

My name is Danielle Brian. I heard you, Chair Hood tell us that the only question before you is whether MU10 is not inconsistent with the comp plan. But surely you are empowered to determine if a less dense zoning could also be not inconsistent with the comp plan?

I live kitty corner from the proposed site at 2100 17<sup>th</sup> St. I fully support adding deeply affordable housing on the site. But when Councilwoman Nadeau advocated for the UPFLUM and OP presented their support of the map amendment, they did it with absolutely no consultation with or input from our neighborhood. And it shows: they argued the block in question is similar to the block with the Reeves Center and Portnoy Flats development. We just heard our ANC Chair make that argument too. It is not the same. There are two significant differences: The V street block behind the Reeves Center and Portnoy Flatts/Sonnet has NO residences. None. There is a bar and a church and its auxiliary buildings. In contrast, the V St block between 16th and 17th streets, bordering the proposed redevelopment, is almost entirely two-story single family residences as many of my neighbors have noted.

Secondly, unlike that block the narrowness of 17th St would not and could not safely allow for the significant increase of traffic created by dramatic upzoning. For comparison: on 14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, and 16th streets there are 4 lanes for car traffic or on 15th St 3 car traffic lanes plus a separate lane for bicycle traffic. In stark contrast, 17th St. has only ONE ONE-WAY traffic lane shared by cars and bikes together. This is also true for V St.

I also want to note that the DDOT study filed in support of the map amendment to increase density to MU10 for these proceedings as Exhibit 462 is based on their flawed assumption that the maximum housing units would only be a total 408 units – with a net change of only 252 units created by the upzoning. But we have all learned from OP their estimate is a total of 600 residential units, meaning

DDOT supported this map amendment assuming the increased residential burden would be 30% less than OP is proposing.

The DDOT study also says they excluded any police and fire traffic from their analysis, as they argued the higher density would not increase the number of police or fire vehicle trips. As a result, not only did they not take into account the number of first responders who are driving to and from this site, but they also didn't take into account that currently the police don't compete with any civilian drivers and service trucks for parking, ingress or egress – even for emergency response. Would the increased traffic competition on these two one-way blocks created by MU 10 zoning be consistent with Mayor Bowsher's Vision Zero initiative of zero traffic deaths?

Cross examinations of OP and the AG revealed several sections of the comp plan are in fact inconsistent with their proposal to make this lot MU 10. There *are* other options that would not be inconsistent with the comp plan, and would respect the neighborhood.

In conclusion, for the redevelopment of this site to be consistent with the comprehensive plan, or not inconsistent, any new construction must respect the neighborhood conservation designation of the Strivers Section. The site is in fact directly across the street from that historic neighborhood on all three street facing sides of the site. The comp plan acknowledges the V St border, but the redevelopment should also respect the 17th St border (as our neighboring ANC noted), which includes several properties once owned by Frederick Douglass.

I implore you, the zoning commission, to reject OP's recommendation but remain consistent with the Comp Plan by applying split zoning and apply height restrictions, setbacks, and covenants to preserve the historic neighborhood character and maintain the safety of the residents.