

From: [Scanlon, Amy](mailto:Scanlon.Amy)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](mailto:Scanlon.Amy)
Subject: FW: 127 Gilman submittal - January 22nd meeting -CORRECTED
Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 11:22:20 AM

From: Stu Levitan [mailto:stuartlevitan@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 7:55 AM
To: Dan Seeley; Scanlon, Amy
Cc: White, William F (22246); Erica Fox Gehrig; Rummel, Marsha; christina slattery; David McLean; michael rosenblum; Jason Fowler; 'Shane Fry'; Margaret Watson Ledell Zellers
Subject: Re: 127 Gilman submittal - January 22nd meeting -CORRECTED

Correction - last graph should read, "If a building were built
..."
Sorry for the poor grammar.
Stu

From: Stu Levitan >
To: Dan Seeley <>; "Amy Scanlon >
Cc: "White, William F (22246)" >; Erica Fox Gehrig <; "Rummel, Marsha" <>; christina slattery <>; David McLean <>; michael rosenblum <>; Jason Fowler <>; "Shane Fry" >; "Margaret Watson <; Ledell Zellers <>
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2014 10:36 PM
Subject: Re: 127 Gilman submittal - January 22nd meeting

Dan
Below are the addresses of the buildings you cite in support of your argument regarding compatibility with the VRA. Can you clarify which of these structures were built during the MHHD's period of significance (roughly 1850-1930)? Have any been built since establishment of the MHHD itself?

1 Langdon
116 E. Gilman
2 W. Gorham
416 N. Carroll
114 W. Gilman

If a building was built after the district's period of significance and before establishment of the MHHD, do you believe it is indicative of the historic district's standard for compatibility?

Thanks,
Stu