

Paul E. Hagen

From: Anne Murphy [anne_mccully_murphy@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 28, 2007 6:29 PM
To: Ispector@stimson.org; Paul E. Hagen; adeleharrell@gmail.com
Subject: Sibley Hospital Expansion

Mr. Spector and Mr. Hagen: Please forward this to the Zoning Commission or make such use of it as you see fit.

To D.C. Zoning Commission

We write in opposition to the most recent submission for construction of the Sibley Hospital medical office building. Sibley has not satisfied the conditions set for it at the time the Commission last declined to approve the office tower. It has engaged in no outreach to the neighbors most immediately affected by the expansion. It has not satisfactorily addressed the parking issues previously raised by the neighbors. Although it has lowered the height of the office building, it has expanded the footprint of the building horizontally, with the result that the tower is still much too large for the neighborhood. Although the hospital has made some improvement in parking, it has not allowed sufficient free parking to compensate for the traffic the building will cause.

We live on Pallsade Lane, a street already adversely impacted by the hospital. Hospital visitors speed on our street, litter, and park on our lawn. The exit from our street to Loughboro is sometimes impassable because of traffic, and traffic will by definition become worse when the office tower is built. We have observed numerous accidents at the Dalecarlia-Loughboro intersection, yet adequate traffic calming has yet to be proposed.

We believe that the majority of our neighbors share our concerns. The Zoning Commission may receive less mail and fewer protests at this time, but that does not mean the community does not care. Rather it reflects the extremely short notice given to the community, as well as Sibley's outreach failures, in regard to the comment period. Please vote no on the proposed medical office building.

Sincerely,

James and Anne Murphy
4902 Palisade Lane NW
Washington, D.C. 20016

Boo! Scare away worms, viruses and so much more! Try Windows Live OneCare! [Try now!](#)

10/29/2007

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.05-42
EXHIBIT NO.213A2

Anita R. Rought

From: Adele Harrell [adeleharrell@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2007 6:30 AM
To: Paul E. Hagen
Subject: Fwd: FW: New Sibley submission to zoning commission attached

Amits letter

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Amit Sachdev <amitsachdev01@hotmail.com>
Date: Oct 24, 2007 6:06 PM
Subject: FW: New Sibley submission to zoning commission attached
To: adeleharrell@gmail.com, phagen@bdlaw.com

Adele,

I have reviewed the revised proposal and continue to find it unacceptable principally related to its continued failure to adequately understand or address the significant traffic impacts the proposed MOB will have. My detailed concerns are explained below, and as I member in good standing of the coalition, I would be happy to have my comments included as part of the response to the Zoning Commission to the revised proposal by Sibley.

My detailed concerns about the revised proposal are as follows:

The agreement to move the helipad and partially upgrade Little Falls Road does very little to accomplish a reduction in the bus traffic on Loughboro -- not just Metro, but Montgomery County Ride-on buses also. Without a commitment from DC and the Army Corp and Montgomery County to actually agree to move the bus stops and idling locations off of Loughboro Road as part of this building project, this offer is meaningless. If I had to value it, it would currently have a value of zero. If they are going to offer this improvement as a community concession it must have some value - an actual value of use would be to reduce/mitigate the bus traffic on Loughboro that occurs until about 1 am (idling buses across the street) and starts at 5:45 am with more idling buses across the street - by designing and moving them to Little falls and building a nice waiting area there. Moreover, with the redesign and elimination of the idle lane where they currently idle which is next to the intersection at Delcarlia and Loughboro - if they intend to idle under the new design, they will be idling on loughboro in much closer proximity to the residences because under their proposal the idling lane is removed . So the Sibley design plans actually create greater bus nuisance rather than help to mitigate it. Sibley's answer that it's out of their control is unacceptable -- it's their proposal to rezone - they must take responsibility for working with DC to mitigate the impact of rezoning -- this remains my greatest overall concern with their proposal, i.e. that in each case Sibley only appears willing to take responsibility for what they estimate to be the added burden to the community of their changes when in fact if they propose a change they must account for how that change affects the conditions that already

10/29/2007

exist on the surface streets -- they can't simply say -- well it was there before, so its not our problem. Yet they said precisely that at the zoning hearing.

The next far more pressing concern is that: 1) nothing in their revision (although the enclosures werent attached so I didnt see any new sketches) address the major traffic problems that already exist at the two intersections most affected by this redesign i.e. 1) Delcarlia at Loughboro and 2) MacArthur at Loughboro. Both intersections already are hazardous and using Sibley's own analysis do not meet the city's current standards for wait times during rush hour. We must recognize these are dangerous intersections - primarily during rush hours when pass-through traffic uses both intersections as commuter shortcuts. (usually in the morning 8AM-9:30, and evenings 5-630pm on weekdays). These intersections currently don't get passing marks under Sibley's analysis for rush hour wait times. At the hearing the Sibley folks stated that the existing conditions were essentially not their concern, and limited their case to mitigating the added impact their MOB addition might have. The net is the same, the intersections will get worse not better with the MOB addition and the hospital is requesting the change in zoning, so it is their obligation to help improve these intersections to passable from a safety and wait time point of view.

With regard to the Delecarlia and Loughboro intersection, if Sibley's plan for changes is the sameas they presented to the Zoning Commission at the hearing (ie the enclosures dont modify the new design they presented to the zoning commision at the hearing) -- it is clear they are actually going to make that intersection FAR MORE hazardous than it already is, and create far greater wait times during rush hour. It's already an "F" by their scale during rush with over 100 seconds of wait if I recall correctly, it will get far worse under their proposal.

For the following reasons: 1) they propose to eliminate the right hand yield/merge (which is currently two lanes merging onto loughboro westbound going down the hill) and instread funnel all of the westbound traffic heading down loughboro to a stop along with the eastbound traffic waiting to turn left from delcarlia onto loughboro. The net effect is to reduce this flow of traffic coming off Delacarla from three lanes (two yielding, one stopping) down to two lanes (both stopping). This will dramatically increase (not decrease) wait times on delacarla to turn either left or right onto Loughboro. (these wait times are already failing acceptable standards today). By increasing these wait times (I would guess it could easily double the left turn wait time) two things will happen 1) more accidents -- people who live here everyday know that most accidents and near accidents occur at this intersection because drivers during rush hour get impatient turning left onto loughboro from delcarlia to go eastbound and when they finally get their turn they make bad decisions and try and jump out into traffic without enough clearance - we see it every morning. Extending that wait time at this intersection with the new traffic load and the reduced lanes will cause more accidents.

2) extending that wait time will cause more people to race through the back streets to try and beat the wait. The single most dangerous practice we have now is actually people racing up Manning to Palisades Lane to cut over to Delcarlia in order to avoid both of the two intersections we are discussing (ie Macarthur at loughboro and Delcarlia at loughboro) -- these people are almost always VA and MD commuters trying not to have to wait in turning lines at the offending

intersections. To make this "profitable" in these drivers minds, they have to get onto delcarlia faster than it would normally take them if they had waited in the lines on loughboro - so the net result is between 800-930AM weekdays, people speed up Manning turn on Palisades and speed over to Loughboro. This is very dangerous. I have almost been hit several times. They used to do it on MacComb but now the speed bumps seem to be helping there. Moreover, the cutthrough streets likely to be affected by the increased traffic and delays on loughboro and macarthur --the cutthrough streets being manning, watson and palisades lane, do NOT have sidewalks. While this is not Sibley's problem per se, it is a fact and as such all pedestrians on those streets have no choice but to walk in the street (typically with dog and stroller in my case) and this will increase safety risk with the extra traffic volume. Overall the proposed Sibley redesign of the intersection at Delecarlia and Loughboro will extend the wait times at that intersection and force more commuters to fly through our backstreets in search of shortcuts and this will increase pedestrian and child danger. There is no doubt in my mind

The final point here is that Sibley actually has an obligation (which they seem unwilling to accept) to estimate just these types of impacts ie the actual likely impact of their proposed redesign. What I find most remarkable is that all of the traffic impact surveys are on current conditions. They then project their increased potential load due to the added transit to the building, but they do nothing to actually assess how their own NEW PROPOSALS will function -- in other words -- once redesigned if done in the way Sibley proposes -- will their new proposed intersections BE BETTER, WORSE, or the SAME as before. SIBLEY SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE A STUDY OF THEIR NEW DESIGN IMPACTS, NOT CURRENT CONDITIONS. Even without empirical data for the reasons I described above -- I feel very confident the traffic impacts will be far worse at both of these key intersections as a result of these proposals and NOT any better. And nothing in the new Sibley submission addresses these concerns in any way.

For these reasons, I continue to oppose the rezoning and am happy to share these thoughts as part of the coalition with anyone who will listen, including Sibley, the ANC and the DC Zoning Commission.

Amit Sachdev
5218 Loughboro Road NW
Washington DC 20016
(located within 50 feet of Sibley's property)

Climb to the top of the charts! Play Star Shuffle: the word scramble challenge with star power. [Play Now!](#)

Paul E. Hagen

From: Lennard, Ed [Ed.Lennard@bcbsa.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 8:40 AM
To: RachelWToo@aol.com
Cc: leonard.spector@miis.edu; Paul E. Hagen; adeleharrell@gmail.com
Subject: Sibley expansion

Dear Rachel,

I am writing to oppose the latest iteration of the Sibley Hospital expansion plan. While it is slightly less objectionable than their earlier proposal, it still represents a substantial shift in the character of the neighborhood from a residential community to a commercial zone. The impact of additional traffic would still be significant.

My fundamental position has always been that the hospital has not demonstrated the need for the expansion. I can believe it might be beneficial for the hospital, at least financially, but I have seen no evidence that it is necessary for the continued financial health of the organization or that it would in any way contribute to enhanced patient care. I can believe that it might be integral to the hospital's plans for growth and increased financial success, and that this result might well be important to the personal success of the hospital's administrators, but this does not equate to a benefit to the community, either the community of neighborhood residents or the community of patients who receive care at Sibley Hospital.

Thank you.

Ed Lennard
5266 Loughboro Rd NW
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 966-1311