

Nyarku, John (DCOZ)

From: Moy, Clifford (DCOZ)
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 6 52 PM
To: Nyarku, John (DCOZ), Varga, Stephen F (DCOZ)
Subject: FW: Case # 18638 - Rosebusch LLC and Greg M Busch

From: Michael A McKenzie [mailto:michaela.mckenzie@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 5:02 PM
To: DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ)
Subject: Case # 18638 - Rosebusch LLC and Greg M. Busch

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 18638
EXHIBIT NO. 67

I apologize for not making the 3pm deadline for this submission.

My partner and I own a unit at The Metropole building on 15th Street NW. The unit we purchased in 2010 faces north faces north to the proposed development.

First off, I'd like to thank the Boarding of Zoning Adjustment for their due diligence with reviewing the proposed Church Street development. We understand this has been a long and difficult process, but we appreciate the decisions you've made thus far that did not allow this project to be approved without first hearing all the concerns and issues being addressed.

I'd like to also state our position on promoting growth within the District and especially affordable housing. We believe both issues are very important to the growth and future of the District. The expansion of both will allow further diversity within our city and allow those within different income groups to live and work throughout many neighborhoods.

However, with that said we expect our local government to continue to enforce, create, and reevaluate rules and zoning to allow such growth. But allow growth while ensuring those directly and indirectly impacted will not be adversely impacted by one-off variance approvals and deviations from the District's growth plan.

We've listed our concerns of the development. We do understand there have been several variance approval. However, we wanted to again state the concerns we believe this development proposes to the city, neighborhoods, residents, and environment.

1. Proposed Variance for a Communal Rooftop Deck - Currently, the way our block is developed, we can hear noise from balconies belonging to the multiple rental units on P Street between 14th and 15th street. A communal rooftop deck on top of a rental building will create unnecessary noise pollution and disturbance. The current management structure of the proposed development does not have any onsite staff. Therefore, when noise occurs, we'll have no choice but to call 911 and then complain to the owners the following Monday. If a roof deck is approved, then tangible and enforceable rules and fines should be a part of the development and agreement with the city.

2. Proposed Variance on Parking - We believe the city does not have a right to forbid a taxpayer and/or owner from obtaining a parking permit for their registered neighborhood. Approving this variance will create both create a precedence allowing future developments to move forward with the required spaces. Years ago the

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 18638
EXHIBIT NO. 67

city required a set amount of spaces per new unit to limit impact to on street parking and manage DC's traffic and parking problems. Allowing a development of this size to only have a few spaces shows residents that our local government is no longer concerned with balancing the needs and infrastructure. Can the city demonstrate they have the controls in place within the Motor Vehicle systems and have proper procedures to enforce providing parking to certain residents?

3. Proposed Design Concerns

a. The size of the proposed development and number of units. Our concerns over the number of proposed units in this space is troublesome. These 'micro units' do not benefit anyone except the developer who will be collecting rent. Rent for these units within this neighborhood could not be considered affordable. Having 38 units in this space this size could set a precedent from the city. Other developers will take this precedents to maximize their investments with little to no regard to the occupants and or surrounding properties and neighbors. We believe this property could be better used to develop a smaller set of units within the confined space that can be aesthetically pleasing and reduce the concerns and issues being addressed with the size of this development.

b. The current rendering of the property will not blend with the surrounding buildings. A balance of brick and glass construction like the building on the block would make the building blend better.

c. The proposal of an all glass design that is to face south could cause sun reflection and potential increased heat from the wall of glass. Metropole's north and east side facing units could experience additional sun glare. The increased sun glare could cause units facing north and east to have higher daytime temperatures. Increased temperatures would cause impact all owners of the Metropole with increased shared utility costs. Our building has a central heating and cooling system. Monthly expenses of the system are divided among owners based on a units square footage. Additionally, units facing north and east have smaller HVAC units. The southern and western facing units have a larger HVAC unit with greater capacity to compensate for the southern exposure temperatures. If increased glare would rise temperatures of units facing this development, it would be costly to each existing owner of the Metropole. That is if it was even possible to increase the capacity of the HVAC units due to current HVAC closet designs.

d. Impact to Unit Values within MetroPole and surrounding building - The large number of units will undoubtedly block northern views for many of the residents on the alley side of the building and those residing in the upper floors of 1450 Church St property. This will certainly reduce the values of the north facing units. Lower values means less tax money and transfer tax collected from these properties. residents. (Overbearing design and limiting view of our bldg and the blocking of the 6th and 7th floor windows of the building beside the proposed bldg) Design could devalue units in Metropole and surrounding condo units. Decreased values mean lower transfer tax and real estate tax income for the city and more importantly lower return on owners investment.

Additionally, we were not happy with the way we were notified or how this has been handled by the developers.

We are not sure if the developers purposely went to our management company in an effort to delay the response or sidestep the process all together. Those within the Metropole were unaware of this development until it was preliminarily approved by our ANC. I believe the majority of the support for this project comes from friends and acquaintances that live on the block. We do not believe approval from someone that lives down the block or on another side of a block constitutes proper support. Furthermore, I believe the approval process of the ANC should change to ensure all proper notification was provided before an project like this is reviewed. All these actions caused the Metropole to hire an attorney during the approval of this development. A

costly amount of money from residents to address and fight proposed variances that directly impact our homes and neighborhood.

Unsolicited emails and phone calls to Metropole residents directly from the developers when they heard of potential opposition began was completely unnecessary. Such actions should be considered illegal during the zoning approval process.

We thank for allowing us to communicate our concerns to the board.

Sincerely,

Michael McKenzie & Ryan Obermiller

Unit 612 of The Metropole