

THOMAS S. PAQUIN
347 L STREET SE
WASHINGTON, DC 20003
(202) 569-5628
tspaquin@gmail.com

January 8, 2015

Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia
Office of Zoning
441 4th Street NW, Suite 210S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Z.C. Case No. 03-12Q/03-13Q

Dear Members of the Zoning Commission:

I am a homeowner along with my wife on the 300 block of L Street SE in the Capitol Quarter neighborhood. My wife and I moved to the neighborhood in 2012, eager to live in a “mixed-use, mixed income” community that was and is still under development.

We have enjoyed living in this community for over two years. The residents on our block are a diverse mix of families with children, married couples of various ages and backgrounds, single people, owners, renters, and individuals of varying levels of income. Taken as a whole, our neighbors on the 300 block of L Street SE seem to epitomize to original PUD goals of creating a “vibrant mixed-use and mixed-income community.”

The zoning modification request that is the subject of this case to modify the development plans for the remaining parcels in the neighborhood and allow construction of a 48 unit multifamily building on the northern portion of Square 767, of which all units would be ACC units, is counter to the goals of establishing a “vibrant mixed-use and mixed-income community.”

Several of my neighbors have submitted their own testimony opposing the requested modifications to the PUD, going into many more details regarding the history of the requested modifications, and laying out a detailed opposition. Due to the constraints of time, my testimony will not go into such details – but I wish to introduce a practical human element for consideration.

Under the DCHA proposal to have a 100% market-rate building next to a 100% ACC rental building, two separate cultures would be established side-by-side, the "us" and "them" dynamic that is counter to the goals of a mixed community.

I have enjoyed handing out candy during Halloween sitting next to my ACC neighbors while sharing a bowl of chili. I have enjoyed playing catch with their kids, and having their kids over to play with mine. Those kind of community connections are essential to fulfill the original vision for this community. I believe that those community connections would be lost with the development of segregated housing on the scale of the DCHA proposal.

DCHA has stated in it's request that their goal is the speedy delivery of units. But why should the community sacrifice the goals of a mixed community, and the culture our community has already begun to develop, for the sake of speedy delivery of the remaining units?

In conclusion, DCHA should not be granted the requested flexibility regarding the location and distribution of the 206 remaining ACC public housing units, as requested in this case.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "TSP".

Thomas S. Paquin