

From: [Eric Lund](#)
To: [Karen Edwards](#); [Michael Behrendt](#)
Cc: [Joshua Meyrowitz](#)
Subject: Letter for Planning Board hearing re: proposed Church Hill parking lot
Date: Wednesday, December 11, 2019 9:55:31 AM

I am unable to attend tonight's hearing due to being out of town on business, but I wish to submit the following letter regarding the proposed parking lot on Church Hill off Main Street in case the public hearing is not continued to a later date, and nobody is available to read the letter during the public hearing tonight.

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

I believe that this application to, as the old song put it, "pave Paradise and put up a parking lot" fails to meet the Conditional Use criteria of being in character with the neighborhood and having no adverse impacts on neighboring properties.

The boulevard style entrance that the engineers praise is not compatible with the location in the Historic District. I am not aware of any other parking facility in the Town of Durham that has a similar boulevard-style entrance. Such an entrance might be suitable for a suburban location, but is not suitable for an in-town location, particularly given the major pedestrian safety and traffic congestion issues we already face on Church Hill that would be exacerbated by this facility.

The proposed parking lot would also likely have adverse impacts on neighboring properties. The facility would add more than an acre of impervious surface in the College Brook watershed and necessitate a snow removal plan. This means additional runoff into College Brook, increasing the likelihood of increased flooding on the properties of downstream landowners such as myself. The proposal would also replace what is currently a pretty forested hill with a filled surface and an unsightly retaining wall, removing existing cherished buffers between Main Street and the adjacent neighborhood along Chesley Drive and Faculty Road. The need for lighting in this parking facility will significantly worsen light pollution in the adjoining neighborhood, which is 40-50 feet lower in elevation than the proposed parking lot.

There are other deficiencies which other residents will likely have covered.

In short, this proposed parking lot entails unwise planning and does not meet the criteria for a Conditional Use permit. It should therefore be rejected.

Sincerely,

Eric Lund
31 Faculty Rd