

Dela Cruz, Jeff

From: Jane Nichols <janenichols@me.com>
Sent: Friday, June 09, 2017 7:09 PM
To: PRC
Subject: Project 3020338

Magda

I must respond to Mr Waggoner's email regarding Tuesday's open hearing. I know you are overwhelmed with applications for new construction, and I'm sure you are up to your eyeballs with Project 3020338. I shall be brief.

1. Why didn't Mr Waggoner join the alleged "parade"?

If he supports the project and sees "many benefits" to it, where was his voice in the room? Reza and Charles could have used some support.

Those of us standing to speak in a public forum expose ourselves to ridicule and criticism. Standing to declare one's position in the face of opposition, especially when it is backed by big money, requires courage and integrity.

Writing an email after the fact from the seclusion of your home does not.

The people speaking on behalf of the Save Madison Valley group have not only demonstrated courage and integrity during this past year's struggle to preserve their neighborhood, but they have tirelessly committed themselves to research, to detail, to fact.

Mr Waggoner could do worse than join that parade if there is another hearing.

2. Of Mr Waggoner's proposed traffic solutions, most of which are unfeasible, if not simply illogical, I will comment only on the suggestion to widen Dewey Place. First of all, how? What side of the street would you start slicing into? Private yards? Or the critical slope? Second of all, to what end? So that the cars making the 90 degree turn by the pea patch can do wheelies? I find this suggestion cynical and inhumane.

3. Regarding Mr Waggoner's global dismissal of our presentations as a resistance to *change* -

I don't know how long he was at the meeting, but virtually no one who spoke suggested they were trying to prevent the development from happening. If Mr Waggoner had stayed for the entire meeting he would have heard members of the 'parade' speak openly about their willingness to welcome the development IF it were compatible with the neighborhood in height, and bulk, and scale; if the traffic and parking situation could be worked out; and if it did *not* require an entire 14,500 sq ft slope of green canopy be demolished. Clear cutting that much greenery, dropping a concrete wall into the scarred landscape, and removing from the Dewey Place cul de sac all semblance of privacy, safety, and livability is not CHANGE! Its ruination. Maybe even a crime.

Respectfully
Jane Nichols