

Submitted @ meeting

#070490

9/25/07

Mr. Jay Reeves, Chair, and
Members of the Historic Preservation Board
Re: Board approval, Petition 36COA-07HPB
Historic Preservation Board Meeting/Hearing April 3, 2007

Reid Fogler/The Wheelbarrow and the Car, Inc. seek demolition of 1102 SW 6th Avenue, 1116 SW 6th Avenue, garage behind 1101 SW 5th Avenue, and replacement with 4-story student housing. I note **this will NOT in the least, contrary to the description in these petitions, resemble Woodbury Row**. I note that the previous incarnations of this petition have also included 1114 SW 6th Avenue, 1122 SW 6th Avenue, 1128 SW 6th Avenue, 517 SW 12th Street, 517C SW 12th Street, and future plans are expected to include all or most of these.

I further note that together with Woodbury Row, these properties comprise virtually a city block (the 1100 block of SW 5th Avenue through to the 1100 block of SW 6th Ave.,) lacking only one corner property owned by someone else, and possibly the alleys. The current petition is styled "Woodbury Row, Phase II," with "Woodbury Row, Phase III" planned to reintroduce the remaining properties, (with the possible exception of 1114 SW 6th Avenue, which then would be surrounded by and in the shadow of the tall, massive new structures.)

The comments herein apply equally whether the proposed demolition and new construction would cover all or part of the group of properties. Nothing of this magnitude has been built in the University Heights South Historic District.

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board:

I have lived at 1026-1028 SW 6th Avenue, right next door on the east side of the above-mentioned 1102 SW 6th Avenue, for 8 years, of which I have owned the property 1½ years. I love and enjoy this neighborhood.

The lovely neighborhood, as you know, consists of 1930's suburban style homes, 1 to 2 stories, many of beautiful brick or chert with delicate brick trim, good-sized spacing between each, sizeable setbacks from the sidewalk, small front lawns, side and back yards, tall, full trees and birds, and it is quiet—an area that cries for maintenance, care, upkeep, refurbishing and renewal, and enjoyment, not neglect, demolition and replacement with massive cubes replacing every square foot of ground and air space with apartment housing, butted up against neighboring small structures, some of whom now have a tiny space between them and the new building on one side, but the normal side yard and distance to the neighbor on the other side, looking unbalanced and dwarfed in the shadow of the new neighbor looming overhead.

We already have one such situation at the other end of the block, and the current even taller and more massive proposed structure now threatens to take over, dominate, and destroy the neighborhood by replacing existing buildings and covering all available land with even bigger and taller buildings of a totally different character. It would replace unique, irreplaceable buildings with ordinary, massive, and totally forgettable structures which would be appropriate in the ample areas outside the historic district, more hospitable to large apartment complex living.

City Commissioner, I understand that **the decisions we make today** regarding transportation, equality, **land use, redevelopment** and energy **will determine the quality of life for Gainesville.**"

Agreed. Let's make a decision today to preserve and enhance, for now and for the future, the quality of life in and the irreplaceable character of a special historic neighborhood in University Heights South.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Antonia Greene". The signature is fluid and elegant, with a long, sweeping tail on the final letter.

Antonia Greene

(All the boldface emphasis in this letter is mine.)

Note. On p. 185 of Guidelines under "Not Recommended," it lists, "Designing new buildings whose massing & scale is inappropriate and whose materials + texture are not compatible with the character of the district."

How will people feel who have put an effort into preservation and renovation of their property in good faith, following all the rules in the smaller things, only to find that another person can just demolish buildings and large chunks of neighborhoods wholesale? It is **inconsistent** and will create a climate to discourage the efforts of owners.

A recent study from UF based on surveys of more than 1500 Floridians showed that **“Historic preservation enhances the quality of life of Floridians through economic and cultural contributions to an improved sense of place.”** (University of Florida News, 12/20/06)

While looking at the **City of Gainesville website**, I found a document, “Historic Preservation Element Data and Analysis”. It likewise talks about the **benefits of Historic Preservation—economic development, neighborhood preservation and revitalization, improved property values, etc.**

It is good to read these things that sound so optimistic generally, but it is discouraging to me when **destructive things are threatening to happen around me.** There’s more.

It states on page 2, **“Homebuyers are willing to pay for the assurance that the neighborhood surrounding their homes will remain unchanged over time.”** No sooner had I purchased my home, than this threat to the historic neighborhood and to my well-being, of impending drastic and disruptive change, was presented to me by Mr. Fogler. I feel I have been or am about to be robbed! Isn’t something wrong with this picture?

Mr. Fogler’s holdings include 4 buildings having original chert with brick trim, of which he has for the moment removed 3 from the above petition to demolish and replace, but the other one remains (1116, 2-story garage apartment), and the 1114 main 2-story house would be closely crowded in by mammoth structures beside and behind it, instead of partnering with it’s junior edition.

I understand **these chert buildings, while rarely found elsewhere, are characteristic of the Gainesville area, as well as being beautiful.** Two of these structures are on the street and two are behind their respective houses as one and two-story garage apartments, labeled “accessory structures,” and there is an alley behind them, actually an east-west alley and a north-south alley.

In the above document, p. 3, mention is made of the character of such arrangements. **“The University Related Residential Thematic Area neighborhoods near the university campus include single-family homes, garage apartments, duplexes, and two-story walk-up apartments. . . Alleyways are as much a part of the historic districts as they are of new urbanist design.”**

This writer must have been walking around and observing our neighborhood! These buildings are historic and ought not to be rated in “descending order of importance” for the purpose of selective demolition!! **The above entire grouping should be preserved and the smaller buildings (such as 1116) valued along with the larger ones.** No piecemeal demolition, please! All the buildings contribute to the character of the area. Wood buildings can also be painted attractive colors for curb appeal instead of drab for demolition appeal.

Why don't we **become a model of preservation of irreplaceable structures**, instead of rewarding neglect and devaluation, by allowing demolition and replacement? This is not the spirit of Historic Preservation.

I understand that a historic district exists to preserve, protect and renew the historic structures, and that **even the non-contributing building "is still part of the character of the historic neighborhood," according to the City of Gainesville's brochure, "A citizen's guide to Living in a Historic District"**.

New construction should never trump preservation by requiring the tearing down of historic buildings, nor should it overwhelm or destroy a neighborhood.

I read in the new Guidelines that "New construction should complement historic architecture. Through sound planning and design, it can respect and reinforce the existing patterns of a historic district." p. 183. I understand that the **Secretary of the Interior has promulgated similar massing of buildings in historic districts**. Local City Guidelines say "Good infill design. . .uses significant patterns, such as **height, materials, roof form, massing, setbacks** and the rhythm of openings and materials to **insure that a new building fits within the context.**" (Guidelines, p. 183.)

That distinctly sounds like 1 to 2 story, relatively small structures with setbacks from the street and from neighboring properties to be on the scale of existing ones. Until new construction began, all the houses and apartments in the area were 1 to 2 stories. That is still the case for SW 6th Avenue, except for the brand new "Stratford Court," on the corner, and I strongly urge that we keep it at 1 to 2 stories to preserve the character of the neighborhood.

The **massiveness of the multiple-unit structure which Reid Fogler has told me he is going to build 4 stories high, 8 feet from my property line (which property line is only about 6.5 feet from my house on its small lot,) with a parking garage on the ground floor, going from the sidewalk many feet deep (front to back), deep enough to have multiple complete units on each floor front to back as well as down the street, taking out all the trees, is totally incompatible with the neighborhood. The idea of "breaking down" the huge facade into smaller "elements" will do nothing to mitigate this incompatibility of massiveness that is totally out of scale. Similarly, putting a postage stamp of chert or other stone on the facade as a gesture to the neighborhood in no way compensates for the losses incurred by the neighborhood.**

The project bears **no resemblance to the Woodbury Row row houses as he has advertised, and calling it "Woodbury Row -- Phase II" is absurd and misleading**. The planned construction are not "row houses," would have a footprint many times of that of Woodbury Row, and (as 1102 is a large lot centered between SW 12th Street and SW 10th Street) would **"fracture the neighborhood fabric" (warned against by Guidelines, p. 182.)**

Woodbury Row, in row house style and in contrast to the above-described plan, consists of only 7 apartments—each of which is 3 stories high, and the building is only one apartment deep, approximately 20-some-odd feet deep as I recall, and was built on a large existing parking lot, most of which still provides ample parking behind the building. **Woodbury Row is also approximately 40 feet from the neighboring building owned by someone else.**

Since the approximately 97 parking spaces were rented out to students by the previous owner, the adding of the 7 apartments of Woodbury Row while eliminating the renting of spaces had to have actually reduced the amount of automobile traffic around that area, unlike the proposed project which would **drastically increase congestion in an already overcrowded street.**

This proposed project is 1/3 taller (than Woodbury Row), longer, much deeper, and far more massive, with nearly non-existent setbacks, butting it up against my house, cutting down tall trees which for years have enhanced the scenic quality of the neighborhood, using all the land area available, with multiple one-story apartment units stacked up four high, which would **dwarf and overshadow neighboring ones.** If I'm not mistaken, it would break new ground as the first 4-story building in the historic district and set a **most destructive precedent.**

This would **not provide "design compatibility" or "reduce the impact of new construction on existing historic properties," (Guidelines p. 183.)** The impact would be great by putting a 4-story high sheer cliff 8 feet from my property line, 14.5 feet from my historic, contributing home, instead of what is there now, a one story structure about 16.5 feet from my property line and 23 feet from my house, affording from my entrance landing a lovely, scenic view of the neighborhood of lovely houses and tall trees, with the sound of birds, sunsets against the silhouettes of the large trees, etc.

I would like you to stand at that spot and enjoy the view, sights, sounds and scents (my tangerine tree is in bloom) and then picture it suddenly replaced by a smelly parking garage topped off by a wall where the only thing that can now be seen is a huge wall with the neighbors' windows at close range.

I invite you to just stand in the shade of a tree at the border of 1102 and 1114 and look in all directions and enjoy the view of light filtering through tall trees and houses. Then imagine all this demolished and replaced with a garish monstrosity that could exist anywhere.

If allowed, Phase II alone will incur degradation and irreparable loss, and if he is allowed to build the entire project, as previously proposed (now Phases II and III,) it will decimate a beautiful, old historic neighborhood, all in complete contradiction to the purposes of a historic district. In fact, he has expressed a goal of purchasing several more properties including mine, contingent on demolition, and sought to virtually eradicate the north side of SW 6th Avenue, the West side of SW 12th Street, and the south side of SW 5th Avenue, all the way east to the alley almost at SW 10th Street and replace it with the above (more than 1.5 city blocks.) His goal has been to go even bigger than what is proposed here or even previously. **If he even builds part of it, he can later argue that more similar buildings would be compatible with what he has already built!**

In fact, I note he is already doing just that. I noticed that in his display on Feb. 6 of 3 photographs titled something like "Neighboring Properties", he has selected the only 3-story elevations in the area, one being his recently built Woodbury Row, and the other being a small 3-story addition to an existing 2-story building, (and the third photo was the ranch house that he wants to demolish,) while omitting the many 1 and 2-story historic structures that make up the historic neighborhood.

This splitting up of the petition in phases can only be intended to establish the drastically different and dominating structures as "typical" of the street, so the remainder of the project, "Phase III," decimating several more historic structures, could be argued to be compatible. Let's keep his entire goal in view.

The full project as previously proposed (now appearing as Phase II and Phase III,) I roughly estimated from the city's brochure, would **demolish at least 5% of the buildings in University Heights South and one beautiful neighborhood**. At that rate, we have only 19 more shots at it until University Heights south is gone. **There truly is only a small, finite amount of special historic area and it should be protected, not squandered.**

* * *

If Mr. Fogler is allowed to build the current project or even if he were to demolish **"only"** 1102 SW 6th Avenue, and build this massive structure there in that spacious area, it would be totally inappropriate for the neighborhood and the following would be the result:

It would chop up the character and appearance of the neighborhood, **"fracture the fabric of the neighborhood,"** which the **Guidelines** warn against, p. 186.

All beautiful, tall trees (per Mr. Fogler) **and** therefore the **bird habitat would be gone**, significant losses in themselves.

It would **totally overshadow my house and put my property in shade** (as Mr. Fogler agrees it would from 12 o'clock on,) jeopardizing my valuable tangerine tree that needs 6-8 hours of sun daily, and other trees and plants, destroy any privacy, and **take away enjoyment of use of the back yard** by the 4 people who live there, myself and 3 tenants, and their visitors.

It would **block sun, fresh air, breezes, view**, enjoyment of seeing the neighborhood while leaving and returning to the house, and **degrade air quality** from all the vehicles coming and going from the ground floor. It would be jarring for pedestrians to look at.

It would force people to **look out their windows right into other people's windows or walls of buildings blocking any view**. Also, many of its inhabitants will have a direct view into my property, such as the back yard, creating privacy issues and curtailing enjoyment of the space.

Very importantly to many of us, due to the **number of units**, it would introduce a factor of **noise and rowdiness** which has been pleasantly lacking until now, with everyone being quiet and respectful, which would **greatly reduce the quality of life, making it hard to sleep, study, etc.** **Mr. Fogler told me he agrees that with that many units you will get some bad, noisy people – it's inevitable. He will not be affected as he lives elsewhere.**

It would **worsen** the already bad **traffic congestion** on the street, which is difficult for two-way traffic to pass through due to there now being parking on both sides of the street and insufficient room for opposing traffic to easily pass through. The ground floor parking garage would be **smelly, unattractive and noisy** to neighbors in itself, their visitors will have to park somewhere, and all the **vehicles will still need to access the street**, further rendering the street impassible, greatly increasing the congestion problem and well as air quality problems. The street parking is already overtaxed, since after the restriction goes off in the afternoon, many students use it to park for night classes, leaving residents hunting.

It would negatively impact my well-being and that of the many student **renters** who have told me they **seek to get away from large apartment buildings** and into the small, separate houses, due to reduced noise, more roominess, private yards, etc. It would **degrade general living enjoyment** to me and those who find it an attraction to rent from me and would **make it harder to rent**, especially during the year-long (per Mr. Fogler) construction process. The construction being so close by would **steal “quiet enjoyment” that leases promise to tenants, as would the presence of the inevitable “bad eggs”**. Again, **Mr. Fogler will not be affected**.

It would **hurt the potential for the neighborhood and its quality of life, also the reduced quality of life would make it harder to fulfill my plans as a homeowner and landlord of 3 people** to gradually make up for the money I have invested and hopefully have something that will make a needed contribution to my retirement in the years to come – this is a long range plan for me.

Even one such building would seriously damage and detract from the neighborhood. The historic district should not be piecemeal because of one non-contributing structure, but should maintain integrity throughout, especially this valuable neighborhood. The ranch house (1102), as the only “non-contributing” structure, does contribute through its desirable qualities of harmonious dimensions, scale, height, massing, setbacks, etc., featuring tall trees, enhancing the aesthetic of the whole instead of “fracturing the fabric of the neighborhood.”

* * *

There is not that much area in the University Heights South historic district, so we can't afford to waste what we have. This full project as previously proposed (become Phases II and III,) would demolish very roughly I estimate at least 5% of the buildings and one beautiful neighborhood. We need to encourage people to live here who want to refurbish homes, as some already have and as some are now doing. I would like to suggest more new homeowners be encouraged to move into the area and fix up houses to live in, along with those who fix them up to rent out, and promote renovation, even offering grants, which I believe are available for new construction.

I suggest people who strongly want to demolish structures and replace them with giant complexes, look just a block further east or south and beyond, outside the historic district's perimeter, which is still close to UF, and sell their current holdings to responsible people committed to maintenance, renovation and historic preservation, and keeping the character of the neighborhood. Surely there are nearby neighborhoods outside this small Historic District where new construction would be productive and contribute to the community, allowing us to preserve what is in the District for posterity.

I respectfully request you decline this entire proposal and any other incarnations of it. I would suggest that in the neighborhood in question we preserve existing structures and concentrate on refurbishing and historic preservation, creating incentives for this, whether to attract interested and committed homeowners or those who purchase as rentals.

I have in my hand a mailed advertisement for re-election of City Commissioner Craig Lowe, with one of those optimistic statements I mentioned above. He says, “The strength of our city depends upon the health of our neighborhoods, a clean environment and a dynamic, responsible economy. As your

What I Would Like to See -- Please read letter for more detail

Antonia Greene

Homeowner of 1026-28 SW 6th Avenue

6/12/07

One to two story houses (no higher) throughout the neighborhood -- stick to the historic scale, massing, height, setbacks, size, etc., so only true aesthetic enhancements can occur, not degradation and fracturing and destruction. The goal of a Historic District should not be cramming the most possible rental apartments onto a denuded lot or lots, but. . .well, historic preservation! Guidelines say: "Not recommended: 1. Designing new buildings whose massing and scale is inappropriate. . ."

Support preservation and renewal over new construction in the Historic District. The district is very small and there is plenty of space outside of it to pursue the city's desire to increase density. The continued existence of the Historic district as such depends on it. Irreplaceable historic buildings and the atmosphere of the street have intrinsic, inherent value.

Keep the character of the historic district intact. Don't fracture the neighborhood fabric (Guidelines) by arbitrarily knocking down "non-contributing" structures, which may be contributing much in the way of compatibility. The new one may contribute far less than the one you demolished, as would sadly be the case with 1102 SW 6th Avenue vs. the proposals I have seen for its replacement.

Keep setbacks intact, so the relative positions of the houses are in balance. No sheer cliffs looming over smaller houses. The "step away" is far from adequate to mitigate the problem and protect any home from this blight.

Keep setbacks intact to ensure saving and keeping a balanced spread of large, graceful, tall trees, which distinguish the neighborhood. Protect all these trees--they took many years to grow.

Maintain the lovely views by maintaining the historic building heights and sizes and massing, again, with compatible front and side setbacks. We like to see nature, not walls.

Wildlife--the trees provide an excellent bird habitat, and we enjoy their fresh songs daily.

Do not demolish any historic buildings, for instance, by rating them in descending order and allowing demolition of members of significant groupings, such as the related chert structures, 1114 SW 6th Avenue/1116 SW 6th Avenue, and 517 SW 12th Street/517C SW 12th Street, as well as the alleys. These groupings are characteristic and quaint and have been referred to as compatible with "the new urbanism." (Found on city website.) **Maintain the standard of no demolition allowed unless a building is literally falling apart and the owner has genuinely attempted to shore it up/fix it.** Willful neglect should not be rewarded. Protect special assets, such as chert, etc.

Do not demolish any non-contributing building unless you are going to replace it with something MORE compatible with the neighborhood, a clear improvement in design as it relates to the historic properties, and the same 1 to 2 stories and other aspects that define the character of the neighborhood, NOT something that is simply designed to cram in as many rental apartments as possible, while making a gesture to the historic area by "breaking down" of the facade into miscellaneous components which do not mitigate the hugeness and in-your-face presence of the new buildings.

Guidelines enjoin avoidance of "fracturing the neighborhood fabric". **1102 SW 6th Avenue is part of the character of the Historic District (per City of Gainesville's brochure, "A Citizen's Guide to Living in a Historic District,") and greatly contributes aesthetically in terms of scale, massing, height setbacks from the road and neighbors, general appearance though not of the same period, and beautiful, large trees which**

are characteristic of the neighborhood. If demolition were to be allowed, I would like to see a 1 to 2 story building with the same length and width as the existing building, leaving the trees, setbacks from the street and neighbors, and **contributing at least all of the aforementioned characteristics in greater degree than the existing building.** There is no other rationale for it.

Honor the promise of the Historic District, per article I found while on the City of Gainesville website, describing the many benefits of historic preservation: **“Homebuyers are willing to pay for the assurance that the neighborhood surrounding their homes will remain unchanged over time.”** **What has been proposed is severe, drastic change.**

Don't build anything where next-door neighbor has to face a high wall replacing open views and the property is robbed of light by massive facade of new building. No encroachment of shade degrading the growth environment of the landscape and robbing residents of enjoyment of outdoor spaces of the property.

Protect my property and environment -- no rowdy noise of “bad eggs” that turn up in multiple unit apartment complexes. No glut of cars and fumes from increasingly overburdened streets, and no parking garage.

Don't destroy your next-door neighbors' quality of life because you don't live there.

Encourage homeowners who want to refurbish homes to live in (we are not extinct!) and who have a stake in the environment, the historic and natural preservation, and the quality of life in the district, as well as those who rent out spaces but who care about preserving the quality of life and character of the district.

Allow accessory structures only (size of main building or smaller, etc.) to be built in the yards behind houses and don't carve out space between the backs of houses fronting on parallel streets, in order to cram in more massive, taller buildings, such as has been done (but no building ensued) between SW 4th and SW 5th Avenue. Again, no looming structures, whether to the side or to the back of existing structures. Keep within size, dimensions, height, massing, setbacks, etc., of existing historic structures, namely 1 to 2 stories.

Let's not trample the Historic District, but preserve and enhance it!

1028 SW 6th Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601
July 2, 2007

Mr. Craig Lowe
City Commissioner, District IV
200 E. University Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601

Dear Mr. Lowe,

I am a homeowner and resident of the University Heights South Historic District, 1026-28 SW 6th Avenue. I wish to express my deep concern about and opposition to a proposed new massive apartment complex planned to be built about 15' from my house wall with 4 stories looming overhead, by Reid Fogler/The Wheelbarrow and the Car.

I wrote a letter, attended Historic Preservation Board monthly meetings and was eventually able to speak at the April 2007 meeting as well as the June 2007 meeting (see enclosed), at which, as you know, the petition was unanimously voted down.

As you know, this petition is now on your agenda for the July 9th City Commission meeting. In fact, the prospective builder already had the next step (the neighborhood workshop) in the mail before the Historic Preservation Board's vote.

I would appreciate it if you might honor my deep concern for the area by reading the enclosed comments and pleas. Incidentally, a mailing from you crossed my desk at just the appropriate moment for me to include a quote from you. I appreciate Historic Preservation Board member Sandra Lamme's article in the Sunday, July 1 Gainesville Sun. I also appreciate very much the Board members' incisive and perceptive comments at their April and June meetings, and hope you all will be provided with transcripts of the tapes of these comments and the citizens' comments.

Shouldn't we be focusing on rewarding and providing incentives for preservation in the Historic District, instead of giving so much encouragement possibly including financial incentives to new construction? If this continues, we won't have this small University Heights South Historic District for long. In fact, someone new has bought two historic houses just this year across from Mr. Fogler's property, and appeared at the June Historic Preservation Board meeting with the same intent as Mr. Fogler.

There is so much space outside of the Historic District, yet in the same general area, in which to continue implementing the City's plans for higher density while preserving the lovely, delicate and irreplaceable character of the University Heights South Historic District.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to the City Commission meeting.

Sincerely,

Antonia Greene
enclosures

Much of the neighborhood, Mr. Reid Fogler has attempted to obtain approval to demolish and replace with a huge 4-story apartment housing complex including parking garage. He has, for the moment, reduced the number of buildings he is petitioning to demolish to 3, including the contributing historic 2-story chert garage apartments, 1116 SW 6th Ave., that belong with the 2-story chert house on the street, 1114 SW 6th Avenue, as well as 1102 SW 6th Avenue which sits on a large lot with tall, beautiful trees, and the garage behind 1101 SW 5th Avenue, carving out plenty of land in and around remaining buildings on which to construct a massive, 4-story apartment complex.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to tell you why I oppose and request you deny the above proposed demolition and replacement of structures with massive new structures, whether these 3 or all of the historic buildings he owns and has planned to demolish, whether “just” 1102 SW 6th Avenue as the only “non-contributing” structure or including any or all of the historic area that he owns.

My reasons are **(1) incompatibility with the character of the street and neighborhood** (per Design Guidelines for New Construction, p. 183,) **(2) the irreplaceability of the buildings** (the loss of even one such building, such as 1116, the chert 2-story garage apartments, would break up and vastly diminish the impact of the grouping) **and their contribution to that character**, and **(3) quality of life issues due to the severe impact of the proposed new larger-scale development on existing historic properties (Guidelines, p. 183), notably my home as immediate next door neighbor to 1102 SW 6th Avenue, where Mr. Fogler has told me he plans to place the eastern wall, a 4-story cliff looming over my house and small yard, only 14.5 ft. from the wall of my house, (8 ft. from the property line).**

Please try to put yourselves in my position, having that on top of you, including a smelly, fummy parking garage abutting your house and back yard. In the current plan, the open wall of the parking garage would be 8 feet from my property line including back yard; it would be 14.5 feet from my house wall. **It must be hard for Mr. Fogler to put himself in my shoes, since where he lives there is no chance of something like this happening to him, but he doesn't mind inflicting it on his next-door neighbors in University Heights.**

Page 184 goes on to mention, “Without careful attention to overall design, materials, **scale, massing, and setbacks**, contemporary construction in an Historic District can **threaten the coherence of the historic context.**” I observe that this is certainly the case here.

It would in fact **eradicate and replace a large area with something completely different.** I don't see the benefit of new construction in the neighborhood when it would require the demolition of valuable, irreplaceable buildings (however many or few, when each is part of an interwoven context, such as the four chert structures,) and destroy the fabric of a beautiful, old neighborhood, while areas outside the Historic District are conveniently nearby and still near UF. Even 1102 fits in well with the neighborhood, and its large lot has a number of **large, beautiful trees, which are also “contributing” greatly to the neighborhood!**

The Guidelines state that **“the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are oriented toward rehabilitation of existing historic buildings.”** I thought that was the idea of having a Historic district. What is the **meaning of Historic Preservation** if we can suddenly **ravage and even completely lose an entire historic neighborhood where we live through drastic, unwanted change?**