

13 September 2002

Carol Mitten, Chairman
Zoning Commission
District of Columbia Office of Zoning
441 4th St. NW, Suite 210-S
Washington, DC 20001

D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2002 SEP 13 AM 9:44

re: rezoning case # ZC 02-17 (Stonebridge Associates)

Dear Ms. Mitten,

As a follow-up to my letter of yesterday, I am sending you, by regular mail, a copy of the email my husband and I sent to the ANC today, inspired by our attendance at a community meeting last night. We feel even more strongly that the rezoning is a very bad idea.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,



Linda Parshall

From: Linda & Peter Parshall <lindaparshall@earthlink.net>
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 15:59:15 -0400
To: <fiskan@worldnet.att.net>
Cc: <mcnamrus@aol.com>, <lquynn@aol.com>, <Thomas.DiBiase@usdoj.gov>, <fsgord@aol.com>
Subject: FW: rezoning case #ZC 02-17

13 September 2002

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
Case 02-17
Exhibit 52

Dear Ms. Diskan,

We attended the ANC meeting last night and were appalled by the Stonebridge Associates high-density / high-rise plans for the corner of Military Rd. and Western Ave. The lack of candor and obvious obfuscations in the presentations were not only egregious, they undermined their own case. Everyone knows that statistics can be manipulated, can do more than mislead, but several of the developers' arguments seemed blatant demonstrations of this: the explanation of how they measured the building's height tried to camouflage but finally admitted the FhORD claims for 98

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.02-17
EXHIBIT NO.52

(well, they admitted to 97) feet; the argument that traffic would be increased only on the weekends (and then not by much) was totally unconvincing. One Stonebridge speaker claimed there would be "only" 185 new units; another of their team claimed 215; the FhORD documents estimate between 200-225 new units in the complex. Which is true? The vagueness about parking was shocking. And why didn't we see an elevation? Such drawings must exist from every stage of the design process, yet we were never shown one. The answer seemed clear to us and no doubt to everyone in the room: they didn't want us to see how the structure would actually appear to a passer-by. Their response to the economic/tax statistics was another example of *fuzzy, unsatisfactory rhetoric*.

It was clear that the vast majority of the community members attending your meeting last night was firmly opposed to the rezoning in general, as well as to this proposal in particular. We have also spoken with many neighbors who did not attend the meeting but who are unanimously against rezoning. To negotiate with Stonebridge for a few more changes to its design would be to go against the wishes of the community as represented (unless Stonebridge is interested in coming up with a completely different plan for condominiums etc. within the R-5-D allowances). The whole idea of rezoning is judged unacceptable by most local residents. Rather, we ask your committee to vote against the rezoning and follow up by doing everything you possibly can to stop the rezoning proposal in its tracks. We are not against developing the Clinic/Lisner area, but it should be done within the existing zoning regulations. An expanded day-care center is a nice perk and can be included within a low-density development. But the impact of over 200 new residential units in such a small place would be devastating for the whole neighborhood.

As recent arrivals in D.C. -- we have moved here from Portland, Oregon, a city that excels in good planning, for which it enjoys an international reputation -- we were pleased to see that local residents are given a fair hearing about things that affect their quality of life, and we hope the results of the hearing will reflect that discussion. Our decision to live in Friendship Heights was made just over one year ago; we don't want it to have been a mistake. The DC Comprehensive Plan for Ward 3 describes what we chose as our new home, a "low density, stable residential neighborhood." We and our neighbors are convinced that "smart growth" is good; this proposal is not.

Thank you for your thoughtful attention.

Yours sincerely,

Linda and Peter Parshall
3932 Legation St. NW
Washington, DC 20015