

From: Save Madison Valley
To: [PRC](#)
Subject: Feedback on Project 3020338
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 10:46:44 AM

Please see comments below from Jacquelyne DeVincent (ideajdevi@gmail.com)

Dear Magda Hogness,

I am writing in response to the EDG Proposal #2 posted on DCI's website 10/17/2016. None of the options shown in this proposal adequately respond to the requests and recommendations contained in the memo sent by you to Lucas Branham and Tony Fan on 10/5/2016.

It is unfortunate that the oppressive nature of this structure on such a small and fragile footprint continues to be ill conceived for the community it seeks to serve.

Increasing the setback on Dewey Place E by 5 feet is not a good faith response to the community concern for a reasonable transition to single family housing.

The board also requested an option that showed how the existing tree canopy might be preserved. This is of considerable importance to me None of the options honor this request, as the canopy would not survive with the disturbance to their roots that would happen.

The board requested that the architect and developer communicate with the community. They did not reach out to the community. Furthermore, community efforts to engage them in a dialogue were rebuffed.

None of the options presented in the second version of the proposal has a community space as was requested by the community and strongly suggested by the board.

No alternative to an above ground parking garage (on Dewey) has been offered. Rather than moving the garage underground, it remains exposed to the public on the eastern side of the site. Furthermore, the pedestrian experience on the eastern side of the building appears to be overwhelming and oppressive.

There is no plan to ameliorate the already overwhelming traffic backups at the MLK and LW Blvd intersection. The addition of this relatively massive structure will surely add to the gridlock potential at this intersection and all those streets feeding into it.

I am disappointed in the EDG Proposal #2. It does not treat the community's concerns or the board's recommendations and requests with the seriousness they deserve.

Clearly, a structure of this size should have a much larger footprint on solid ground and in a place that does not subject scores of neighbors to live in a world of shadow and concrete. This plan is a very poor option for this particular site and I sincerely hope the city will recognize this and prevent it's approval.