

Linda Brown, Greenleaf Resident
lindac.brown@yahoo.com
ZC Case #02-38, Testimony

This case represents the status quo in recent development schemes for Ward 6 and Southwest, my longtime home.

I adopt all issues those in opposition have raised and more.

I am a native Washingtonian. I've lived in the Greenleaf senior community for more than a decade. I call Ward 6 my home and I am dreading how more and more of the same types of luxury projects as that before you now will ultimately affect my life, the life of my daughter who has disabilities, and the lives of my friends, family, and neighbors living and working in the Ward 6 neighborhoods nearby.

This is a case of a major modification and major elimination of an important open public site and amenity. This is a applicant asking to build 600 new housing units with only 5 for families.

The project is a hardship on residents like me and the surrounding community, especially since I am on a fixed income and most especially since affordability is currently based on a metric that goes up every year, the AMI. This is unjust.

Here again, the affordability numbers and levels are such that it barely meets the minimums and will be mostly studio/one bedrooms. That means the so-called affordable units will only be affordable to single professionals making about \$55,000 a year.

From what I can tell, there are no demographics analysis and no local level surveys or reports on the record showing who in the neighborhood may be vulnerable to more housing cost burdens this luxury overdevelopment will only heighten.

The Commission must realize this type of project exacerbates the existing affordable housing crisis for families in Ward 6. It also continues to put gentrification pressure on the existing affordable housing in the surrounding area, including that of public housing.

Further, without the developer (aka real estate speculator) being asked to step up to contribute to utility upgrades to support their project, among the many projects in the area, the overdevelopment will inevitably increase utility bills. For those on fixed incomes or already housing-cost burdened, increases in utility bills increases displacement pressures. Developer contributions to upgrades of utilities (water pipes, utility conduits and needs) as a condition of approval may substantially mitigate costs passed onto ratepayers like me.

Bringing 600 new units online will also bring additional and unmitigated traffic volumes, no matter what the applicant's expert say (you can't mitigate the numbers of cars/trucks that

each project creates with stop signs and new stop lights).

Projects, especially when taken cumulatively, all together challenge equitable access to transportation and parking for me and my daughter. My daughter has special needs by which I require readily available nearby parking as a caregiver.

The size of the project is too big and will further impair our community's access to unclogged and free flowing public transit ways. School buses will be further restricted, emergency responders will be restricted, my life will be restricted. Please shrink this project down in size to make up for all the other overdevelopment approvals in recent years.

Further, for the above reasons and due to its sheer size, this project will also obviously impact pedestrian safety (especially for those in wheelchairs like my daughter) and will impact the quality of our air. Please study this. Obviously shrinking the project down will reduce these impacts.

If this project goes forward (it really shouldn't) our community wants to be compensated by the developer during the years of construction that we have learned the hard way can bring serious negative impacts to our health and quality of life. We want the developer to set up a fund to help folks stay at hotels at times of significant anticipated dust impacts and noise impacts to the surrounding community especially for those with children and for elders. And we want the developer to pay for any remediation efforts such as on site water sprayers and mesh dust fences and canopies to be used during all times.

Finally, as a nearby public housing resident, I am asking that at least a significant number of the units in this project be set aside as temporary "build-first" units for the public housing residents like me living nearby. Residents like me are being threatened with displacement from our public housing by more redevelopment (New Communities Initiative), yet no one is actively making sure the numerous new giant projects that the Commission recently approved takes on its fair share of "build-first" units to help those in public housing dispel fears of permanent displacement when times comes. Ward 6 public housing residents in the area cannot be like Barry Farms all over again (not to mention Temple Courts, Sursum Corda, Cappers-Carrolsburg, etc.)

I support the work of Coy McKinney and align with the efforts of DC for Reasonable Development: Ward 6/Southwest Study Group seeking to protect the surrounding community. This open space at 4th and M is an amenity we now enjoy. Do not take it away and replace it with a status quo luxury box that is a net harm to our community for the above reasons (and as supported by numerous policies in the Comp Plan).

Linda Brown

lindac.brown@yahoo.com