

ANC 7D Great Weight

Testimony Case Opposition in Case 05-28E, 05-28B and 05-28C

Since, this may conclude my testimony on behalf of ANC 7D in providing "great weight", please allow me to share my thoughts.

According to the applicant testimony the project amenity and public benefit its functionality does not fit in the footprint of Parkside. The applicant is requesting to modify the already approved residential land use in parcel 12 to add a 47 foot Health Clinic next to a 130 foot oversized office building. The scale of this proposed modification if approved will not be in-line with the overall plan along Kenilworth Terrace at 90 foot. Also, the convenience store may be redeveloped and by right can become a 65 foot building along Hayes Street.

We want and need to keep the "Market Rate" housing planned for parcel 12 that is what the residents agreed on for the land use.

DCPCA will be a small 47 foot building, so the 90 and proposed 130 foot development will cast a shadow on it's presents. The proposed DCPCA will bring massive traffic to the already over burdened area. The increase number of patients per year of 50K is enormous for the Parkside, Eastland Gardens and Kenilworth community. The proposed DCPCA does not fit in the footprint of this community. The proposed DCPCA has only 10 parking spaces dedicated for patients and 59 to 60 for staff at "Market Rate" why would anyone park in the garage when the applicant has identified 102 on street parking for "free"? The design and scale of the building would fit in an area of Downtown Deanwood at the corner of Minnesota and

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 05-28C
EXHIBIT NO. 61
EXHIBIT NO. 61

Benning or in the applicant East River parcel location. The proposed DCPC is out of scale and the approved land use is residential. The design and building material are not inviting. The applicant has mentioned a grave risk of a delay, to their proposed plan for a health facility, so let's talk about the special exception. Why have they applied for "special exception" to develop the proposed DCPCA and CCDC in one of the approved 110 foot tower? The DCHA property is also available, so the chances to develop a "state-of-art health care in Ward 7 is possible. Parcel 12 is approved for residential and the community standby that decision. It will help off-set the over concentration of affordable and public assistance living.

The proposed building for CCDC is too tall and its design is arctic in nature and does not provide the attractiveness, comfort, ease, beauty, and clam the community requires. The shadow a proposed 130 foot building will cast on the 2nd Stage develop along Kenilworth Terrace is enormous. Why wasn't a request for special exception considered for this proposed develop to place it into one of the approved 110 foot towers? The design is not appealing and the scale proposed scale is not balanced to go from a 47 foot building (DCPC) to a 130 foot building (CCDC). The residents are in need of quality retail that the approved land use for residential will demand. Workforce housing and market rate will bring the quality of life up to a standard Parkside, Eastland Gardens, and Kenilworth deserves. This proposed modification will impact the current neighbors with over kill of "baby New York". This development should add value to our community and not additional stress. The land use of residential will add a tax base that is needed in Ward 7 and in this community. Don't gridlock our constituents in a "oneway in and oneway out" community that already exist. We want and need responsible development and if that

mean the developer need to hire better architects so be it. It is a hog pod of development and a holistic approach is needed to understand the negative impact it will have if approved to modify. Mr. Moore-Adams is ready to "fight" for a parking space. How is this an improvement and responsible urban design? Lotus Square at full capacity of tenants would absorb the on street parking the applicants testified that are available. When will we get a clear answer from DDOT if the proposed new pedestrian bridge is going to be built to help ease the foot traffic of all stages in this development. The proposed bridge is open who are the applicants really going to attract as government tenants? Why isn't the proposed bridge a major factor in this development now?

The land use for residential is a win-win. The proposed CCDC is too tall at 130. It's not even in a downtown area. The Department of Employment Services is only 5 stories in height. By right the applicant has additional parcel on the SE corner of Minnesota and Benning and the oversized 130 foot tower may fit right in on that plan. Additionally the applicant has two other projects which broke ground Victory Senior Housing and Educare. The 96 to 98 affordable senior housing doesn't have dedicated parking. Educare I believe is sharing parking with Neval Thomas Elementary School. Also, the Pollin development has broke ground in the same footprint.

The traffic issues are a major concern there are challenging locations, and dangerous access points within the footprint of Parkside. Commissioner Selfridge you have stated "maybe the whole project should be reevaluated". I do agree on behalf of ANC 7D. We the people and residents, who will remain behind will be impacted by the land use if modified from residential to institutional. The uneven scale and height

of the buildings don't bring uniformity to this community or for a new development. The decision you make in this case will have an adverse affect for decades to come. This proposed plan is a dysfunctional modifications with several concerns, lack of functionality, vision, scale, urban spacing, height, shading, a warehouse look, stress from additional traffic, RPP on all neighboring streets, cave and tunnel vision from the poor architectural design. On the other hand my constituents Mr. Rhett, President of EGCA has address the hoc Pod of Social Services and lack of Market Rate Home that was approved in the First-Stage PUD. Ms. Singletary, President of Historic Mayfair has concerns about the traffic, building height and most of all the quality of life for life long residents of Mayfair.

We urge LANO, LLC to return to the vision led out in the First Stage PUD testimony on June 16 2008 as Mr. Lopaino, said "we heard repeatedly from residents that they want market rate housing. "The neighborhood currently is dominated by affordable housing with mostly public housing and assisted housing Mayfair Mansions, Paradise, Kenliworth Parkside Public Housing, even the newest Lotus Square. "So this community wants and needs more workforce and market housing". "The project is designed to deliver that".

When has the residents vision changes? It has not the greed of LANO, LLC to transfer land has cloudied the process from the onsite of its vision to proposed an amendment to modify parcel 12 from residential to institutional.

We believe this applicant will alter the Possibilities of home sales and the market will decline further from the "baby new

york" or baby "atlantic city" they present to you in the three cases 05-28E, 05-28B, and 05-28C.

The 7D Commission given "great weight" firmly believe that rezoning would have a domino effect in our community, while in the next breath as compared to downtown Deanwood located at Minnesota and Benning the new government Center our Department of Employment Services is only 5 stories in height and in a CR zoned district.

I applaud the efforts of the residents, who testified today to protect the tranquility and residential fiber of their quality of life. We should never have to fight for a parking space and add additional stress of our everyday lives regarding, any proposed development. I urge you to evaluate all areas of there presentation and protect the historic preservation and long-life community we know and love.

Yes, we want development that is respectful to our needs, desire, and that will add quality to our neighborhoods. The 1st stage PUD was approved unanimously by many of the communities here tonight because it gave a sense of inclusion, added market rate homes, minimal office space and would attract retail that this community desires. When ask why the proposed height from 90 to 110 and 110 to 130 was not approved in 2005 Mr. Chris Lopiano said "because it was too tall". That statement stands true today.

I appreciate the District of Columbia Zoning Commission for your wisdom and foresight.

"Great Weight" on behalf of 7D Commission Constituents,

Commissioner Willette Seaward
Chairperson ANC 7D