

ZONING STATEMENT

I am Susie Humphreys. For two decades, I have lived at, and owned, 456 M Street SW, the townhouse at the corner of 6th and M Streets. Although the postman goes to my mail slot on M Street, my waking life focuses on my do-everything room otherwise known as my dining room, where Tiber Island Condominium groups sometimes meet, and my sunny patio, where I enjoy gardening. It directly faces 6th Street, a narrow street which the PUD proposes to narrow to only 30 feet across by removing a 10 foot wide lane. Salutory sunlight and breezes can flow through the west wall of glass panes and screens. Yet for all this openness, I have the privacy designed in the Tiber Island Condominium and protected in our R3 zoning. No window of mine faces another window. The massive building proposed for parcel 11 would wall me in with windows peering into my home. The current church buffers Tiber Island Condominium from the dense development downhill on the wharf. PUD 11-03 impacts what I treasure and it degrades the community.

The PUD would also cause a huge increase of traffic on M Street and incredible congestion and pollution on 6th Street. Already scarce parking, made all the more rare by DC employees in their new 4th Street offices, would be even vanish. As it is now, service people charge us for the expected \$50 parking ticking because parking their trucks usually has to be done illegally. Illegal parking in a three lane street could block emergency vehicles.

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 11-03
EXHIBIT NO. 100

I enjoy living in the neighborhood. St. Augustine's Church has been a good neighbor; they let neighborhood groups use their facilities for meetings, as we lack a neighborhood gathering place, integrate socially people of disparate economic means, and help those needing help. However, now St. Augustine's has answered the siren call of a developer.

It is time to chase the money changers out of the temple. Land use evolves, but, as we have heard often in recent years, too big is too big.

St. Augustine's Church and the developers have said that they are developing by rights. But no one has the automatic right of changing the zoning, especially to such a dense zone adjacent to a community designed for open space and the enjoyment of common areas, a community designed and built in the First SW Redevelopment plan.

The developers say that the SW Wharf area would be served by two Metro stations. However as the L'Enfant station is up a steep hill, quite onerous after wining and dining, I am sure that the Waterside station, the one a block from my home, would be the station of choice for most people even though it would be further from much of the commercial attractions. It is already overcrowded much of the time, especially when during ballgames and rush hours. I have been passed up when the train was too full to cram another person aboard and, of course, the platform itself can become dangerously crowded.

The developers say, a shadow study showed that we wouldn't be in the shadow of the proposed monster condominium. However, the study was presented without a description of how the transit of the sun was calculated to vary over the year. Copies of the results were requested in advance of the study, but refused. What assumptions were made? How could it be replicated? What happens to the total light intensity?

The developers say a smaller development would not be viable, that translates as they would not make as much money.

The developers said the St Augustine's Church plot will be in the first phase of construction, they say it will not, then they say it will be...who knows?

Likewise, the developers said that the park area will have a concession stand, they say, well maybe it won't, their July 8 supplement declares commercial use. It is not just green space. What can we depend on?

I hope the city holds the developers accountable for whatever PUD it accepts, that flexibility not be just a code word for detrimental changes, and we are not left as we were with the Waterside Station PUD with teardown completed but without project completion. It is a blight on the neighborhood.

I would like to end with showing you two pictures. The first is of a sunset from a window of my living room which faces 6th Street. The February viewshed features sun reflected off the

channel. I especially rejoice in this view, and I am sure that, whenever I sell, the buyer would too.

The second picture is taken from down on 6th Street looking up at St. Augustine's Church and the sunset sky. Note the dramatic plunge of the roof of St. Augustine's Church which lets more light pass than the maximum height of the building would indicate, a height further manipulated by including the height of the cross. It was designed in concert with Tiber Island; its cornerstone was laid in 1965.

It is not just for the government to give what I have honestly obtained, use and enjoy to benefit a private corporation, St. Augustine's Episcopal Church, for its private gain.

What a heritage we have!

Thank you.

Susie Humphreys

QUESTIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

1. Has the US Department of Homeland Security examined the plug the proposed development would put in the bottlenecked M Street traffic in an emergency evacuation?
2. Have simulations been made of high water flow resulting from narrowing the channel? We are all aware of the disastrous flooding from the Dakotas to Louisiana caused by constricting the flow of rivers, often by Army Corp of Engineer projects. We remember that remnants of Hurricane Isabel flooded the Harbor Police Station in 2003.
3. Climate change which brings us hotter summers and colder winters (NASA, among many others) seems detrimental to expecting people to bask on a wharf or walk. Are these conditions compatible with sustained daily visitor numbers sufficient to maintain the shops and restaurants?
4. Why change the name of 6th Street SW?