

**From:** [Eric Lund](#)  
**To:** [Karen Edwards](#)  
**Cc:** [Michael Behrendt](#)  
**Subject:** For Planning Board: Comments on proposed Church Hill parking lot  
**Date:** Thursday, June 17, 2021 8:28:39 AM

---

Dear members of the Planning Board:

I am writing in regards to the proposed parking lot in the Church Hill district, with a nominal street address of 19-21 Main Street. The application is subject to conditional use, and therefore approval requires the Planning Board to find that the project meets all eight of the criteria specified under Section 175-23C of the Zoning Ordinance. The second of these criteria reads as follows:

"The external impacts of the proposed use on abutting properties and the neighborhood shall be no greater than the impacts of adjacent existing uses or other uses permitted in the zone. This shall include, but not be limited to, traffic, noise, odors, vibrations, dust, fumes, hours of operation, and exterior lighting and glare. In addition, the location, nature, design, and height of the structure and its appurtenances, its scale with reference to its surroundings, and the nature and intensity of the use, shall not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment nor discourage the appropriate and orderly development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood."

I was present at the site walk conducted on 26 May 2021. The site walk underscored the close proximity of the subject property to the house at 5 Smith Park Lane, owned by the Urso family. The applicants have argued throughout the process that the development of the subject property as a parking lot is consistent with other parking lots in the neighborhood, including the Community Church parking lot and a parking lot at 18 Main Street, the latter of which is owned by the applicants. However, neither of these two parking lots is directly adjacent to the Urso property. Thus the proposed parking lot would have a number of impacts on the Urso property in excess of the adjacent existing uses, including noise, dust (from the salt or sand applied during winter), hours of operation, and exterior lighting and glare. In addition, the close proximity of the parking lot to the Urso house, which apparently has little or no setback from its rear property line, would make the house unsuitable for a family with small children, a category which includes the Ursos, and thereby "discourage the appropriate and orderly development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood." The proposed parking lot therefore cannot satisfy the second conditional use criterion, and the project should accordingly be rejected by the Planning Board.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eric Lund  
31 Faculty Rd., Durham