

RECEIVED

2002  
1 21  
2007 10/22 PM 5:24

RE Case: 200 H Street NE

05-37

I write in opposition to the current development plan.

The zoning request is a very large gift to a private developer for which the City is not receiving benefit.

The City is now a very desirable place for development activity and we should not give away very valuable resources on the threat that a developer will leave. There is still a strong development momentum in the district. It is time for us to now reap those benefits not just give them away.

The property has already been up-zoned with the H-Street Overlay since the purchase - granting an immediate financial benefit to the developer.

The argument in support of up-zoning from the City Planning Department is that this is a transit zone. This status does not differ from the status at the time of the H-street overlay planning - It was then a transit area as it is now. With no change in the status there is no corresponding argument for increased zoning based on being a transit-oriented area. The status has not changed. It was a transit area at the time of the overlay zoning as it is now.

The developer has not presented any case for the up-zoning. There is no supporting documentation that there is a need nor a benefit to the City - apart from a few fee of brick sidewalk not a remotely corresponding value for the gift represented by the up-zoning.

There has been little attention given to the precedent given for very large structures being built on the same block as fragile townhouses.

The adjoining ANC made a good zoning case against the up zoning but abandoned it when it was agreed that the zoning would not be a precedent for their ANC. So it is ok to do it to us - just not them.

The developer has made much of the number of meetings with the neighborhood. However, they have been very restricted to only 2-3 people. The attitude has been if you don't agree with them then you cannot participate. They have been very reluctant to hear opinions and ideas from the entire neighborhood.

### Developer's History with the Neighbor

I often feel as though I am shouting that "the emperor has no clothes." No matter how many times they claim to be a "good neighbor" they have not exhibited that trait with the construction of the SEC and adjoining building.

I have been included on the meetings with the developer on the SEC construction.

ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia

ZONING COMMISSION

District of Columbia

CASE NO. 200-37

EXHIBIT NO. 118

118

For almost two years when I drove to work, I probably called the developer's rep 2-3 times each week with some infraction in how they managed the traffic and parking around the site.

I came to be involved with them when I had a couple of days off and the pile driving on the SEC building shook my house. The company tasked with responding to the neighborhood laughed at my complaint and then the Dryfus staff told me they did not have to notify our block of the work on the project.

They have continually close 2<sup>nd</sup> street with no notification for short to longer periods of time.

Construction trucks continue to drive down 3<sup>rd</sup> street with impunity – there is no enforcement of the agreement not to bring construction trucks down our street.

There subcontractor used to gather at the end of the work day on Saturdays to drink beer off the alley and then race down the alley – we have been very lucky that no one has been injured with this reckless behavior.

Large construction trucks are directed to back up "G" street which is one way – causing a hazard to those who come out of the alley – not expecting trucks to be coming up the wrong way backwards. The traffic direction on 2<sup>nd</sup> street is often not there or not paying attention so that traffic backs up.

Subcontractors have started construction before 7 in the morning and worked after the cut off time.

I have lost track of the number of issues that have arisen from the lack of construction management at the SEC building from this same developer.

While I appreciate the effort that the Planning department has shown in providing for the mediation process, it was a continuation of the limited participation. Of the 5 people involved, only 2 participants are directly impacted by this proposed development. Therefore, 3 of the participants have no vested interest in protecting our neighborhood.

This project requires a great deal more consideration – especially as it pertains to the impact on our homes. I hope that you will vote to postpone your action until these issues are resolved.

Sincerely;



Anne Morrison

722 3<sup>rd</sup> St. NE

Washington DC 20002