

Edward S. Yambrusic, Esq.
4720 Massachusetts Av., NW
Washington, D.C. 20016

Sept. 30, 2019

Mr. Anthony Hood, Chairman
District of Columbia Zoning Commission
441 4th St., NW
Suite 210 S
Washington, D.C. 20001

RE: Case Number 19-10; Valor Development, LLC; Consolidated PUD Square 1499, Lots 802, 803, 806 and 807: Letter in Opposition

Dear Mr. Hood:

I oppose Valor Development's proposal to develop the SuperFresh lot with a 220 unit apt. building for reasons cited below.

I am an attorney and 48 year resident of Spring Valley, living only two blocks from the proposed 220 unit Valor development. The Valor proposal, drastically changes the unique character - primarily peaceful residential single family homes - of the neighborhood.

A similar development was proposed by Miller developers in 1973. Together with GEN. (Ret) Wilhoyt and ADM (Ret.) Blix - my next door neighbors - we strongly opposed 70 units in clusters of four development on a three acre lot in Spring Valley. With the prudent professional assessment and genuine appreciation of our concern by the then Zoning Commissioners, we reached a mutually acceptable compromise: the number of units was reduced from 70 to 35. That reduction:

- (a) assured single detached homes could be built on Van Ness St., and semi-detached on the newly-proposed 48th Place NW;
- (b) enriched and preserved the character of the neighborhood;
- (c) prevented the Miller developers from further ambitions to build apartment complexes in nearby Palisades. Instead, Miller built an array of beautiful single detached homes which blended nicely with the character of the Spring Valley region.

Why couldn't a similar approach be taken with the current Valor proposal? The number of units could be reduced by 50%, OR townhouse/condos put in. Such a *compromise* would maintain the safety and originally intended character of the neighborhood.

The reduction of number of units would also address density concerns. 'Density transfer' would impose:

- a) Drastic changes to the character of the neighborhood, and
- b) New safety hazards caused by daily traffic congestion for pedestrians and drivers seeking to park at commercial establishments with their own traffic influx

RE: Case Number 19-10; Valor Development, LLC; Consolidated PUD Square 1499, Lots 802, 803, 806 and 807: Letter in Opposition

What is the rationale that density transfer would resolve the above-cited problems?

I would hope that the Z.C. would respect the long-standing character of the neighborhood, rather than to impose new burdens for the sake of 'economic development.'

Respectfully submitted,
Edward S. Yambrusic, Esq.