Subject: 3400 Connecticut Avenue Partners (Macklin) Case 20266

To: Mr. Frederick Hill, Chairman, Board of Zoning Adjustment

I live at 2949 Newark, within the 200 feet range in which you invited neighbors to participate in this hearing, just 4 doors up from the Macklin. Its developers and its agents have never once contacted me or my neighbors even closer to the development to discuss how to mitigate the havoc this proposal could wreak on our street, which was designed by the famous landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted as a very narrow, meandering lane following the contours of the land. As traffic on the street over the past several years has more than doubled, we have seen the dangers of the lane's blindspots to our residents as more and more cars, moving trucks and delivery services try to navigate Newark while searching for a space to park on the one side of the street where it is permitted, and then making u-turns in the 2 narrow driving lanes when they find one. Over the past few years, parking on both the Cleveland Park commercial strip and Newark Street has increasingly become very, very difficult. The current closure and and uncertain future of the service lane on Connecticut impose still more stress on parking in a neighborhood where retail owners identified parking as their number one problem in a report to the Deputy Mayor, and residents compete daily with merchants, their customers, metro riders, visitors and tourists who circulate on both Connecticut and Newark in search of a parking space. The pandemic causing closure of both our metro stop and the 28 spaces' parking service lane compounds the parking challenges we face going forward, as more and more residents see owning a car as at least a backstop and perhaps necessary for commuting.

So it is of grave concern that the Macklin development claims preliminary concept approval to eliminate 18 private and public spaces on Connecticut as it increases its residences from 17 to 51 and doubles its retail space. Adding insult to injury, the developer also now requests a waiver from its obligation to provide the minimal 17 off street parking spaces BZA requires, meaning no off street parking for the entire development. We strongly oppose granting such a waiver that would result in a net reduction of 35 parking spaces from the status quo, as it adds 35 new residences and doubles its retail space, further compromising the safe and vibrant residential and commercial neighborhood we believe that zoning regulations seek to encourage and protect.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Harris