

## Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

---

**From:** Mandy Warfield Granger <mandywarfieldgranger@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 31, 2018 8:11 AM  
**To:** DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ)  
**Cc:** mgranger70@yahoo.com; all@anc3c.org  
**Subject:** Letter in Opposition to Case Number 19751 (Application of MED Developers, LLC).

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the DC Government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. If you believe that this email is suspicious, please forward to phishing@dc.gov for additional analysis by OCTO Security Operations Center (SOC).

Dear All:

We are writing to express our concerns regarding BZA application #19751 (Application of MED Developers, LLC) and the development of the properties 2619, 2621 and 2623 Wisconsin Avenue NW. We live at 3615 Edmunds Street NW, which is across Edmunds Street from the subject property and cannot, in good faith, support the application as it seems very clear that the proposed development will be very disruptive to, and not consistent with the existing character of, the neighborhood.

As you know, the subject property is in a residential neighborhood that is zoned for single family homes. Allowing a very large, non-conforming, commercial facility to be built there will adversely affect the use of neighboring property, is not in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the existing zoning regulations (as we understand them) and, perhaps most importantly, will not be beneficial to the existing neighborhood. In addition, the proposed building is extremely large for the lot and will stick out like a sore thumb in the neighborhood. Although of a slightly lesser concern, the facility will tower over our house and will likely cast a shadow over it during the course of a day.

In addition to our concerns about the size of the facility, the commercial nature of the operation is also extremely problematic. First, dropping a commercial enterprise into a neighborhood comprised of single-family homes will, by definition, be disruptive. The streets and alleys surrounding the subject property are not adequate for commercial activities (which in this case will include supply deliveries and trash removal on the scale that is much greater than currently exists for the single-family homes in the neighborhood). In addition to the fact that the existing infrastructure will not be sufficient to support a commercial enterprise, the deliveries and trash removal will undoubtedly be excessively noisy, which will be disruptive to the immediate neighbors (of which we are one). Secondly, the proposed facility seems to be taking a particularly problematic (and unrealistic) approach to parking. As we understand it, the facility would have a very limited number of parking spaces, which do not seem to be remotely sufficient to satisfy the needs of the residents, staff and visitors. Regardless of whatever parking studies are presented by the applicant, as someone who actually lives in the neighborhood, I can confirm that there will certainly not be sufficient parking to meet the needs of the facility (there is not even sufficient parking for the neighborhood as it is). Finally, we have concerns about the continued use of the facility. As you know, it is extremely difficult to successfully own and operate an assisted living facility. We are concerned that, if the facility fails (which seems statistically likely), the developer

will immediately transition the facility into a different, more disruptive, use. The developer is, understandably, concerned with making a profit and seems indifferent to the concerns of the neighborhood. Once the facility exists, we have no doubt they will seek to maximize their return above all else and the neighborhood will not have any opportunity to express their views on such different, non-conforming use.

Finally, we would like to point out that we are not opposed to development of the lot generally. However, this proposal is particularly problematic (for the reasons described above, among others) and is not one that we can support.

We appreciate your consideration.

Regards,

Marc and Mandy Granger