

Mrs. Barbara F. Kahlow
800 25th Street, NW #704
Washington, DC 20037
February 8, 2025

Mr. Anthony Hood, Chairman
Zoning Commission
441-4th Street, N.W. – Suite 210
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Opposition to ZC No. 24-15, Consolidated PUD & Related Map Amendment, 901
Monroe St NE (Square 3829)

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Zoning Commission:

At the request of the then ANC SMD Commissioner, I led the coordination of ZC No 10-28, the last PUD proposed for 901 Monroe Street, NE (Square 3829, various Lots). The result was three DC Court of Appeals Orders: a 5/16/13 remand, a 9/11/14 second remand, and then a 5/26/16 Court Order vacating the ZC Order, basically since it was inconsistent with the DC Comprehensive Plan. First, I was surprised to see no mention of this history in the 2/3/25 Office of Planning (OP) Set-down Report (Exhibit 19) for ZC No. 24-15, a proposed larger and taller PUD for this site. Recently, I was asked to support the current 200-Footers of this property, most of which are new owners from the “200-Footers” Party in ZC No. 10-28 which had appealed the ZC Order.

Second, I was surprised and disappointed that OP’s Set-down Report (Exhibit 19) includes no information from the five thoughtful and lengthy current 200-Footers letters in opposition (Exhibits 12 & 12A, 14, 15, 16 & 16A, & 17), all submitted into the record by 1/14/25, i.e., well in advance of OP’s 2/3/25 Set-down Report. I recommend that the ZC request a Supplemental Set-down Report by OP so that it has the needed information about the many objectionable aspects of the current Application before it votes to Set-down this case for a public hearing.

Third, I want to briefly raise six points in OP’s Set-down Report:

1. pp. 3, 22, 23, 24, 25 – OP’s stated, “Additional information is needed about the proffers.” On p. 23, under PUD Evaluation Standards, OP quotes Chapter 3 Subtitle X, para. 300.1, “2(h) Offers a commendable number or quality of meaningful public benefits.” The already cited five letters of Opposition in the case record recommend a number of meaningful public benefits, none of which are cited or discussed in OP’s Set-down Report.
2. pp. 4, 8, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32 – OP stated, “new development … should be compatible with the existing scale,” which the proposed 75 feet height is clearly not.

3. p. 19 – OP stated, “Guiding principles of the SAP [Small Area Plan] include protecting existing neighborhood character,” which the proposed PUD does not.
4. pp. 19-20 – OP stated, “The language of the SAP … may be allowed up [to] a maximum of 50 feet through a Planned Unit Development … Buildings in the subarea should set back in height at a ratio of one-half (1/2) to one (1) above 50 feet.” The proposal is for a 75-foot building and without the specifically required setbacks. OP adds that, “the Council adopted amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that superseded the 2009 guidance of the SAP… where there is a conflict between the Comprehensive Plan and a Small Area Plan, the Comprehensive Plan governs.” I believe that the ZC should consider the adverse effects on air and light on the low-scale rowhouses along 10th Street.
5. p. 24 – “OP also finds to double the effective width of the alley is a benefit.” The current 200-Footers unanimously disagree with widening this small alley behind the rowhouses facing 10th Street, worrying about their young children and the adverse environmental effects on their air quality and traffic noise.
6. p. 28 – From the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, OP cited, “Policy Par. T-1.1.8.: Minimize Off-Street Parking … excessive off-street parking should be discouraged 403.14.” The PUD includes only 54 parking spaces for 230 rental apartments. The result would be a huge increase in off-street parking which is already near saturation. This would have a profoundly adverse effect on the neighboring residents in many freestanding homes and rowhouses.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

/s/
Barbara F. Kahlow