

**From:** [Thomas Innes](#)  
**To:** [Brown, Jonathan W. - PDR; PDRLanUseAdmin@richmondgov.com; Ebinger, Matthew J. - PDR](#)  
**Cc:** [Julia M Carr; Bryan D Carr; zoning@fandistrict.org; president@fandistrict.org](#)  
**Subject:** Ordinance No 2021-083, 109 N Plum Street, 23220  
**Date:** Thursday, April 15, 2021 3:07:25 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

1501 Grove Avenue  
Corner of Grove Avenue and Plum Street

### Members Planning Commission

This letter will serve as a letter of support for Julia and Bryan Carr and their request for a guest house on their property with one caveat. They approached the neighbors last year and shared their plans in a letter to the neighbors dated September 10, 2020. As part of that letter, which is included in the package provided on your website, "The guest space will not be rented out for long or short term rentals nor will it be rented as an Air B & B."

That consideration is why I, as well as a number of my neighbors, are in support. However, in reading the terms of the Ordinance, it appears that those conditions are to be loosely covered in Paragraph 3. Special Terms and Conditions. Reading first in Section (f) The accessory building shall not be used for short term rental purposes and second in Section (g) The accessory building shall not be rented out to the general public. My sense is that the applicants did not focus on the exact language and missed possible alternate interpretations.

It may be a matter of semantics, but this does not specifically state "no long term rentals", just that it will not be rented out to the general public. For example, someone that is not a member of the general public, ie business associate, in law's college roommate, traveling professor, etc could rent the premises out long term.

The purpose of this guest house, as presented for our information in that same letter, "we have extended families on both sides who visit regularly" was that it would not be a rental under any circumstances and that it would provide a space for the owner's family members to use when they visited. That would also be fine for any subsequent owner to have a familial guest house. While I have faith in the current owners honoring their representation, this use will go with the property and a subsequent owner may not feel honor bound to adhere to the "understanding" without tighter language and some type of sanction for a violation.

The language in the Ordinance needs to reflect the language in the letter provided to the neighbors. If that is not included, then this just becomes a second Unit on a lot that is only a single family. I would submit that that would set a terrible precedent for the Fan. We would see little rentals popping up all around the Fan and other urban sections of the City where someone has a garage.

It would be specifically for that reason, if the said language is not modified, that I would change my support and oppose the Special Use. My sense is that many of the neighbors would agree, having only read the letter and probably not the Ordinance. Also, I think the terms of the Ordinance were not readily available until a few days ago, which is why this letter appears to be last minute

Thank you in advance for your consideration and understanding of my perspective.

Tom Innes  
1501 Grove Avenue  
Richmond, VA

CC: Julia & Bryan Carr  
Fan District Association

--

**Thomas N. Innes**  
**Principal Broker**  
**RE/MAX Commonwealth**  
**7201 Glen Forest Dr #104**  
**Richmond, VA 23226**  
**804 288 5000**  
**Licensed in the Commonwealth of Virginia**

[What can we do for you today?](#)