

Hello Paul:

Here are a few more points that need to be made with regard to my project as compared to Bradley Square.

My Community Housing Project, CHP, meets all zoning requirements, Bradley does not. CHP has on site parking for all dwelling units, Bradley is 10 to 15 parking spaces short. CHP has a design reminiscent of 1890's Cottage City Hotels, Bradley Two on Dukes County Ave. is so out of proportion it looks fake, similar to the fake gables on Tisbury Market Place. CHP has Mark London's stated proper proportions of twice as wide as tall, see his report on Dukes County Ave., Bradley is almost three to one and is typical of nothing on the island except Tisbury Market Place. CHP is residential housing only, Bradley is housing, retail, office, meeting room and will still bring parking chaos to the neighborhood. The island needs resident housing but has a glut of retail and office space currently available. CHP by design is dramatically more Green than Bradley due to the fact that CHP houses 12 units in one building. This far more efficient use of land allows for proper parking capability, a twenty foot setback and a more attractive streetscape. CHP is far more cost effective to build, has a traditional look considered elegant by the Cottage City Historical Society, uses far less materials to house more residents, will use far less energy to build, heat and cool, has huge solar potential from hidden solar panels on the roof and because the hallways provide an easy route for piping between floors from roof to cellar has easy solar retrofit capability. Bradley, because of design, has no solar potential. Green = efficient use of space, materials and energy to build and efficient use of energy to heat and cool.

I also want to urge the Commission to not load CHP up with conditions because it will turn off potential buyers to have the feeling they are living under the thumb of the Commission. This is the same reason I have found people of my target demographic, those affording \$325,000 - \$350,000 units, staying away from Affordable Housing type restrictions in that they want to own their property and not partner with some future unknown bureaucracy. I would strongly urge the Commission to end the once a DRI always a DRI for this and other reasons that are contrary to the future economic sustainability of the Island.

Please add this to my staff report  
Thanks Paul

Donald N. Muckerheide