



Public Comment Received for:
Item 3: 1601 State St
(PLN2015-00524)

Name of Sender	Distributed prior to hearing	Distributed after the hearing
1. Dave Jones	x	

From: [DAVID JONES](#)
To: [Community_Development_HLCsecretary](#)
Subject: 1601 State St.
Date: Monday, September 26, 2022 3:12:16 PM

EXTERNAL

I'd like to comment on the Review After Final for this address (Item #3 on the Sep. 28, 2022 agenda).

I'd been watching the construction of the project for some time and it was the topic of discussion with a few people when I realized the odd roof of the elevator tower was also noted by others. I searched the past files and saw that the configuration was different than the approved design. A few months ago, I brought this to the attention of the HLC staff and got confirmation there was a violation. This was before plaster was even applied to the construction. It has taken this amount of time for the applicant to respond and get on the agenda. the contractor is asking for approval of the roof design as constructed, not as approved.

The thickness of the cantilever roof is about twice of all the other roof overhangs and really is not consistent with the remainder of the building. The approved design had a very small depth. The larger overhang mostly covers inaccessible roof areas. It appears the rationale for such a deep fascia is due to the way the roof drainage is configured. But that design could easily been different, still drain to the desired area. The large overhang is only for appearance sake anyway as the elevator door is on the opposite side of the tower.

Granted this issue is not the most important one the HLC has faced but it is important for designers and contractors to realize that the HLC approval is not optional. Without conformance to the approved plans, the HLC process is compromised and becomes meaningless.

This item also calls attention to the way conformance of HLC approval is verified. Right now, it is the building inspectors that are tasked with "enforcement". In my view, they have many other more important issues on their plate like code compliance, health and safety to deal with. And there is a certain amount of judgement involved in making the call on what "compliance" is. I'm sure the inspector on this project had no idea there was a variance to the approved design. I'm not sure how to correct this part of the process other than vigilance of the staff and good faith of responsible applicants.

Dave Jones