

Herbaugh, Melinda

From: Jaime Pharr <jaime.pharr@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 23, 2016 5:24 PM
To: PRC
Subject: Project #3020338, 2925 E Madison St.

Dear Magda,

I am writing in response to the second proposal submitted for 2925 E Madison St., project #3020338. Upon review of the proposal, as well as the Early Design Guidance of the East Design Review Board following the July 13th meeting, and your memo dated 10/18/2016 to the East Design Review Board members, it appears to me that the applicant has ignored the feedback and direction provided by the Board.

Following are the items that do not comply with the design guidelines and direction from the Design Review Board.

Height, Bulk, Scale and Massing Options

- The transition between commercial and residential areas is inadequate and not sensitive to the residential areas.
- The proposed building is six stories on Dewey Place where it is zoned for four stories. The minimal setbacks do not adequately compensation for the out-of-scale height of the proposed building.
- The pedestrian experience on Dewey will be a large concrete wall.

Response to Context and Topography:

- Increasing part of the setback on Dewey Place by 5 feet is not a suitable response to the Board's direction: *"The Board unanimously agreed with public comment that additional setbacks should be provided to respond to the site topography and transition to the single family zoning."*
- The Board questioned if two stories of elevated parking provides the best frontage along Dewey and the adjacent single family zone. Clearly it does not. Putting vines on the exposed garage does not change the fact that it is two stories above ground and exposed to residents and pedestrians. If the garage can be completely underground on Madison, it can also be built underground on Dewey.

Site Features, Existing Tree Canopy & Exceptional Tree/ Grove:

- The Board requested an option that showed how the existing tree canopy might be preserved. None of the options honor this request, as the canopy would not survive the disturbance to their roots that would happen in the No Departure option.
- As stated in the letter from M. S. Patterson, MSES/MPA: *"The proposed development deprives the city and neighborhood of significant mature tree canopy does not adequately compensate for the permanent loss of ecological services and aesthetic benefits that exist today on the site. Little has been to modify the design to protect the existing tree canopy or provide for its replacement."*

Height Calculation Methodology:

- As you indicated in your memo *"... the DRB could state that...it is too tall in light of the Design Guidelines."* This proposed building is clearly out-of-scale for the neighborhood, particularly in contrast to the single family zoning bordering it on two sides.

Northeast Corner:

- The northeast corner of the building will tower over the p-patch and homes, and create an oppressive and overwhelming pedestrian experience.

Landscape Concept:

- The proposed landscaping appears to give priority to providing ornamental plants rather than plantings that will provide sufficient replacement for the tree canopy that is to be eradicated.
- As specified in the letter from M. S. Patterson, MSES/MPA: *"The landscape zone along Dewey should be increased to at least 20 ft. in width, and should be continuous along the full length of the property to ensure healthy, layered tree growth, fuller continuous canopy development, and adequate landscaping buffer."*

Other:

-The Board requested that the architect and developer communicate with the community. To my knowledge, they did not reach out to the community at large via any of the available channels.

-None of the options presented in the second version of the proposal has a reasonable community space as was suggested by the Board.

I am disappointed in the EDG Proposal #2 submitted by the applicant. It does not treat the Board's recommendations and requests with the seriousness they deserve.

Many thanks to you and the Board for your consideration of community input and commitment to ensuring that the proposal adheres to the City's design guidelines and ordinances.

Regards,

Jaime Pharr