

**From:** [Scanlon, Amy](mailto:Scanlon.Amy)  
**To:** [Scanlon, Amy](mailto:Scanlon.Amy)  
**Subject:** FW: 3414 Monroe St. - DMNA Zoning Committee Comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 03, 2015 11:22:31 AM

---

**From:** John Imes [mailto:jimesother@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 02, 2015 4:04 PM  
**To:** Dailey, Lucas  
**Cc:** Perry Sandstrom; Lynn Pitman; Julia Cattani Billingham; Zachary Madden; Subeck, Lisa; stuartlevitan@sbcglobal.com; Scanlon, Amy; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] Rummel, Marsha; jason@c21affiliated.com; [REDACTED] Coon, Scott F.; Brian Schneider; Holly Gibbs; Schmidt, Christopher; arborhouse@tds.net; Jack Imes  
**Subject:** Re: 3414 Monroe St. - DMNA Zoning Committee Comments

Perry, thank you for your very thoughtful letter...and thanks to Lucas for his response.

A few clarifying points...

First, one of the frustrations for many continues to be the lack of accuracy in materials submitted to the Landmarks Commission and made available to the neighborhood and other stakeholders. The height of the Arbor House Annex is depicted as approximately 33 feet tall, when it's actually 24.5. A 9 foot balcony is shown as the same height as a 15 foot high wall on the proposed building. Lucas, you mentioned the Annex is only 7 feet from the shared property line, but it's actually 14 feet according to the site plan. It's also unfortunate that you have not been able to take us up on our long-standing offer to tour Arbor House and see first-hand a project that won a National Sustainable Design Award for its sensitive design and placement, helping insure that The Plough Inn landmark site would be protected for generations to come. In short, the [building images](#) underestimate the overall mass, scale, height, and setback relationship to the Landmark site and Commissioners should request that the submittal materials be revised and corrected in order to make an informed decision.

Second, we need to address potential problems in the public comment process. Over the weekend, I noted over a dozen emails sent by neighborhood residents expressing concerns about the project that were not included in the official file. All had been sent to Lucas and/or Katherine Cornwell at the City and had cc'd me. I forwarded the emails along to Landmarks staff last night, but what about other potential public comments that have been lost in the process that Commissioners are not being made aware of? This is another area that needs to be corrected before Commissioners can make an informed decisions about the proposed building.

Third, the DMNA Council has not had an opportunity to meet and formally consider the

project given the timing of the application and the Council meeting schedule. The next Council meeting is this Wednesday, March 4 and the association should be given an opportunity to formally consider the matter and provide their opinion on whether the proposed development is so large or visually intrusive as to negatively impact the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark site.

For these reasons, I would urge that the Landmarks Commission to refer the matter to a future meeting date. This would also provide ample time and opportunity for the City Attorney to consider issues regarding the project and share his opinion with the Landmarks Commission.

Sincerely,

John Imes