

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING

2016 MAR 18 PM 2:46

TO: Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia
FROM: Beatriz Otero and Fernando Lemos *BO*
1769 Lanier Place, NW 20009
RE: Support for 15-09
DATE: 03-18-16

We have been residents and homeowners in Lanier Heights since 1986. We are writing today and testifying on March 21st to express our unequivocal support of R-4 Rezoning for Lanier Heights. Over these past thirty years we have raised our three children and watched them, along with many others, grow up in a neighborhood environment conducive to families. Our children as adults continue to live in the city and they and their friends want to be able to remain in the city and raise their families here. Our neighborhood as well as the rest of the nation's capital needs to continue to be accommodating to families so they can remain in the city and prosper. The continued loss of homes that would make this possible both changes the character of the city and possibly forces young families who would like to stay in the city to move out simple because they have limited housing choices.

Consider the unprecedented investments made to our education system to ensure that families have confidence in the education their children will receive. In addition to improving educational services in schools the city has spent over \$400 million dollars to renovate the school buildings that serve this neighborhood. Who will attend these schools if we do not have the housing to accommodate families with children?

Along with many of our neighbors we believe that Lanier Heights already has a healthy balance of apartment buildings and row houses. In fact, there are hundreds of apartment units being developed within a couple of blocks radius of our home alone. The Ontario, Adamo, new development on Columbia Road and of course the 9 unit, 50-foot-high building that was permitted to go up adjacent to our home in spite of all our concerns regarding zoning and permit allowances that we believe do not meet code. R-4 rezoning would continue to allow for reasonable growth without the loss of family friendly housing stock.

Unfortunately, opponents of this rezoning request many of whom may simply see the opening provided by our current zoning designation as an opportunity to make a profit without consideration to environmental, livability and a sense of community issues raise concerns that are unfounded and often untrue. So let me be clear:

- R-4 will not take away our property rights, it will in fact ensure that we can continue to live in the home we bought over 30 years ago for the next 30 years without the danger of more buildings being built around us taking away sun light, boxing us in and significantly changing the character of our neighborhood.
- R-4 protects the availability of homes large enough to raise a family and is not an affront to the living preferences of recent and future residents. It simple maintains a healthy balance of both.
- The type of irresponsible development (conversion to 4-5 units) being allowed throughout our neighborhood neither preserves the character of the neighborhood or increases architectural diversity, since most are god-awful designs that do not blend in with existing designs and eliminate all green space that may have existed prior to construction.
- Anyone concerned about gentrification should note that that ship has sailed a long time ago in Adams Morgan what we have to do now is protect the existing affordable units, limited equity co-ops and rental units that are constantly pressured by new developers which eventually forces them to leave the units, the neighborhood and move out of our city.
- And finally as evidenced by the signatures provided many apartment dwellers have in fact been informed of this request and have signed on.

We urge you to vote in support of 15-09 and honor the wishes of the overwhelming majority in the neighborhood, as evidenced by the letters of support and testimony you are receiving.

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
ZONING COMMISSION
CASE NO. 15-09
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 15-09
EXHIBIT NO. 13
EXHIBIT NO. 93