr. Tammy Samuelson [mailto:dr.samuelson@ncrrbiz.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 4:13 PM

**To:** Phil Mason

**Subject:** Planning Board

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

Since we are unable to attend tonight's meeting, we wanted to voice our opposition to the proposed amendment of the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance(LUMO).

We are residents of the Parkside neighborhood and we are greatly concerned about the proposed new location of the Community House Men's Shelter. We feel there are better locations away from residential areas to relocate this needed service.

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter.

Allen and Tammy Samuelson

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

From: lvolk1@nc.rr.com [mailto:lvolk1@nc.rr.com]  
 Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2009 5:15 PM  
 To: Phil Mason  
 Subject: Planning Board Meeting Tonight October 20, 2009

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

Our understanding is that the proposed text amendment to the land use management ordinance being considered tonight would amend the definition of "shelter" in Appendix A of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) as follows:

"Shelter: a building or group of buildings owned or operated by a non-profit organization intended to be used solely for temporary occupancy of [delete: by not more than twenty-five (25)] homeless persons, with an on-site supervision during all hours of operation, with or without board for the occupants and staff of the shelter."

We oppose this change as it removes the upper limit on the number of people who can be housed at the shelter. It is interesting to us that the proposal is not to simply raise the upper limit to a number consistent with the IFC proposal that was outlined at last night's town council meeting. Why is that? It seems to us that an open ended definition paves the way for not only the current project to move forward, but for the elimination of a step to the extent there is a desire to subsequently further expand the shelter. As we have seen with the Freedom House, the initial approved size of a facility does not necessarily comport with the final magnitude of such facility.

We recommend that the town council not amend the definition of shelter as proposed.

Sincerely,

Thomas and Lisa Volk

-----  
**From:** rmw47@aim.com [mailto:rmw47@aim.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2009 1:21 PM  
**To:** Phil Mason  
**Cc:** nosshelter@googlegroups.com  
**Subject:** Tonight's Planning Board Meeting

To the Members of the Planning Board,

As a resident of the Parkside Neighborhood, I wish to voice my opposition to the proposed land use management ordinance text amendment being discussed tonight.

I am a concerned citizen of Chapel Hill, and opposed to amending the land use management ordinance to increase or altogether remove the maximum residential occupancy included in the definition of a shelter. I oppose Gene Poveromo and Phil Mason's recommendation that the council determine maximum occupancy during the course of of special use permit consideration.

Changing the definition of 'shelter' to allow a larger residential population will endanger public safety and jeopardize local welfare as it allows for a larger gathering of homeless individuals in residential and commercial areas. This proposed amendment is not in the best interests of the Comprehensive Plan for Chapel Hill.

Research has proven the link between homelessness and crime, substance abuse and mental illness. Increasing the maximum number of homeless in a shelter can only bring more crime, substance abuse and mental illness.

I urge you in the strongest way possible to recommend that the town council NOT amend the definition of shelter.

Sincerely,

Rey Warner  
Parkside