

OFFICE OF ZONING
2009 FEB 17 PM 12:03

ANN O. HAMILTON
3518 Newark St., NW
Washington, DC 20016

February 17, 2009

Chairman Anthony Hood
D.C. Zoning Commission
441 Fourth St., NW, Suite 210S
Washington, DC 20001

Ref: Case #08-15 (Friendship-Macomb SC Inc.)

Dear Mr. Hood,

I was so distressed when I read the DDOT Report of February 11, 2009, on the above case that I am writing to you to suggest that the hearing scheduled for February 19th be postponed until you can have the benefit of a report that identifies the issues accurately and addresses them honestly. Failing that, the Commission will be relying on information that is actively misleading.

To point to but a few of the egregious errors:

- The report says that DDOT's "independent investigation" revealed that the existing Giant received "1 to 2 deliveries per day," ending by 2:00 PM. **Fact:** The applicant itself acknowledges the arrival of 5 to 6 semi tractor-trailers and 25 to 30 single-unit vendor trucks (box trucks and vans) a day, even at the existing, smaller, under-utilized store, and not including the additional retail and commercial that would be part of the PUD, and these deliveries continue until at least 5:00 PM.
- The DDOT report says that current delivery trucks "travel on Wisconsin Ave and take a right on Newark Street to access the store's loading docks," and concludes that "One of the more important factors of the applicant's transportation report is the strong attempt to route deliveries to the north and south parcels via Idaho Avenue." **Fact:** Under the current pattern, trucks *already* turn from Wisconsin Ave. onto Idaho Ave., and only then turn left on Newark for a few yards to the loading entrance, so the claimed improvement is totally specious.
- The DDOT report says that Idaho Ave. has a "wide right of way," "approximately 50 feet wide" that, once turned into a two way configuration "will allow for an easier truck delivery system." **Fact:** Idaho Ave. is 36 feet wide. With 8-foot parking lanes on both

CASE NO.

08-15

EXP

0.

148

sides, this would leave only 20 feet for two travel lanes, not enough for two SUVs, much less two semi tractor-trailers.

- While it refers to “7 loading berths,” the DDOT report makes no mention of the location of those berths. **Fact:** One loading berth is proposed to be at the end of a narrow public alley on Macomb Street, which has implications for delivery traffic patterns that are nowhere mentioned in the report.
- The DDOT report says the action plan for coordinating truck loading and deliveries on the north parcel is “similar in scope to the south parcel” and concludes that it is “sound” and will therefore “allow for proper use of the loading docks.” **Fact:** The proposal says nothing specific about the management of such activities on the south parcel, and *nothing at all* about truck management on the north parcel. Nor does the proposal or the DDOT report discuss the probability of street unloading and deliveries.
- The DDOT report concludes that the 535 parking spaces proposed by the applicant is sufficient. **Fact:** Except for 30 spaces allocated to existing retail users south of the PUD (to meet a demand estimated at perhaps 175 spaces) and 30 spaces allocated for overnight residential parking, neither of which is mentioned in the DDOT report, the proposal and the report are absolutely silent on how to meet existing traditional demand on both the north and south block properties and on Idaho Ave.
- The report speaks of a “rigid delivery schedule” for all the retail uses, including the new supermarket, and of “safeguards that will assist with traffic management.” **Fact:** Apart from a new traffic signal at the intersection of Idaho and Wisconsin, the proposal is totally silent on any such measures.

I could cite many more examples of factual errors in the DDOT report, but I will spare you. Suffice it to say that I believe the Zoning Commission deserves to, and should, base its decision on a document reflecting less bias and carelessness in its preparation. I don't see how that can be done on the current schedule, and suggest that the hearing be postponed to make it possible.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ann O. Hamilton". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ann" being the most prominent.

Ann O. Hamilton