

**TESTIMONY OF THE LAMOND-RIGGS CITIZENS ASSOC. (LRCA)  
FOR THE ZONING COMMISSION HEARING OF July 20, 2006  
RE: THE MED STAR DEVELOPMENT, CASE # 05-30**

**PRESENTED BY RODNEY FOXWORTH, PRESIDENT**

Good evening Commissioners and thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Lamond-Riggs Citizens Assn. (LRCA). I am Rodney Foxworth, President of LRCA.

Since 1948, LRCA has served represented all of Lamond-Riggs and we have been active in everything from the proposed highway through our Community in the 70s, to building of a library and rec. centers in the 80's, from issues of crime and co-sponsoring the City-Wide Youth Summit last year, to holding our first Annual Bazaar last Sat., from advocating for a Small Area Plan to guide overall development in Lamond-Riggs, to working on proposed development projects like the West Group's PUD Application.

Although we acknowledge that the Jarvis and West Group attended numerous Community meetings to explain the proposed project, LRCA still opposes the PUD. We sent correspondence to the Zoning Commission earlier this year **opposing the project based on "best purpose" land use decisions and policy.** Having done an analysis of the PUD along with Citizens Aware, Lamond-Community Action Group (2 of LRCA's Block Organizations) and ANC 4B Commissioner Bowser, our opposition was not an emotional response. We did however, state that we would re-visit that decision after reports from appropriate City Agencies were available so that we could benefit from their review and comments.

LRCA has done an analysis of the reports and still opposes the PUD based on "best purpose" land use decisions and policy. **The Zoning Commission should reject this PUD. I believe that there may be opportunities for compromise, but not with the PUD as presented.** The Zoning Commission should deny the PUD Application for the following reasons based on Reports from the following City Agencies and Community issues that were previously submitted:

**FEMS**

- The street width of 20' between the parallel parking spaces is insufficient and not enough "room" for FEMS equipment to easily respond to emergencies.
- FEMS and Community Residents must not depend on whether cars are properly parked given the spacing, to receive "life saving" emergency assistance.

**DDOT**

- The Home Owners Assn. will be responsible for maintenance, upkeep and care of the private streets. The District does not have a "great track record" with Home Owner Assocs. maintaining infrastructure of this nature.
- Traffic was very bad on New Hampshire Ave. before the bridge work, with cars "zooming through" our Community that is mainly composed of seniors and kids.

**TESTIMONY OF THE LAMOND-RIGGS CITIZENS ASSOC. (LRCA)**

**ZONING COMMISSION**  
CASE NO. 05-30  
District of Columbia  
**EXHIBIT NO. 05-30**  
EXHIBIT NO.61

**FOR THE ZONING COMMISSION HEARING OF July 20, 2006  
RE: THE MED STAR DEVELOPMENT, CASE # 05-30**

**PRESENTED BY RODNEY FOXWORTH, PRESIDENT**

Page 2, DDOT Cont'd.

Traffic has gotten worse with bridge construction and will not improve even after it's finished when 50% or more vehicles from the project, per the Traffic Study, will be added to these same roads.

- In addition, we do not agree with DDOT's assertion that nearby signaled intersections are projected to operate at an acceptable level of service.
- We do not believe that the Study included the major intersections of New Hampshire Ave. and North Capital Street, or North Capital Street and Riggs Rd. These intersections serve as the only major artery for traffic on New Hampshire Ave. for the morning and evening "rush hours".
- There are no significant Community Amenities as mistakenly noted in DDOT's report and the Commission should not be mis-lead to think that there are.

**DHCD**

- We do not agree that the proposed density replicates the massing and density of the housing unit types in Lamond-Riggs. There are "no" townhouses or condos anywhere in our Community.
- The proposed public spaces will not serve as "public front yards". This is a private development, on private streets that will be owned and maintained by a private Homeowners Assn. It is our understanding that the proposed public spaces and parks are private property, period.
- The number of proposed affordable units is insufficient. We understand that for projects like this in the City, the District considers having 20% of the proposed development or 28 units marked as affordable and so do we. In addition, the extra affordable units should be equally spread out in the proposed project and not concentrated in the Townhouse units.

**WASA**

- We see no provisions in the proposed project that mandates the building of water and sewer mains to WASA's standards.
- We see no provisions in the proposed project that mandates the building of a storm water detention structure that complies with WASA Regulations.
- Likewise, we see no provisions in the proposed project mandating coordination and cooperation with WASA to plan the design for the water and sewer lines, to ensure that regulations are adhered to and Lamond-Riggs is not "harmed".

**OP**

- Just as DDOT must have review of the Homeowners Agreement to ensure proper legal clarity re: maintenance and ownership of the private streets and other infrastructure, we see "no" provisions mandating that the parks, "pocket" parks,  
**TESTIMONY OF THE LAMOND-RIGGS CITIZENS ASSOC. (LRCA)**

**FOR THE ZONING COMMISSION HEARING OF July 20, 2006  
RE: THE MED STAR DEVELOPMENT, CASE # 05-30**

**PRESENTED BY RODNEY FOXWORTH, PRESIDENT**

Page 3, OP Cont'd

and other public spaces be used by the larger Lamond-Riggs Community. Remember, this is a private development on private property and without and until this language is part of a Homeowners Agreement; these items cannot and should not be considered part of any Community Amenities.

- The project is still too dense. The Zoning Commission expressed disbelief to OP at the "sit down" meeting in November that the Community supported the project with 199 units. The Commission thought that the project was too dense and the developer's reduction of the 12 townhouses since then does nothing to change our view of the density.
- We do not support the project's request for relief of Sections 410 and 2516 of the Zoning Regulations in addition to the relief of density, and other requirements. Granting the requested relief will have a significant adverse affect on the surrounding Community.
- We see no significant evidence that the proposed project meets the requirements of DCMR-11, Chapter 24 which notes a PUD's purpose and standards are to "encourage high quality developments that provide a commendable number of public benefits"
- We see no significant Community Benefits in the PUD. Although the developer suggested a package totaling \$202,000, it was not included in the PUD. For a project like this, whose home sales are likely to generate close to 1 billion dollars in sales, a Community Benefit package totaling \$400,000 is more appropriate, representing only .053% of the total estimated sales.
- The number of affordable and "workforce housing" that is proposed is not acceptable and "no way" near the 20% norm that is used in this City. As such, the proposed project does not meet the requirements of the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan, that in Section 302.1, encourages "housing to meet all levels of need and demand".
- In addition given the above, the proposed project does not meet the requirements in Sections 302.2a (and 1508.1-c) which encourages "housing to meet the needs of present and futures District Residents" and (e) which notes "with particular emphasis on the needs of low and moderate income residents".
- The PUD does not comply with the Generalized Land Use Map that recommends the site for low density residential and does not meet the intent of the intent of the Comprehensive Plan Elements and Objectives.

Thanks you for the opportunity to speak before the Commission, and I will be happy to answer any questions.