

January 25, 2015

To: Chairman Lloyd Jordan, D.C Board of Zoning Adjustment
From: Opposition Party BZA Case Nos. 18852 & 18853

RE: BZA Case Nos. 18852 & 18853 – Response to ANC 2F Amended Letter, December 10, 2014

ANC 2F submitted an amended letter to replace their previous letter of November 10, 2014 to clarify the details of their split vote on the parking variance.

The amended letter does not include the **Proposed Conditions of Approval** attached to the original letter.

The amended letter includes the details of the commissioner's vote on October 1, 2014 where 7 commissioners voted to support the following variance and special exceptions by a **vote of 6-0**.

1. Side yard variance for 91 Blagden Alley; 2. Open court variance for 90 Blagden Alley; 3. Lot occupancy variance for the first floor of 90 Blagden Alley; and 4. Special exception for multiple penthouses and related setback requirements for both 90 & 91 Blagden Alley.

ANC 2F voted to support the applicant's request for complete parking relief at both 90 & 91 Blagden Alley. Seven (7) commissioners were present, the ANC **voted 4-3** to support the Applicant's request for complete parking relief.

The ANC 2F split vote **shows the ambivalence to this project**, and rightly so. It is also crucial to note the **significant and growing opposition in the community**, as evidenced by the formulation of an opposition party with 10 property owners within the 200-foot boundary, and the signatures of **135+** opposing residents and property owners within Square 368 and 369.

ANC 2F noted in their minutes of the November meeting, “Several Commissioners and community members expressed their opposition to 100% parking variance for the fully furnished 123-unit residential project, **simultaneously noting the negative precedent that would be set.**”

The minutes went on to state “the very nature of [this particular] development makes it unique among projects requesting this extent of parking relief. I believe the Applicant has shown to the project will have only a minimal impact on the community's parking stock, and that they are putting in place significant remedial efforts to address the concerns identified by the community and CDC.”

This is not true. The Applicant has not shown there will be minimal impact on the community; they have merely stated this but have provided no fact-based argument. And if impacts are to be “minimal”, then why the need for **“significant remedial efforts?”** It is the belief of the community surrounding this apartment complex, that the effects would be very significant and perhaps disastrous. **They would also be completely irreversible and would set an extremely negative precedent for other developers in the area and citywide.**