From: [redacted]
To: Le, Thai-Chau
Subject: Input to June 2nd zoom meeting
Date: Friday, June 4, 2021 4:57:39 PM

[External Email]

I want to make two main comments to add as input to the EIR scope zoom meeting June 2 about the proposed project at the corner Norwood and Ruby in Evergreen.

First, as a comparison of projects, the property of Groesbeck Hill Park was considered for possible park development before any of the housing development around it was begun. People bought their homes with knowledge of that potential for development. A few homeowners at the time, mostly directly across from the park, resisted that development. I do not think such resistance justifiable because of foreknowledge. I know this history very well. I am an original homeowner in the area since 1980 and served as president and principal organizer of the exceptionally large neighbor organization (Evergreen Advisory Group) that promoted that park development. By comparison, no single-family homeowner could have possibly predicted such a large impacting project might be considered for the corner of Norwood and Ruby. This must be particularly devastating to the homeowners next to the project.

Second, in listening to actual details for the first time of the proposed project, I was impressed and became saddened. I know what it is to dream about a project you're wanting. But what I heard at that meeting was a shattering of an original dream. The reduction in scope seemed much too far of a sacrificing to try and appease the neighborhood and still did not go far enough. While the plan from the graphic projections connotes beauty, peacefulness, and care for the others next to it, I think it belies the potential impact and is inadequate for the original expressed need of its congregation. There must be sadness and pain associated with its diminishment, and as commented at the meeting offers a complete lack for possible growth.

I sat on councilman Dave Cortese's Evergreen/East Hill Committee that reviewed potential development or lack of it for the large tracks of vacant land in the area. Surely adequate portions of that land could be made available. As was commented at the meeting, some of the old golf course land would seem well suited to accommodate original parking needs as well as an expanded temple, residential, and gathering needs. I think it could then be a considerable community asset without having such negative impact on established neighborhoods. The District 8 City Council Representative's office should help this organization interface with landowners and other appropriate city and county offices to obtain an equitable resolution that much better fulfills original needs and dreams and reaches a truly win-win situation.

Signed,

Gordon F Lund
[redacted]

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.