From: Greta Fuller

SAFE HAVEN – HAVEN-HIGH COURT
BZA APPLICATION No. 17358

I have read and researched the variances that Safe Haven has identified in BZA Application No. 17358. These are the following items that I would like to speak about today.

A. 11 DCMR 3103.2 for a variance from the extension of nonconforming uses within structures provisions under subsection 2002.3
B. A variance from the off-street parking requirements under subsection 2101.1
C. And to allow the renovation of two multifamily buildings comprising of 48 units instead of the existing 36 units.

1. I would first like to talk about Zoning Regulation, Chapter 21 Off-Street Parking Requirements. I am going to refer to Section 2101 Schedule of Requirements For Parking Spaces. This section states On and after May 12, 1958, all buildings or structures shall be provided with parking spaces as specified in the following table.
    a. The parking variance is needed because the R-3 zone does not have a calculation for multifamily structures under the table set forth in 2101.1.
    b. Safe Haven also states in their written statement that R-3 was R-5-A until the rezoning took place. R-5-A stated under 2101.1 if you refer to the table for apartment house and multiple dwelling 1 parking space for each dwelling unit.
    c. I do not feel Safe Haven is being considerate to the existing home owners and residences in the community when they ask for R-4 preference which would allow 1 space for every 3 dwellings. This is very near to the highest density of parking that is available on the table in 2101.1. Not only would this cause a hardship on the existing home owners and residence of Ward 8. It could also increase crime in the area, by this I mean a home owner can park in front of his home at the present time and they can see their car , in other words their car is in sight and immediate neighbors know who is who and has deterred theft and vandalism in some cases. If there is no parking we stand a chance of parking in unseen spaces, elders, pregnant mothers, citizens of the community will find it difficult to unload their parcels in front of their homes. Women stand the chance of being attacked when out of sight of their homes. Elders and all in the community stand a greater risk of being mugged if you must park away from your residence, for instance if you have a job that brings you home late in the night. Historic Anacostia has a large amount of elders who usually park in front of their homes. Also these elders are retired or

BZA
Case No. 17358
Exhibit No. 32

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17358
EXHIBIT NO. 32

on fixed incomes which do not allow them to purchase or repair automobiles as easily as someone who has a job. I can personally speak that my car and several of my neighbor's cars have been hit several times on this street because of the high volume of cars that speed up and down the street and because of the already narrow street with little to no parking space at the present time. Very few homes have parking spaces, and to put more cars on this street would make the street almost non passable. I have worked with others in our community and on my street Maple View Pl SE to call parking enforcement which has heightened their visibility and have begun to ticket persons without DC tags, expired tags and other violations. I have also worked with members of the community to request high visibility for our area from the police department because of the amount of hit and run accidents on Maple View PL. I have lived in DC over 21 years mostly in NW and since I have moved to Historic Anacostia my car has been hit 3 times in the last 3 years. Therefore, I propose that we stay with the R-5-A reference which is 1 unit 1 space and not that I do not support 1 space for every 3 dwellings and the petition signed by residence also speak to that matter.

2. I would now like the Board to refer to 2103.4 (c) that states The Board shall give consideration to the "Amount of traffic congestion existing or that the building or structure can reasonably be expected to create in the neighborhood". I believe allowing this variance will cause such congestion; disturb the peace and quiet of our neighborhood.
3. I would like to bring to the attention of the Board 2100.6 which states: "When the intensity of a building or structure existing before May 12, 1958 is increased by an addition of employees, dwelling units, gross floor area, seating capacity or other unit of measurement specified in 2101, parking spaces shall be provided for the addition, subject to 2100.7 through 2100.9.
4. I also do not know how Safe Haven will designate parking spaces. We the citizens of Anacostia feel that a lack of parking spaces may cause frustration between tenants which could result in a disturbance of the peace, order and quiet of our neighborhood.
5. We the citizens of Historic Anacostia also believe that a variance of this type will leave the neighborhood vulnerable. We believe other developers will seek the same variances and use this case as history.
6. We the citizens of Historic Anacostia also ask the Board to look at the area in which Safe Haven wishes to place this building. Historic homes surround this location on all sides. The property itself is historic land but the buildings are not. Historic home owners wish that all properties built in the residential area of Historic Anacostia conform and look like the existing Historic homes.
7. We the citizens of Historic Anacostia ask the Board to take in consideration our previous R-5-A status which allows for 1 unit for 1 space if the Board must decide on parking space requirements.

8. We the citizens of Historic Anacostia also disagree with the written statement provided by Safe Haven that low income are less likely to have a car. I have seen the Section 8 building residence own 2-3 cars at any given time. I would also like to point out that the Section 8 housing is within the same block as the Safe Haven affordable housing. These are the words that have been used in documentation to describe their plans to the neighborhood. Whereas they have used the words low income in the zoning application which is not the same as affordable housing.
9. We the citizens of Historic Anacostia also would like to state that others have opposed this building and parking and at this site in the past, as identified in appeal No.8020, December 1964 as stated in this application.