

Lannon, Kurt M.

From: Young, Shaneka
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2007 12:53 PM
To: Lannon, Kurt M.
Subject: FW: Information for meeting tonight

From: Bruce DeLaney [mailto:bdelaney@uff.ufl.edu]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2007 11:54 AM
To: clerks
Subject: Information for meeting tonight

I regret I will be unable to attend the meeting tonight. If possible, please provide my comments to the City Commission at or in advance of the meeting.

Dear Commissioners:

I regret I will be unable to attend the meeting tonight regarding the appeal of a recent Historic Board decision. Tonight you have the unenviable "splitting the baby" task Solomon faced so long ago. I'm writing about the process and policy of the city, without regard to the pros or cons of the proposal before you. Indeed, I have not seen a site plan, elevation or any other data regarding the pending proposal.

I write as the founding chair of the College Park/University Heights Redevelopment District Advisory Board, and as a member of the subcommittee of that board that helped develop the compromise guidelines for redevelopment in the University Heights Historic District. These guidelines were jointly developed by the Historic and Redevelopment boards at the Commission's instruction. They were meant to be a compromise between the more strict requirements of the Secretary of the Interior guidelines and the somewhat conflicting goals the City Commission adopted with the Redevelopment and Dover Kohl Overlay Plans for the area. The Commission recognized that there would be "scale and character" conflicts and instructed both boards at that time that the guidelines would be yardstick by which proposals were to be evaluated.

At the time the Historic District was created, some of us expressed worry that the process would place the Historic Board members in an impossible situation. They are, more or less, a single issue advocacy board sworn to preserve the scale and character of the neighborhood. However, it is the official adopted policy of the City Commission to change the scale and character of the neighborhood to a significantly more urban style. Nonetheless, the compromise guidelines were chosen to split the difference, notwithstanding the burden it placed on the Historic Board's shoulders.

Significant reductions in then permitted scale were adopted with the "step down" and "step back" criteria. Building heights were reduced from that allowed by the very high density zoning that has existed in the area for 40+ years. While the architect hired by the city (CRA) to determine the effects of the guidelines indicated the result would be substantial losses in value from the intensities permitted by that zoning, these reductions would still allow significant increases in the mass and scale, and thus change the character, of the area to a more urban fabric. Thus, the dilemma for the Historic Board-while they are sworn to preserve scale and character, they compromised both those things at the instruction of the City Commission when they approved the guidelines and were instructed by the Commission to use them when evaluating redevelopment proposals. I don't envy the position into which they have been placed.

Times change and board memberships change. In reviewing comments made by members of the Historic Board at the June meeting and in a letter to the editor by one of the members, it's clear the members are only following

their passion for historic preservation when statements such as "...approve no more projects...return the area to single family..." and "...the compromise setbacks are not enough..." and "...I do not believe the board has to comply with the guidelines..." are made.

Unfortunately, that wasn't the instructions the City Commission gave both boards when they were assigned the task of developing compromise guidelines that were to allow both redevelopment and historic preservation visions to go forward together. The assignment was that this district would be different from other districts and would have the guidelines applied as a compromise between the almost mutually exclusive goals the City Commission had established. Whether or not this project meets the guidelines or not is of no concern to me. My concern is that this conflict was predictable and with this first controversial project the City Commission is presented an "opportunity" to establish the proper and new equilibrium between strict historic preservation and strict scrape and rebuild redevelopment.

So, good luck splitting the baby tonight. I suggest the most important thing you need to do is to establish whether or not the compromise guidelines for this district are controlling and to be used to "break ties" between the somewhat conflicting goals the Commission has established for both redevelopment and historic preservation. I suspect when you've reviewed both sides of the argument, you'll find that both the historic board and the developer have pushed the envelop too far towards their respective positions and passions and that this will be an opportune time for the Commission to re-establish its intentions that the best of both positions is the outcome that properly balances City needs in this area.

That new equilibrium point between the two extremes is what is needed. Good luck!

Bruce DeLaney

Documents made or received by anyone acting for or on behalf of the UF Foundation are confidential and exempt from F.S. 119.07(1) pursuant to F.S. 1004.28(5) and in accordance with the UF Foundation policy on confidentiality of Foundation documents.

Revised from
R.F.
070196 6/27/07
(KL)

Commissioners,

I know that most of the time an appeal is brought before you there are at least two sides of the coin. I acknowledge that both positions have valuable and relevant goals and objectives. The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) takes a position of "preservation first". The Wheelbarrow and The Car Inc. (WNC) takes a position of "Let's invest, in and redevelop in the University Heights Redevelopment District (CPUH)." Some think balancing redevelopment and preservation goals is impossible. I would say this is a difficult trick at best. That is what you are being asked to do.

We continue to work with the HPB board and city staff to satisfy all parties.

The following is a time line of how we got from June of 2001 to now.

I hope this is helpful. There is a lot that goes around this whole mess. I hope you can see the forest from the trees at the end.

7-01

Reid Fogler and Bill Woodbury began talking about Bill selling his wife and his property to Wells and me.

There were rumblings that the subject property would wind up in a historic district of some sort.

Bill was concerned this would ruin his investment as the property was and still is in a Redevelopment district.

I and many others thought we would defeat the attempt to become a historic district as very few to none of the subject property owners were in favor of it.

10-01-01

the Wheelbarrow and The Car Inc. went under contract to purchase the Woodbury's .

12-21-0 The transaction was closed.

1-14-02 The Historic district was passed and adopted.

2-4-03 the Wheelbarrow and The Car Inc. was issued a C.O.A. for Woodbury Row.

7-31-04 the Wheelbarrow and The Car Inc. finished construction on seven Row-houses.

5-4-05

AGENDA
College Park University Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board
Wednesday, May 4, 2005 5:00 PM

F. OLD BUSINESS

1. Historic Preservation Guidelines for both University Heights Historic Districts

Explanation: Last month Paul Miller, an architect hired to complete a study analyzing the build out scenarios under the University Heights Historic District proposed Design Guidelines and the University Heights Special Area Plan, presented his further analysis of the application of the guidelines, per the Board's previous direction. Following his presentation and extensive discussion, the Board appointed Member Fleming and Bruce Delaney to meet with staff to develop a recommendation outlining the impacts of the Historic Preservation Guidelines on redevelopment activities within the University Heights district. Member Fleming and Mr. Delaney have met with staff and have crafted several recommendations for the College Park/University Heights Advisory Board to consider adopting and recommending to the Historic Preservation Board, the Community Redevelopment Agency, and ultimately to the City Commission.

Member Fleming and Mr. Delaney have developed the following recommendations for the Board's consideration:

The following modifications should be made to the University Heights Historic Preservation Design Guidelines to balance historic preservation with redevelopment: 1) Step back: the side setback for new structures should be the same as the side setback of the adjacent contributing structure, with a maximum side setback of 20'. If a new structure lies between two contributing structures, the setback should be the average of the two setbacks, not to exceed 20'. Corner lots where only one side is affected would be exempt from this average setback, and would follow the same side setback for the adjacent contributing structure, not to exceed 20'. 2) Build to line/Front Yard Setback: The new structure build to line should be halfway between 0' and the actual front yard setback of the contributing structure. If the new structure has façade articulation, the end unit adjacent to the contributing structure must be set back. 3) Step down: If other recommendations are implemented, the step down guideline can remain unchanged will also provide further clarification of the issue and their recommendations.

10-5-05

AGENDA
College Park University Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board
Wednesday, October 5, 2005 5:00 PM

3. **Historic Preservation Guidelines for both University Heights Historic Districts**

Explanation: Last month, the CPUH Board reviewed the most recent draft of the University Heights Historic District proposed Design Guidelines and provided final recommendations, which staff transmitted to the Historic Preservation (HP) Board staff. The HP Board reviewed and finalized their recommendations for the University Heights Historic District Design Guidelines on Tuesday, September 6. The Historic Preservation Board is still considering combining the historical background information and historic rehabilitation guidelines for all Historic Districts, including University Heights, into one document, with the new construction guidelines still unique to each district. Following are the recommendations previously made by the CPUH Board and the corresponding decision of the HP Board:

CPUH Recommendation: page 39 – picture is of the North Historic District
Historic Preservation Board response: If all of the historic district design guidelines are converted into one document, photos will be representative of all Historic Districts.

CPUH Recommendation: page 56 – request to strike recommendation 2 (2. keep new additions to historic buildings to a minimum).
Historic Preservation Board response: The HP Board felt this regulation was important for historic buildings and did not strike it.

CPUH Recommendation: page 65 – CPUH stated that the code required 1.5' currently (guidelines require 1.6') and removal of the crawl space requirement.
Historic Preservation Board response: The 1.6' requirement is reflective of the University Heights Special Area Plan. They did not remove the crawl space requirement.

CPUH Recommendation: page 69 – the CPUH Board recommended that metal and vinyl type shutters be allowed provided they simulate appropriate products.
Historic Preservation Board response: The HP Board has no objection of this for new construction, and will amend the guidelines accordingly, but remained firm that the guidelines remain for historic homes.

CPUH Recommendation: page 112: the CPUH Board questioned whether the photograph was illustrating a recommended or undesired placement location of the transformer, and recommended consultation with GRU.
Historic Preservation Board response: the photograph was illustrating an undesired placement, and the section will be sent to GRU for review prior to final adoption.

The draft will now be forwarded to the City Plan Board and City Commission for final adoption.

Fiscal note: None at this time.

RECOMMENDATION: 1) Hear update from staff and 2) take action if necessary.

F. OLD BUSINESS

1. Historic Preservation Guidelines for both University Heights Historic

Districts

Previously, Paul Miller, an architect hired to complete a study analyzing the build out scenarios under the University Heights Historic District proposed Design Guidelines and the University Heights Special Area Plan, presented his further analysis of the application of the guidelines, per the Board's previous direction. Following his presentation and extensive discussion, the Board appointed Member Fleming and Bruce Delaney to meet with staff to develop a recommendation outlining the impacts of the Historic Preservation Guidelines on redevelopment activities within the University Heights district. Member Fleming and Mr. Delaney have met with staff and have crafted several recommendations for the College Park/University Heights Advisory Board to consider adopting and recommending to the Historic Preservation Board, the Community Redevelopment Agency, and ultimately to the City Commission.

Member Fleming and Mr. Delaney developed the following recommendations for the Board's consideration:

The following modifications should be made to the University Heights Historic Preservation Design Guidelines to balance historic preservation with redevelopment: 1) Step back: the side setback for new structures should be the same as the side setback of the adjacent contributing structure, with a maximum side setback of 20'. If a new structure lies between two contributing structures, the setback should be the average of the two setbacks, not to exceed 20'. Corner lots where only one side is affected would be exempt from this average setback, and would follow the same side setback for the adjacent contributing structure, not to exceed 20'. 2) Build to line/Front Yard Setback: The new structure build to line should be halfway between 0' and the actual front yard setback of the contributing structure. If the new structure has façade articulation, the end unit adjacent to the contributing structure must be set back. 3) Step down: If other recommendations are implemented, the step down guideline can remain unchanged will also provide further clarification of the issue and their recommendations.

Staff has received a revised copy of the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines, which contains language that compliments the recommendations of Member Fleming and Citizen Delaney. The Historic Preservation Board met last night and no action was taken. The guidelines were postponed to the September meeting.

Discussion followed. Several board members made the following comments regarding the guidelines:

Member Fleming:

- Page 39: the top picture was taken in the North Historic District.
- Page 56: Recommendation 2 (*2. Keep new additions to historic buildings to a minimum*) should be stricken.
- Page 65: Regarding *Board Approval Guidelines*: The Code requires being 1.5' above grade currently. The CPUH Board recommends removal of the crawl space requirement.
- Page 69: Regarding *Shutters, last sentence*: metal and vinyl types should be allowed provided they simulate appropriate products

Member Cavallino:

- Page 112: It is unclear as to whether this photograph is illustrating an ideal or undesired placement location of the transformer. It is recommended that installation of transformers be accomplished in the least obtrusive way possible, and GRU should be consulted before final adoption of these guidelines

Questions and discussions ensued. Bruce DeLaney commented on changing the details for "step back". Brief discussion continued.

The Board voted in favor of the motion made by Member Rider, seconded by Member Moss, Member Fogler opposed.

Recommendation: To accept the board members comments listed above for the Historic Preservation Guidelines.

11-19-05 the Wheelbarrow and The Car Inc. sent Gary Hunter of Hoping Green information to review the situation. (Hoping Green was later retained by The city of Gainesville regarding I believe the new power plant.)

2-27-06

CPUH Advisory Board Members:

FYI - Just a reminder, the University Heights Historic District Design Guidelines are on the agenda for the City Commission this evening at 6:00 PM for adoption.

Following is the agenda item for your reference:

City of Gainesville

Legislative File Number 050884 (version 0)

Resolution for proposed Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guidelines (B) The Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guidelines are authorized as the document to be used as the criteria for reviewing and evaluating a Certificate of Appropriateness application for designated historic properties pursuant to section 30-112, City of Gainesville Code of Ordinances.

The City Commission approve the following resolution: A resolution of the City Commission of the City of Gainesville, Florida, approving and adopting the Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guidelines to be on a supplementary basis by management when evaluating an application for a certificate of appropriateness for property located within the City's historic districts, as more fully described in section 30-112, City of Gainesville Code of Ordinances; providing a repealing clause; providing an immediate effective date. (A copy of the Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guidelines will be on file in the Clerk of the Commission Office.)

Alternative Recommendation A: The City Commission deny the resolution to approve and adopt the Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guideline. Alternative Recommendation B: N/A

The goal of the Historic Preservation Rehabilitation and Design Guidelines for the City of Gainesville is to provide advice and assistance to city officials, building professionals and property owners for the purpose of maintaining, rehabilitating, and preserving historic buildings, structures, objects, and appurtenances within the historic districts of Gainesville or individually listed properties on the local or national register. The Guidelines also recommend strategies for the design of new construction that maintain the building pattern of the districts, are compatible with the existing district character, contribute positively to their evolving character, and protect existing contributing structures. The guidelines are a single comprehensive document that also employs specific language to protect the unique historical and cultural fabric of each district.

Owners in the historic districts were notified by mail of the guidelines as well as the maps. A public hearing was held on the evening of October 27, 2005.

The College Park/University Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board and the Fifth Avenue/Pleasant Street Redevelopment Advisory Board contributed significantly to the evolution of this document with their input during the development process.

Please contact me with any questions.

Have a good day,

Kate A. Parmelee
CRA Projects Coordinator - College Park/University Heights Gainesville
Community Redevelopment Agency
MS 48, PO Box 490
Gainesville, FL 32602-0490
Phone: (352) 334-2205
Fax: (352) 334-2132
Visit us on the web at: www.cityofgainesville.org/comdev/redev

FYI: Under Florida's Public Records law, most written communications to or from City officers and employees regarding City business are public records and are available to the public upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure.

2-27-06

FYI - for further clarification, the remaining issues that the Historic Board did not agree with the CPUH Board on the University Heights Historic District Design Guidelines include the following:

1. Keep additions to historic buildings to a minimum (CPUH Board recommended to strike this, the Historic Preservation Board kept it in)
2. Metal and vinyl shutters be allowed provided they simulate appropriate products (the Historic Preservation Board had this apply to new construction only, not historic homes)
3. Crawl space requirement - they made it consistent with the code, but did not strike it as the CPUH Board suggested.

Community Development Director Tom Saunders is going to recommend that the City Commission include CPUH recommendation #1 & #2. This would apply to all historic districts, because the design guidelines have been combined into one booklet for all historic districts city-wide, with separate sections for new construction in each historic district.

The meeting begins at 6 PM. If this issue is important to you there will be opportunities for public comment and this is the last chance to provide feedback to the Commission prior to adoption.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Kate A. Parmelee
CRA Projects Coordinator - College Park/University Heights Gainesville
Community Redevelopment Agency
MS 48, PO Box 490
Gainesville, FL 32602-0490
Phone: (352) 334-2205
Fax: (352) 334-2132

Visit us on the web at: www.cityofgainesville.org/comdev/redev

FYI: Under Florida's Public Records law, most written communications to or from City officers and employees regarding City business are public records and are available to the public upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure.

4-4-06 Gary Hunter refers the Wheelbarrow and The Car Inc. to Sid Ansbacher.

6-8-06 Begin working with Victor Raymos to evaluate condition/cost analysis of current buildings.

12-18-06 Trying to make deadlines for HPB February meeting.

1-2-07 Ralph Hilliard writes an email stating only the board can continue or defer a discussion of an item.

1-13-07 Victor finalizes report.

2-6-07 Staff recommends denial for Woodbury Row Phase II for the first time

2-6-07 HBP meeting

2-6-07

Staff recommends denial and continuation on all, but 1102 SW 6th Ave.

2-6-07 Paul examines what was presented to the HPB in staffs report. Discovers there seems to be a discrepancy.

Good Morning Paul,

Currently we only have the one form for AL1164 that I sent you in December. The form dates from 1982. If could send me the updated form, that would be great. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Regards,
Ginny Jones
Senior Database Analyst

Florida Master Site File
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250
850.245.6440 (p); 850.245.6439 (f)
www.flheritage.com
sitefile@dos.state.fl.us

Please provide your comments about the quality of service you received today at the following link:
<http://dhr.dos.state.fl.us/comments/>

-----Original Message-----

From: hpa007@aol.com [mailto:hpa007@aol.com]

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2007 7:41 PM

To: Jones, Ginny L.

Cc: FMSFILE

Subject: 1122 SW6th Ave. Gainesville, FL

Ginny or other helpful person:

Back in December you provide me with information on several sites in Gainesville. I had asked for information on the above referenced site but you could find nothing. You were able to provide me with the Site File for 1128 SW 6th Avenue (AL1164). The City of Gainesville sent me a Historic Structure Form for 1122-1128 SW6th Avenue dated August 8, 2005 with the same site file number. I was curious if this was ever recorded.

If you could let me know at your earliest convenience, it would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks for your help,

Paul Weaver
Historic Property Associates

2-7-07 Paul apologizes for the nervous breakdown he experienced during the meeting.

Reid:

I don't know what to say to you to apologize for last night. I went through a very emotional experience the last week and the stress caught up to me. Sid and my wife are encouraging me to get some help with some emotional issues I have repressed for many years.

You are a really good guy and I'm sorry I let you and Wells down last night. I have promised Sid I will help him prepare as best I can for the next meeting. Below is something I posted last week on Gatorcountry about a close friend of my son's who died last week.

Again, my sincerest apology,

Paul

The Title of the Thread was "Urban in St. Augustine"

(We were able to insert a picture of TJ with Chris of the Dreams of a Lifetime Foundation, Chris's wife, Tim Tebow, Coach Meyer and Aaron Hernandez. In addition to his Gator Cap, TJ is wearing a St. Joseph's Academy Fighting Flashes T-shirt and giving his classic "Peace Out Sign.")

No he wasn't visiting Allen Bailey, Terrence Tolliver or Rojo. He and Shelley Meyer were visiting a young man named Thomas "TJ" Jackson. I was TJ's first coach in youth soccer here in St. Augustine. TJ went on to play football at St. Joseph's Academy, a small 1A school. TJ wasn't big enough, strong enough or fast enough to obtain a major college scholarship but he loved the game. He walked on at Tusculum College in Greenville, Tennessee.

Last March TJ was diagnosed with cancer. He eventually went to Shands Medical Center for treatment. There he met Shelley and later Urban Meyer. Apparently TJ and Urban hit it off. Coach Meyer took the time to visit TJ in the hospital and made TJ part of the team preparation the week before leaving for the National Championship Game. TJ was also visited in the hospital by local players Brandon James, Jacques Rickerson and Tim Tebow.

On Tuesday, January 30 TJ passed away at Shands at the age of 21. Shelley and Urban took the time to drive to St. Augustine in the midst of recruiting and Urban spoke at the service tonight at St. Pauls AME church about his relationship with TJ.

I know the Meyers would not want any publicity but I wanted to share this with Gator Insiders. We have not only a great coach but a great human being, someone who not only talks the talk but walks the walk.

If any of the local Gator fans are interested, donations can be made in TJ's honor to:

Dreams of a Lifetime Foundation for Cancer
917 Chippewa St.
St. Augustine, FL
32084

This foundation has been set up for kids with terminal cancer so that some of their dreams can be fulfilled.

(Updated information about TJ and the Foundation)

A close friend of mine, along with myself are the ones who have started Dreams of a Lifetime for Cancer Patients. I want to share some more of the story with you.

TJ came into our lives only a few short months ago, actually right before the South Carolina game, and inspired us to start this organization. My friends wife was TJ's attending med student at Shands, and introduced her husband(my friend) to TJ. It wasn't long before TJ and he bonded and became good friends. They spent a lot of time together,

and with some help from the Gator boosters office we were able to get TJ to the Western Carolina game with the appropriate accommodations. TJ loved the Gators! More importantly he was a wonderful man and fought that cancer until the end. When we proposed the idea of this organization to TJ he was very excited, and wanted to contribute in any way possible. Tragically, TJ wasn't able to see the completion of the foundation he inspired us to start. However, we are striving to pass along the inspiration he shared with us to others in hopes that TJ will continue to impact lives long after he's left us.

We are going to begin our work in the North Florida area, taking our patients primarily from Shands and North Florida Regional Hospital. Because of this we expect to be working to fulfill the dreams of many Gator fans like TJ. We would love any and all help the rest of Gator Nation can provide.

**** Anyone who might be interested in making donations or helping out**** in another way please shoot me an email at (fundingdreams4cancer@gmail.com). I need to provide you all with a little more info on making out donations because we're still in the process of filling our paperwork with the IRS.

****TJ/Urban Meyer Tidbit:** Urban spent lots of time with TJ. He wanted to be updated on his condition if anything changed, and did not just simply pop his head in the door and say hello. He spent quality time with TJ. He invited TJ to a practice during the title game preparations, introduced TJ to his family and the team, brought TJ gifts from the team including Warm up suits, hats, signed helmets, Gator DVDs, and video players. He also brought along Aaron Hernandez, and Reggie Nelson to go along with the other players listed above. Also, as was already mentioned, Urban and Shelly took the time out of their presently extremely busy lives to attend TJ's memorial service today. That should tell you a lot about Urban Meyer and family. He does care.

God Bless you all, and thank you for helping us take care of our fellow Gators!

2-9-07 Sid reports. had a great call with marion.

how'd the city meeting go yesterday?

2-27-07 We get Weavers word.

3-1-07 review HPB vote for date certain.

3-5-07 We Let D know that we her decision not to comply with the boards motion.

3-8-07 Tom Saunders agrees to meet with Ralph and Ricardo.

3-19-07 We Sid agrees in writing to sit on the sidelines.

4-3-07 Staffs report creates a Woodbury Row Phase Three.

4-09-07 John,

Please let us know the status of the information requested last Tuesday, (see attached e-mail). As I mentioned earlier, we would like to review the approved projects and used some of the concepts and features that staff and the board have approved and fill comfortable with.

Also, we would like to set a short meeting (tomorrow if possible) with you and Dee to address some of the design issues, so we could continue with this project.

Thank you for your assistance.

Ricardo

Ricardo Cavallino, AIA
President
Ricardo Cavallino + Assoc., Inc.
22 S.E. 5th Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32601
352-377-1751 (O)
352-377-1765 (F)
RCA22@bellsouth.net

4-17-07 Woodbury Row Phase II is placed on CPUH CRA Advisory board agenda.

4-25-07 Ricardo communicates to Ralph to clarify weather to use or not use the guide lines.

4-26-07 the Wheelbarrow and The Car Inc. receives invoice for additional services from RCA.

5-7-07 (this was never brought to CRA per city legal)

Reid,

Thank you for your email. I think it will be going to the agenda review for the June meeting. I have a copy of the language enclosed for you.

RESOLUTION: The College Park/University Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board feels that Woodbury Row Phase II appears to be compatible with its objectives for the neighborhood's redevelopment.

Hope you are well.

Anthony

Anthony Lyons
CRA Manager
Gainesville Community Redevelopment Agency
MS 48, PO Box 490 | Gainesville, Florida 32602-0490

Phone: 352.334.2205 | Fax: 352.334.2132

5-10-07 Ralph,

Thank you for the opportunity to meet with us and our clients. Tomorrow at 1:30PM will be great. It will be important that Dee could attend the meeting as well, we worked on the elevation of the modified garage building as well and it will be important that she sees it (especially since she made a comment regarding the one story adjacent existing building, when it appears that these are other adjacent buildings that are 2 stories in height.

Additionally I would like to request a copy of the staff report at the time that it is completed (when you mail it to the HPB board members or earlier if possible), so we could have time to review it and be prepared for responses to the HPB.

At the last HPB meeting we received a copy of the staff report the day before the meeting, as you could imagine, there was no time to read it and prepare any response to the comments with so little time.

Thank you again, Ricardo

5-11-07 D. will not be available. Ralph

5-16-07
John,

Please find attached the revised street elevation profile as requested by Dee yesterday.

If you have any questions or comments, please let us.

Thank you, Ricardo

5-23-07 Tampa findings.

5-25-07 D. Henrichs is working on the report, it is not complete, and probably will not be completed until maybe Wednesday of next week. Ralph Hilliard

5-30-07 Ralph,

Regarding the information requested, the numbers of units on the Woodbury Row Phase II project are twenty three in a combination of three, three and half and four stories and the number of bedroom are 63.

If you need any other information please contact us at your earliest convenience.

6-1-07 Reid and Wells,

Early this morning I called Ralph to find out what is happening with the report. Ralph has a message in his answer machine that says "I will be out of the office for a few days". Immediately after I called John, asking him what is going on and why is it taking so long to produce this report. His response was that Dee is almost done with it and we will have it today, he also stated that due to the time delay they are postponing the meeting for the following week (June 12) for us to have more time to review the report.

Ricardo
6-1-07 John,

Thank you for letting us know that the HPD meeting was extended to June 12.

We informed our client of the extension of the meeting and they were not happy about the delay. Especially when we have been contacting you for the last two weeks and we never had a hint from you of this decision of extending the meeting.

We want to clearly communicate to you the opinion of our client: that if the reason of extending this meeting is to give us time to review your report, please note that at this time our client would like to go ahead with the meeting as originally scheduled despite the lack of time to review your report (which we still have not received).

Your last e-mail (received today) stating that the report will "be available to you as soon as it is completed sometime next week" appears vague and we still do not know if indeed we will have the time that we originally requested to review the report.

In addition to that, there were a number of concerned citizens that wanted to attend the HPB meeting and now they have to be informed of the extension which might not work with their schedule.

To learn about this extension so close to the meeting date is really not good planning, aren't there requirements about early or timely notice of changing public meetings? We thought that a fifteen day notice apply. Can you please tell us why the meeting is been postponed? We want to make sure it is not because of our project.

We continue to want to work with the board and staff to reach a fair and reasonable conclusion to this C.O.A. process, but please note that time is a big concern for our client.

Ricardo,

6-6-07 We receive staff report.

Wells and Reid,

Here it is!! When you've had a chance to look at it give us a call.

Joshua Shatkin

6-12-07

John,

Regarding the separate Certificate of Appropriateness requested for the demolition in the latest staff report of 6/12/07; our clients have the understanding that we have submitted an application that was for the demolition of the existing buildings and the approval of the proposed new construction.

Last Friday in our phone conversation you stated that this requirement for separate COAs was only a formality and was not going to delay the process with the HPB or approval.

Our clients wanted to make sure that at the next HPB meeting (6/12/07) the issue of demolition of the existing buildings and the approval of the proposed new construction are both addressed and decided at that time.

After the vote of the HPB (what ever the vote may be) if a new COA is needed we will be happy to do it, but please explain why this is needed and why Staff has not advised us of this issue at the time of the application submittal for this project.

Thank you very much.

6-14-07

We file this appeal.

This is just a small sampling of where this thing has been, before getting to you.

All that aside.

The question before you is did the HPB over step its authority and trump zoning and CRA requirements when HPB voted the project down.

I submit that even though the redevelopment meets the HPB's written guidelines. The HPB is not satisfied with the guidelines that they wrote and agreed to uphold, because the board is too far slanted toward preservation to permit the reasonable and allowed redevelopment the HPB said they would support.

Please ask the clerk to provide you with a copy of the Guidelines to redeveloping in UH historic district. The Guidelines clearly state that buildings may be 3 or 4 stories tall.

I look forward coming before you.

Please call me if you have any questions. 352-376-0768

Respectfully,

Reid Fogler