

From: [Nicholas Davies](#)
To: [Plan Commission Comments](#)
Cc: [Urban Design Comments](#); [Martinez-Rutherford, Dina Nina](#)
Subject: 78635 - 139 W Wilson - Standards to reject NOT met
Date: Sunday, August 25, 2024 12:41:40 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from nbdavies@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Plan Commission,

Item 78635 represents an opportunity to make much more efficient use of a downtown parcel, and to provide much-needed housing, designed for affordability, and consistent with the walkable, bikeable, and transit-oriented area in which it will be built. As you can tell by the legistar number, this has gone through plenty of review already.

The summary recommendation in the staff report suggests that failing to meet recommendations 1-5 (which came out of UDC as an advisory recommending body) could provide justification for denying the conditional use request. I encourage you to find otherwise.

Recommendations 1-5 are all about "visual interest" and "etching patterns"--purely aesthetic, and completely subjective considerations. I do not see these as adequate reasons to delay or deny the proposed construction, especially given how bureaucracy it has already gone through.

I, for one, have reviewed the plans and renderings, and find them entirely adequate as far as looks are concerned. So you can put me down as a vote in the other column on this, for what that's worth.

I look forward to walking past this building, biking past it, and knowing that it's providing housing for hundreds of people. If I ever need to find single-occupant housing downtown, I might look forward to living there. To me, that makes it beautiful.

If the architect of this building were making a brutalist statement with it, would you still be going on about "etching patterns" in the concrete facade? It strikes me as a kind of architectural illiteracy to just arbitrarily apply that as a requirement, and cite no basis for it within the field of architecture.

People often complain about new construction all looking the same. I wonder if that comes from taking the "safe route" to avoid this kind of architectural backseat-driving? Or perhaps the ingrained biases of our architectural reviewing bodies are pushing new construction towards more uniform designs?

I don't see visual conformity--or lack thereof--to be a reason to deny requests for new construction of a much-needed resource. But on balance, I do think the city could benefit from more architectural diversity.

Thank you,

Nick Davies
3717 Richard St