

Mr. Jay Camp
Matthews Town Planner

November 5, 2019

Jay:

Thank you for meeting with Roger Martin and me on short notice.

I wanted to outline my concerns with the proposed Lodging text amendment and propose revisions to the text amendment that I believe would better solve the problem of guests living in extended stay hotels.

Concerns about the text amendment as it now written:

- 1).The amendment will have no effect on the current problem hotel.
- 2). The amendment does not solve the problem because you can still build in other districts.
- 3). The amendment will virtually eliminate new hotels in Matthews by requiring developers to apply for rezoning on the of the few remaining green field sites suitable for new hotel construction. Rather than go through the expensive, time consuming and uncertain rezoning process, hotel investors will move across the county line to hotel friendly Union County and take their high tax value investments with them. This punishes all the owners of undeveloped sites zoned Business Highway and deprives Matthews of the highest tax revenue developments because of one recently developed low end extended stay property.
- . 4). This amendment renders all existing hotels in Business Highway zoning districts to a non conforming use status. This devalues the hotels market value to potential buyers and limits the ability of the owners to expand and refinance their properties. These businesses provide the highest tax revenues per square foot of all the properties in Matthews when you combine property tax and the 3% occupancy tax revenue. It is ill advised to punish these highly desirable tax payers because of one offender.
- 5).This amendment does not support the objective for new hotels to support the Sportflex that the Town of Matthews and their planners have voiced repeatedly in the past

There are several approaches that I think would be more effective in solving the problem of low end extended stay hotels becoming permanent living quarters for their guests.

First, the offending hotel could be cited for a change of use violation i.e. it is an apartment house. It clearly is in violation of its approved zoning.

Second, list extended stay hotels as a separate use in the ordinance with a definition of the hotels you don't want. This prohibits the activity you don't want by defining what uses you can't build anymore.

In conclusion, the hotel classification should not be removed from B/H zoned properties in the current ordinance because its removal punishes current hotel owners and B/H zoned land owners but does not solve the problem. It will also prove costly to future property and occupancy tax revenues in the Town of Matthews and limit new developments that benefit the Sportsplex.

Instead, this text amendment should be revised to target low end extended stay hotels that the Mayor and Town Council wish to eliminate in the future.

Respectfully,

Bill Ingram

Fwd: Lodging Text amendment

1 message

Jay Camp <jcamp@matthewsnc.gov>
To: Shana Robertson <srobertson@matthewsnc.gov>

Fri, Nov 8, 2019 at 4:52 PM

Please add to his initial letter.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bill Ingram** <bingram121@outlook.com>

Date: Fri, Nov 8, 2019 at 11:58 AM

Subject: Lodging Text amendment

To: Jay Camp <jcamp@matthewsnc.gov>

Jay:

I wanted to add an additional comment to my letter dated November 5 regarding the Lodging Text amendment.

I do not object to the provisions of section 155.506.32 of the Text amendment that requires minimum square footage, masonry facade materials and daily maid service.

The hotel developers and consultants I've talked to say that provision alone would solve the problem of low end extended stay hotels in Business/Highway zoning.

The only objection I have to the Text amendment is the removal of the hotel classification from Business/Highway zoning.

Sincerely,

Bill Ingram

--

(704) 708-1226

jcamp@matthewsnc.gov

Pursuant to North Carolina General Statutes Chapter 132, Public Records, this electronic mail message and any attachments hereto, as well as any electronic mail message(s) that may be sent in response to it may be considered public record and as such are subject to request and review.