

From: [Scanlon, Amy](mailto:Scanlon.Amy)
To: [Scanlon, Amy](mailto:Scanlon.Amy)
Subject: FW: 127 Gilman submittal - January 6th meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 11:34:19 AM

From: Stu Levitan [mailto:stuartlevitan@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2014 1:21 AM
To: White, William F (22246); Erica Fox Gehrig; Rummel, Marsha; christina slattery; David McLean; michael rosenblum; Jason Fowler
Cc: Scanlon, Amy; 'Shane Fry; Margaret Watson; Dan Seeley; Scanlon, Amy; Ledell Zellers
Subject: Re: 127 Gilman submittal - January 6th meeting

Atty. White

Thank you for your response.

We appreciate that you have now provided your analysis of the gross volume of the proposed new buildings. However, I have further questions and concerns about the Letter of Intent. First, your calculation of the gross volume is substantially lower than that provided by architect John Martens. Mr. Martens has explained his calculations; please do likewise, explaining how you arrived at your figure of 206,205 as the average GV of the three proposed buildings.

I also note that your analysis of elements 2, 3 and 4 explicitly make the comparison between the proposed new construction and the respective averages for the proportions and relationships of the structures within the VRA, but that you decline to state an average gross volume of those structures. This figure is absolutely critical in the Commission's analysis of whether the project satisfied the first criterion. Please explain why you state and rely on the averages of the structures within the VRA for your analysis of points 2,3 and 4, but not point 1. Also, please respond to Mr. Martens' calculation that the remaining structures within the VRA have a gross volume of about 50,000. Finally, accepting your figure of 206,205 cubic feet for each proposed new structure, please explain how that gross volume is "visually compatible" with structures one-quarter its size.

I also note the letter you forwarded on Friday bears the same date as your original letter, but markedly different text. The Commission welcomes your efforts to provide full and current information, but I think the record gets confused when you alter submissions already made while retaining the original date. Please submit a clean copy of this correspondence with the date it was actually finished and submitted.

Finally, I note that nothing in Friday's material responds to the questions I posed about the proposed demolition of 127 W. Gilman. Those questions remain relevant to the Commission's consideration of your proposal.

I am sorry that the weather forced a cancellation of Monday's meeting. I am very hopeful that we can have a special meeting scheduled for next week, so that we can continue with our timely consideration of this project.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or comments on this matter.

Sincerely,
Stu Levitan

Chair, Landmarks Commission