

TESTIMONY OF THE CARROLLSBURG SQUARE CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, INC. (CSCA), BY HENRY BAKER, PRESIDENT OF THE CSCA BOARD, AND KATHLEEN BEETON, IN THE APPLICATION OF WATERFRONT ASSOCIATIES, LLC AND RLA REVITALIZATION CORPORATION FOR A MODIFICATION OF A FIRST-STAGE PUD AND A SECOND-STAGE PUD AND A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, Z.C. NO. 02-38A ON JUNE 7, 2007

We are, Henry Baker, 381 N Street SW, Washington DC 20024. President of the Carrollsburg Square Condominium Association, Inc. (herein: CSCA) Board of Directors, and Kathleen Beeton, a resident at 319 N Street SW, Washington DC 20024. Mr. Baker and Ms. Beeton appear on behalf of CSCA and its 102 resident owners.

Carrollsburg Square Condominium Association is a 102-unit townhouse condominium located on the south side of M Street SW, between Delaware and Fourth Streets, and south to N Street SW. A number of our residents live along M Street SW, immediately adjacent to the Waterside Mall property. CSCA's primary concern is not the proposed density of the Waterfront development (i.e. number of units and square footage), but that the proposed development plan is incompatible with the design principles of the existing established Southwest neighborhood related to connectivity, compatibility of mass and scale of architecture, and well-designed, usable open space. In short, the proposed plan does not contribute to "a sense of neighborhood."

The proposed site plan does not advance the building and site design principles of our neighborhood or good planning principles in general. In particular, we are concerned about

Approve Phase 1
M Street Frontage
Parking
Traffic
Retail
Open Space

We believe the following changes need to be made to the proposed plan:

Approve Phase 1

We recommend the project be expedited swiftly and in a prudent manner. The neighborhood around the failed Waterside Mall has been without services for many years while this plan has been conceptualized. We are unhappy this process has taken so long while our many of our businesses have been closed. We are hoping for swift action this time by the zoning commission and by the

ZONING COMMISSION
CASE No. 02-38A
District of Columbia
EXHIBIT No. 70
CASE NO. 02-38A
EXHIBIT NO. 70

developers, so services can be restored to our neighborhood. This is not a simple issue - support or not support. Nor should it be cast as a support-not support issue. Few, if any of us, would not support urban development for our neighborhood; however, we require several key items to be addressed, the failure to do so will result in nothing more than the failings of the current Waterside Mall.

We have no issue with the proposed zoning changes; furthermore, we feel the zoning can be flexible to accommodate any and all modifications necessary to integrate the M Street buildings to the neighborhood.

We are happy with the increase residential FAR

We commend the Architect for the fine design of the Fourth Street buildings.

M Street Frontage

The proposed buildings along the M Street frontage of the site should be set back a minimum of 22 feet from the existing curb line. This distance will ensure the provision of wide sidewalks that promote the walkable nature of our neighborhood and encourage Metro and other forms of transit, allows for the provision of larger caliper street trees to improve the appearance of M Street and provide shade and related environmental benefits, and new benches and other related street furniture as amenities for residents, visitors and others.

The revised building footprints shown in the applicant's plan places the bulk of the buildings parallel to the street, thus creating a "wall-like" affect, with buildings proposed to be 280 and 290 feet, respectively, in length along M Street. When combined with the approved design for the surface parking lot at Marina View Towers, and the potential for similar massing at Town Center, the net effect of this development will result in a fortress-like environment along M Street that is significantly different from the character of the Southwest neighborhood and contrary to the principles of Modernist design that underpin the existing development pattern in the neighborhood. These buildings will not improve the community's quality of life and will not honor the existing character of this section of Southwest.

We recommend that the massing of the proposed buildings along M Street be redesigned in order to better reflect the established development pattern in this section of M Street. We ask that the Zoning Commission require that the applicant reconsider the proposed massing of the buildings on M Street and explore providing a strong visual break in the mass of each building that will make the scale more approachable and read as a series of individual, but

related, elements, not a monolithic wall as currently depicted in the applicant's plans.

The combination of a greater building setback, with a wider sidewalk, and articulated building design will greatly reduce the impact of the proposed buildings on its residential neighbors, including the 102 residents who live at CSCA, directly across the street from this development, respect the established character of the neighborhood and integrate the new development into the fabric of our neighborhood.

Parking

We agreed with the Metropolitan Police Department Memorandum dated 3 May 2007, "Ensure private parking is allotted to these residents prior to approval—there is lack of off street parking there."

The proposed residential parking requirement of one space for each four units is too low. We understand from the Office of Planning that a ratio of .8 spaces per unit has been applied to new development elsewhere in the District that is in similar proximity to a Metrorail Station. We believe this ratio should be utilized as a minimum parking requirement for residential uses in the proposed development. The current parking requirement of one space per four units is insufficient, as it the applicant's "first come, first serve" policy with regard to residential parking. We are especially concerned about the inadequacy of the parking given the applicant's request to increase the amount of residential square footage proposed in this PUD modification. Our neighborhood streets already function as overflow parking for people going to Arena Stage, the dinner and tour boats, and the clubs on Water Street. We note that the Metropolitan Police Department identified this concern in its May 3, 2007 memorandum to the Office of Planning where it stated, "Ensure private parking is allotted to these residents prior to approval—there is lack of off-street parking there."

In addition, we believe the applicant's assumption of 80% transit rider-ship is unrealistic: many office workers do not live in Metro-accessible locations, many residents will have at least one car, and little incentive to ride transit is offered by the applicant.

We believe that insufficient off-street parking proposed by the applicant, its illogical residential parking policy, and lack of meaningful transit incentives will not reduce car ownership or increase transit usage and will further exacerbate the existing parking condition.

We ask the that Zoning Commission to require the provision of more residential parking spaces, require the applicant to monitor residential parking supply and

demand, and require the shared use of the office parking during non-peak office hours so that this parking may be used by the general public, retail customers and others.

Traffic

We remain skeptical of the statistics on traffic flow as determined by Mr. Chad A. Baird. We do not feel the studies performed in December 2006 accurately take into account the additional sidewalk curb cuts for the M Street buildings, the proposed median cut (s), the increased activity in the area, the proposals and plans of DDOE, the newly designed pedestrian plaza, and the service roads in and around the development.

We request that more extensive traffic studies be performed prior to Stage 2.

We believe the applicant's revised plan will create pedestrian-vehicular conflicts at east-west plaza as pedestrians try to get to Metro, grocery store, residential towers, and M Street. That conflict currently exists today, albeit on a smaller scale due to the limited commercial activity on the site, as cars turning into the site from M Street cross the path of pedestrians walking to and from the Metro escalator or to the Safeway. Pedestrians are forced to stop in the existing crosswalk to accommodate vehicular traffic. We are concerned that this condition will be exacerbated by the proposed circulation plan that provides vehicular circulation to the two towers and the extension of 4th Street and will pit pedestrians against vehicles.

We have a similar concern about the proposed curb cuts on M Street for the new parking garages. These curb cuts will break up the retail storefronts and create an undesirable retail environment and prioritizes vehicles over pedestrians and shoppers, thereby reducing the walk ability of the M Street frontage. Outdoor dining will also be less viable. We strongly support the Office of Planning's recommendation that these curb cuts be relocated to any other street frontage.

We also recommend that the applicant be required to work with the District on pedestrian safety improvements at the existing intersection of M and 4th Street and do not support the proposed median break on M Street.

Retail

Beyond our concerns about the site and building design and open space, CSCA is concerned about the type of future retail uses envisioned by the developer to occupy the proposed 110,000 square feet of retail space, the developer's commitment to market the new space to ensure that it is successfully occupied, and the phased development of the total amount of retail space.

We are dismayed that only 20,000 square feet of retail is proposed in this first phase of the project. The community's retail needs have been significantly underserved over the past ten years, as the few successful retail businesses were forced to close prematurely to allow the redevelopment of the Mall site. This action has forced residents and others to shop outside the neighborhood, and in many instances, outside the District boundaries in northern Virginia and Maryland, resulting in a flow of sales tax revenue outside the neighborhood and outside the District. It should be a concern of the District's, as well as the community's, that the proposed retail space be fully occupied by viable retail shops, restaurants and neighborhood-serving service uses that meet the needs of residents, workers and visitors to our neighborhood. In addition, we want to ensure that the new retail space will have the necessary infrastructure to support restaurant uses as well so that new restaurant uses are not precluded.

We are not convinced that the applicant has assessed the existing and future market conditions nor has put forth a leasing plan that targets the retail uses desired by the community. This community has waited long enough for good retail and will not be satisfied with the slow phasing of development or lack of sustained efforts to attract and secure viable retail tenants. The proposed vendor carts depicted on the applicant's plans will not satisfy the community's desire for a vibrant, mixed-use environment that supports strong retail tenants. The applicant and the District must do more to ensure that the proposed retail space is constructed in a timely fashion along with the other phases of development and that, once built, these spaces will be leased to viable retail tenants.

Open Space

We believe that the proposed amount of publicly accessible open, green space is insufficient both for a project of this size, with over 1,000 new residential units, millions of square feet of commercial space, and for the surrounding neighborhoods which use the existing park as a place to sit and read, play checkers, meet friends, host races, seek relief on a hot day, hold public events and so forth.

We consider green space to be vital for the success of the project and the health of our neighborhood. The neighborhood is losing a park that provides a significant public gathering space, with mature trees, that acts as a mini-oasis in the sea of concrete that is the existing Waterside Mall. The loss of the mature tree canopy and park space is not offset or in any way compensated by the spaces proposed by the applicant in this plan. Indeed, we understand that the District has lost two-thirds of its tree canopy in the last 25 years. As a consequence, we all should be concerned about the loss of any tree canopy and demand that the applicant provide as much tree canopy, and related green space, as possible in the proposed open spaces.

Moreover, the privatized open space (depicted as “east and west courtyards” on the plan) created for the use and enjoyment of the new residents does nothing to off-set the loss of this existing park and provides no community benefit to the people who live in neighborhood today. We note that the proposed Metro and east and west plazas are almost exclusively hard-scape that will be very uninviting during the warm summer months, and, with the streets running through it, create pedestrian and vehicular conflicts that compromise its use and function as a community gathering space. In addition, unlike the approved plaza that created a sense of place and identity for the new town center, the proposed plaza is ill designed and lacks sufficient space and amenities to make it a true gathering place.

We ask the Zoning Commission to require that the applicant provide, via dedicated public access easements, full public access to all proposed open spaces, including the proposed east and west courtyards identified on the applicant’s plan. The applicant should be required to ensure full public access to its proposed open spaces so that the community will continue to benefit.

A related change is the redesign of the east and west plazas. As currently proposed, it is a hard-scape plaza with a few trees. Once the site is fully redeveloped, this will be the only area for office workers, retail employees, patrons, and the community to gather. As such, it is woefully inadequate and will not provide the environmental benefits and comfort that the existing park provides.

Finally, the Zoning Commission should require the applicant to prepare and implement a plan for the redesign of the remnant park spaces, so called “pocket parks” by the applicant, that will remain on either side of Fourth Street once it has been extended to I Street.

Summary

In summary, while we fully support the redevelopment of the Waterside Mall and share the developer’s enthusiasm for creating a vibrant town center, we have concerns about key elements of the site plan and related building design and respectfully request the Zoning Commission consider these elements as they review the applicant’s zoning requests. We strongly request:

1. The project is expedited swiftly and in a prudent manner.
2. The M Street buildings require at least a 22-foot setback.
3. The M Street buildings design be modified from “fortress” to “inviting”
4. More Parking be provided throughout, especially for residential units
5. Traffic simulation and circulation studies be repeated prior to Stage 2

6. Retail concept needs more thought and energy put into it
7. Abatements for rodent and dust must be attached
8. Green space made accessible to all and more green added to the public plaza

TESTIMONY OF THE CARROLLSBURG SQUARE CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, INC. (CSCA), BY HENRY BAKER, PRESIDENT OF THE CSCA BOARD, AND KATHLEEN BEETON, IN THE APPLICATION OF WATERFRONT ASSOCIATIES, LLC AND RLA REVITALIZATION CORPORATION FOR A MODIFICATION OF A FIRST-STAGE PUD AND A SECOND-STAGE PUD AND A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, Z.C. NO. 02-38A ON JUNE 7, 2007

Addendum: Emails from CSCA Residents

Support with CSCA Board recommendations: 14 by email, 6 by phone.

Support fully: 4

From: attorneybaten@aol.com
Subject: Re: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 5, 2007 3:23:22 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

I support the position of the Board on the set back of the M st. buildings. Also the scale of the project is too large for the area. M Street cannot now handle the rush hour traffic. 4th street is designed as residential, but even now large trucks violate their prohibition on the street. This violation will only get worse when contruction begins on M street.

Phil Baten
1226 4th st.

From: Shenriq@aol.com
Subject: Re: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 5, 2007 4:23:54 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

I am speaking for me and my family, definitely opposing the development plans that include large buildings across from CACS, bringing further car and foot-traffic that further congests our neighborhood, which is presently underserved by inadequate transportation systems to accomodate the existing volumes. The current subway and inferior narrow and two lane streets that serve us today work dysfunctionally and cause huge delays as "normal" disruptions to our current quality of life, additionally exacerbated by the 4th street construction and expanded further by the baseball stadium.

The plans for development of this property simply do not increase our community value and contribute to our noise levels, pollution and garbage, and disruptions overall, which are second only to the short-sightedness of

our politicians and developers, whose motives don't seem to factor the fact that we're being inundated by change without the proper infrastructure to support this growth. Routinely, neighborhood activities are disrupted by the historical failure to provide for adequate ways to handle the routine daily traffic to and from our streets to neighboring Virginia and Maryland, and don't let it rain or there by a fire or national emergency.

This area of SW simply cannot sustain the changes at the intended magnitude and to have them imposed with kill and compromise the character of the neighborhood.

Susan Henriques-Payne, MA
Co-Active Life Coach
1232 Fourth St., SW
Carrollsborg Square Condominium Association

From: aat_web@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 5, 2007 3:11:24 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsborgsquare.org

As an owner and resident at Carrollsborg Square Condominiums, I support the CSCA testimony and oppose tall buildings and increased traffic along M Street. I support improvements to the grocery food service in the area.

Arthur A. Totten
1245 Delaware Ave., SW
Washington, D.C. 20024

From: flanagan@flanaganconsulting.com
Subject: Hearings
Date: June 5, 2007 2:52:03 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsborgsquare.org

Dear Henry,

Thank you for asking for some resident input for this matter. The new messages are great and you and the board appear to be doing a better job than the Board has done in the past. Congratulations. I will not be attending the

meeting but I trust that you will carry our opinions forward.

I am firmly IN SUPPORT of the entire development as proposed. I grew-up in Chicago (not the suburbs) and tall buildings are a way of life. They are neither the distraction nor the impediment that many believe that they will be. The buildings will hold jobs (and people who want to live near work) as well as commercial opportunities for shopping, employment, entertainment and other distractions. More neighbors will lend a vitality to the neighborhood that may eventually chase the Greenleaf Gardens away. M Street is sufficiently wide enough to make the buildings appear further away than they might be. Last, if my neighbors like the suburban-like open space, let them seek out a suburban dwelling.

Those buildings along with the entire development will drive the property values through the roof. Look at any (and I mean any) downtown dwellings and the prices are gigantic relative to their square footage and condition.

I am all for the entire development, as is.

Mike Flanagan
1279 Delaware Ave.

MICHAEL PATRICK FLANAGAN
President
Flanagan Consulting LLC
207 Constitution Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 675-8336

From: kgui@loc.gov
Subject: Re: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 5, 2007 2:43:29 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsborgsquare.org

To the Board:

This is in response to the recent "Action Alert" email. I support the Board's position with respect to tall buildings across M Street, increased traffic to the area, 15,000 new resident units, 4-6 office buildings, and other items of the proposed development.

Mr. Kay D. Guiles

340 M Street

From: ericschoon@gmail.com
Subject: Re: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 5, 2007 2:22:33 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org, angieschoon@gmail.com

I am writing to support all office, commercial and residential development. I think that the more people and services brought to the area, the better. I don't worry particularly about the traffic or increased number of people, nor proximity of tall buildings so long as the infrastructure is developed along with the commercial and residential projects. Of course, I don't face on to M st., either.

eric schoonover
389 N

From: mdetlefk@aol.com
Subject: Re: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 5, 2007 2:11:27 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org, dasmithk@yahoo.com

Dear Mr. Henry Baker -

Thank you for this information. Although I am out of the area, I will ask by wife, Deborah, to participate.

Our views are as follows:

We are not against development per se, we are for the building of a viable community across the street that has a combination of living space, office, retail and parking space. There is a need to view the areas on the north side of M Street in a continuum. High rise towers close to the street with no open space — or parking space — does not make for a viable community.

We have lived opposite the subsidized housing area — now the towers are unoccupied for the last four years — for over 20 years — and affordable housing is not what needs to be built.

Use the Shirlington, VA developed area as an example. It has a reasonable traffic and pedestrian area, friendly to walker, shoppers, office workers and area residents.

That is not what we are getting...

All the Best,
Michael and Debbie Krause
252 M

From: jameskidney@comcast.net
Subject: Re: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 7, 2007 8:24:31 AM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org
Cc: sarafritz@comcast.net

Dear Board:

Please count my wife and I OUT on opposition to any aspect of the new Waterfront Mall. We feel very strongly that it is critical that the project be commercially successful — meaning that the developers have the opportunity for a good economic return on their investment and that the citizens have a project which will be reasonably upscale to help boost the SW neighborhood. We do not believe that the objections mentioned by the Board are sufficient to warrant opposition to the plan as presented. In fact, we are saddened that the board seems to have joined all the other "NIMYBY" opponents, such as our ANC, in seeing only the perceived drawbacks to a plan rather than its advantages. That the plan has good and less good features, with different people seeing them differently, comes with the territory.

We chose to live in a city neighborhood. We lived on Capital Hill for 20 years. Residential density is part of being in the city and, to the extent the density is full of people employed in well-paying jobs, it adds to the attractiveness of city living. We anticipate the condo development to do this and it is a good trade-off for the height issue.

Jim Kidney & Sara Fritz
1224-4th

From: BlIndc@aol.com
Subject: **Re: Action Alert Two**
Date: June 12, 2007 8:27:59 AM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

IN RESPONSE TO "ACTION ALERT TWO" I STRONGLY OPPOSE THE WATERSIDE MALL PROJECT WHICH ENTAILS THE CONSTRUCTION OF TALL BUILDINGS ACROSS M STREET, INCREASED TRAFFIC TO THE AREA, 2-3 NEW RESIDENT UNITS, 4-6 OFFICE BUILDINGS AND OTHER ITEMS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. I DO SUPPORT CSCA BOARD'S POSITION OF "APPROVE WITH SEVERAL RECOMMENDATIONS" AS OUTLINED BY KATHLEEN BEETON AND HENRY BAKER.

UNFORTUNATELY, DUE TO HEALTH REASONS, I WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ATTEND THE UPCOMING ZONING COMMISSION HEARING TO BE HELD ON 6/14/07. HOWEVER, PLEASE SUBMIT MY EMAIL WITH CSCA'S WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

MANY THANKS TO OUR BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS FOR TAKING SUCH AN ACTIVE STAND AND KEEPING THE ASSOCIATION ADVISED OF THIS PROJECT. I LOOK FORWARD TO READING FURTHER UPDATES.

SINCERELY,

BRENDA LINDSEY
1263 DELAWARE AVENUE SW (entrance via M St.)
WASHINGTON, DC 20024

From: sarafritz@comcast.net
Subject: Re: Action Alert Two
Date: June 12, 2007 8:34:58 AM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

Dear Fellow CSCA Condo Owners:

We appreciate the attention the condo association officers are giving to the Waterfront Mall, but we completely disagree with their conclusions. We strongly support the plans for the Mall that were unveiled at last week's zoning commission meeting. The new development will be beautiful and a boon to our neighborhood, plain and simple. A zoning commission member even complimented the developers for making improvements in response to the neighborhood needs. Our ANC supports it, and they are usually against everything. We suggest you take some time to look at the plans before taking any position. Please do not rely on the CSCA's description, which seems to us to be hyper-critical. The changes they are demanding would be appropriate for a suburban development, but not necessarily in the inner city. More importantly, we fear the CSCA's opposition will cause another delay in this project, leaving us to endure the current mess indefinitely. We are tired of the filth and inconvenience the delays already have caused. We also question whether the board has a right to develop a position without seeking an informed vote of the membership. On Thursday night, we will be testifying in support of the project. Please Come.

Sara Fritz and James Kidney, 1224 4th Street St

From: crod@att.net
Subject: Re: zoning hearing
Date: June 13, 2007 7:10:16 AM EDT
To: l.eichmiller@asiwpca.org, president@carrollsburghsquare.org, KBeeton@excite.com, jonathan-beeton@excite.com, Vweyres@aol.com, ea.e@yahoo.com, whitsonj@hotmail.com, walter_adamsii@yahoo.com, jerribird@earthlink.net, paul.stoskus@ref.army.mil, and 32 more...
Cc: rlmoff@erols.com

Dear Sara and Jim:

This is not one simple issue - support or not support. Nor should it be cast as a support-not support issue. Few, if any of us, would not support urban development for our neighborhood - upgrading and up-scaling, renovation of the mall, increase retail, etc., etc. Development of this scale will not be stopped in this area - it can't be - it is prime real estate, commercially and residentially.

But the short-term and long-term gains, assets and liabilities must be given voice. And they have not. Public and neighborhood input has been very limited. Even public comment at the ANC meetings was highly limited and controlled. There have been almost too many regulatory agencies to count with their hand in this "planning" along with commercial interests and developers and it becomes obvious they do not talk with each other. I am not convinced everything is on the table. Our condominium leaders and members who are shouldering some of our interests do not deserve condemnation, nor are they working for their own personal interests, nor are they working from an uninformed position. They are raising issues that have not been given fair consideration and in a professional manner.

We all must take very seriously the parking and traffic issue alone. By itself, the 4th Street cut through will bring us many unanticipated problems which are not being addressed. Just think of the volume of increased traffic coupled with the stadium on a street and parking infrastructure which is essentially left untouched throughout - not even to mention the increase in gas-emission pollution. The traffic survey information, alone, has not been given its due.

This is but one example why we dis-service ourselves if we rubber-stamp what is before us.

We hope that these final "hearings" are not intended to create the impression of soliciting community input while planning decisions go forward unchallenged.

Carlos

Carlos M Rodriguez, Ph.D.
315 N Street SW
Washington, DC 20024
202-554-8724
crod@worldnet.att.net

From: phil_gina@netzero.net
Subject: Re: Action Alert Two
Date: June 12, 2007 2:24:57 PM EDT

To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org
Cc: phil@caares.com, phillip.fletcher@dhs.gov

We support the city's Waterside/M Street proposal with the modifications as in the CSCA draft testimony. We believe that there are many government agencies that could be relocated to the new Waterside facility, such as portions of the Department of Homeland Security, particularly the headquarters offices located on 7th Street SW & Maryland Ave., and the Transportation Security Administration. Additionally, the Dept of Transportation has moved just down M Street in SE, and we understand that their new facility may not be able to house all of the DOT organizations moving out of the Nassiff building at L'Enfant Plaza. These are only 2 government agencies attempting to find new office space, and there are many more. What better way to seal the Waterside renovation project than to confirm occupancy by federal government agencies. We believe that the district must aggressively pursue gov't occupancy in this area.

If you need assistance in this, please contact us; we will be happy to assist.

Phillip and Regina Fletcher
309 N Street SW
Washington, DC
(202) 554-3538

We support the city's Waterside/M Street proposal with the modifications as in the CSCA draft testimony. We believe that there are many government agencies that could be relocated to the new Waterside facility, such as portions of the Department of Homeland Security, particularly the headquarters offices located on 7th Street SW & Maryland Ave., and the Transportation Security Administration. Additionally, the Dept of Transportation has moved just down M Street in SE, and we understand that their new facility may not be able to house all of the DOT organizations moving out of the Nassiff building at L'Enfant Plaza. These are only 2 government agencies attempting to find new office space, and there are many more. What better way to seal the Waterside renovation project than to confirm occupancy by federal government agencies. We believe that the district must aggressively pursue gov't occupancy in this area.

If you need assistance in this, please contact us; we will be happy to assist.

Phillip and Regina Fletcher
309 N Street SW
Washington, DC
(202) 554-3538

From: l.eichmiller@asiwpca.org
Subject: RE: CSCA Action Alert!
Date: June 7, 2007 6:59:35 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

Fighting this kind of issue in DC takes cunning strategy, a knowledge of the system, a strong coalition and good negotiation skills. It is dog eat dog in this town. Showing up at a hearing is too little too late. I read the points we intend to raise. They are good, but they barely scratch the surface of the issues at hand that need to be addressed in a project such as this. Setbacks are just the beginning and that is the fall back when a community is not successful on the major points. We are not speaking to many issues, that if unaddressed, will mean that we will have a behemoth of high density across the street coving the full footprint up 11 stories (the worse floor to area ratio). If we do not get involved in the design and elevations etc., there is no assurance that it will be in any way compatible with the community.

From: josephrosenstein@comcast.net
Subject: Re: Action Alert Two
Date: June 12, 2007 11:35:32 AM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

Please add the names of the 2 CSCA residents named below to the list supporting CSCA's recommendations submitted to the Zoning Commission:

Dr. Joseph Rosenstein – 332 M St.
Dr. Donald McGee – 332 M St.

From: Shenriq@aol.com
Subject: Re: Action Alert Two
Date: June 12, 2007 12:12:10 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

Thank you for the summary.

The traffic concerns are huge for residents, with current narrow streets serving as major gateways to Virginia and Maryland which are totally congested without special events on a daily basis, heightening delays with inclement weather. What's the city/developer doing to facilitate traffic, which already precludes ready access for fourth street traffic to turn either left or right during rush hour. The allowance for cars to be parked on the streets further impedes the ability for traffic to use three full lanes, and traffic traveling from the fish market across town is bottle-necked by having to merge from three to two lanes, depending on the hour and traffic routinely disrespects the right-turn only from M onto 4th street to continue across town, adding to the confusion and frustration brought about by thoroughfares that can't handle today's traffic volume. Exiting from Maine/M Street to Virginia is horrific, backing up traffic for long stretches of time on these streets and when merging into one single lane to access Maine extension or Virginia, traffic is further hampered by traffic coming from 12th streets and delayed further by delivery trucks servicing the hotel. Additionally, hotel traffic exiting the hotel creates even more traffic that delays traffic on Maine/M streets, something that seems to be addressed and ignored by the city which is turning a blind-eye to developers.

Susan Henriques-Payne, MA
Co-Active Life Coach

From: ktrceph@aol.com
Subject: Re: Action Alert Two
Date: June 12, 2007 1:12:00 PM EDT
To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

You have my full support as currently drafted. I must hone up on suggestions for mitigation to the eminent traffic problem on M Street. Some verbiage I don't comprehend but I still get the gist. I.e. "Allow increased height with smaller footprint".

From: LCYNCHA@aol.com
Subject: Re: Action Alert Two
Date: June 12, 2007 4:24:28 PM EDT

To: maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

To Whom It May Concern:

As the owner of a Carrollsburg Square Condominium Townhome at 334 M Street, I strongly support the Carrollsburg Square Testimony.

I am very concerned about my skyline view upon completion of this Southwest Waterfront project. I am also equally concerned about the distance between my home and the buildings being constructed directly across from my residence.

While I support growth in South West – as it will hopefully assist in the valuation of my property – as the Carrollsburg Square testimony states, zoning must heavily consider the input of the current resident population and not proceed forward with any plan that diminishes my enjoyment of the area, including high rise buildings that interfere with my view, an irrigation system that is "substandard" and any measure that interferes with the already parking shortages that currently exists.

I support the Carrollsburg Square testimony fully.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa C. Charles
Owner
334 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024
(202) 554-2212

From: Tabone.twinoaks@verizon.net
Subject: Responding to action alert two.
Date: June 13, 2007 9:17:41 PM EDT
To: Maildesk@carrollsburbsquare.org

- # 1. Keep M Street buildings setback at 22 feet from sidewalks.
 2. No Government offices in retail spaces.
 3. Buildings no higher than ten (10) stories.
 4. No "Optional" Vendor Carts in or around the Mall.
-

TESTIMONY OF THE CARROLLSBURG SQUARE CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, INC. (CSCA), BY HENRY BAKER, PRESIDENT OF THE CSCA BOARD, AND KATHLEEN BEETON, IN THE APPLICATION OF WATERFRONT ASSOCIATIES, LLC AND RLA REVITALIZATION CORPORATION FOR A MODIFICATION OF A FIRST-STAGE PUD AND A SECOND-STAGE PUD AND A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, Z.C. NO. 02-38A ON JUNE 7, 2007

Oral Testimony and slide show of Henry Baker
(numbers correspond to slides)

1. Open slide

Henry Baker, 381 N St. SW, delivering the testimony for Carrollsburg Square Condominium Association, Inc. in place of Ms. Kathleen Beeton who could not attend this rescheduled hearing. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for allowing Carrollsburg Square a voice in these hearings.

Carrollsburg Square Condominium Association, herein: CSCA overwhelmingly embraces the prospects of revitalizing our neighborhood.

I quote Dr. Carlos Rodriguez, former President of CSCA Board of Directors: "Development of this scale will not be stopped in this area - it can't be - it is prime real estate, commercially and residentially. But the short-term and long-term gains, assets and liabilities must be given voice. And they have not. Public and neighborhood input has been very limited."

Mr. Chairman, The neighborhood around the failed Waterside Mall has been without services for many years while this plan has been conceptualized. We are unhappy this process has taken so long while our many of our businesses have been closed. We are hoping for swift action this time by the zoning commission and by the developers, so services can be restored to our neighborhood. This is not a simple issue - support or not support. Nor should it be cast as a support-not support issue. Few, if any of us, would not support urban development for our neighborhood; however, we require several key items to be addressed, the failure to do so will result in nothing more than the failings of the current Waterside Mall.

To be fair to my constituency, not everyone agrees with our testimony today. I am aware of only a hand full of residents who have examined the proposal set forth today most I believe are responding from over-enthusiasm or fear. Fear of the unknown can sometimes lead people away from a good idea, conversly-- over-enthusiasm can lead people into negative situations. Hopefully these hearings will alleviate both fear and over-enthusiasm.

In a survey of CSCA residents, 20% support the development without considerations, 80% support the proposal with the following considerations. Overall we ask the commission to consider our requests and to act swiftly upon this proposal so the project may proceed with no further delay.

2. Today I will cover: Who We Are, our Concerns, and a brief Summary.

CSCA : Who We Are

3. We are a Neighborhood

Carrollsburg Square Condominium Association, Inc. (CSCA), is a residential cooperative containing 102 town homes in the middle of a leafy, quiet part of SW DC. A number of our residents are the original owners of our c1966 buildings.

Our residents are of all ages from newborn to senior citizen. We are homemakers, lawyers, builders, designers, government workers, retired professionals, contractors, and many other careers of life. We represent a wide cross-section of race, color, religious creed, national origin, sexual orientation, and ancestry.

Our borders are the 200-300 block of M Street SW – east to Delaware Ave – west to Fourth Street and south to N Street SW. CSCA is directly across the street from the Waterfront-SEU metro stop, within 200 feet of the Waterside Mall project.

- 4: Perspective: CSCA relationship to Waterfront Mall
5. Size of project in blue, with adjacent construction projects in purple on either side. Represents quite a volume of neighborhood space
6. So large in fact, all but 11 feet of the United States Capitol Building would fit. (Capitol is 751 feet long, the M St. frontage is 740 feet long -- 11 feet shorter)

Concerns:

7. M Street Buildings' Mass, Scale and Sidewalk

Zoning & Height

We do not object to the requested zoning changes. This land was covered under the SW Redevelopment Act, which expired in 1996. It was zoned shortly thereafter, with zoning applied as the existing structures demanded, and my point is there is no historic precedent that would prevent the zoning changes the applicant requests and we support those changes.

We suggest this allows the applicant to maximize the zoning abilities. We recommend investigating a reduction of horizontal mass even if it means building taller, thinner buildings. Smaller footprint, higher elevation.

There are creative solutions to keep a line of sight, a feeling of space, avoiding the fortress wall feeling, while embracing the Modernist Architecture of the neighborhood.

Setback Approved at 22 Feet

Require the previously approved 22 feet setback from curb to building wall. The current request is insufficient to provide large street trees, encourage walking, transit ridership and the shopping envisioned by Forest City. We share Mr. Turnbull's concern and think that narrowing the sidewalk is not viable. It will make the retail less viable, make it less comfortable to walk and shop along the street, and will preclude outdoor dining.

570 Feet of Building Wall

The two M Street buildings create a fortress effect along the street, as we will show in a moment.

Invest Creative Capital

I personally highly respect the work of Shalom Baranes Architects. I think the neighborhood will benefit from his personal and collaborative creative talent. We ask that M Street receives the same or more attention to detail that he has shown on his 4th street drawings. We challenge him to find ways to visually and physical reduce the appearance of the mass and scale of the buildings. I know from his portfolio, that he is more than capable for this challenge.

8. Corner of M Street and 4th Street looking northeast. July 2007

9. Same corner of M Street with artist's rendering of proposed buildings.

10. M Street looking west from 3rd Street July 2007

11. Same corner of M Street with artist's rendering of proposed buildings.

12. Retail Strategy

Full-service grocery store is a must

We are pleased the applicant agrees and is working hard to secure a new Safeway lease.

Engage Retail Broker for viable retail

Neighborhood is significantly underserved for retail, restaurants, and neighborhood-serving uses

Want to ensure that new retail space is occupied with viable uses that create a lively, mixed-use place and serve the entire community, not just office workers from 9 am to 5 pm

Consider 2nd floor retail

Health clubs, elevated coffee shops, medical offices, etc. can thrive on the 2nd floor (or even a rooftop restaurant!)

No Government offices in retail space

Unacceptable: Vacant retail storefronts

No "Optional" vendor carts

13. Examples of needed community retail.

"We lack Community Space, Medical Facilities, Health Clubs, and other neighborhood services."

14. Parking, Circulation and Access

Parking & Traffic

Increased Traffic

"We all must take very seriously the parking and traffic issue alone. By itself, the 4th Street cut through will bring us many unanticipated problems which are not being addressed. Just think of the volume of increased traffic coupled with the stadium on a street and parking infrastructure which is essentially left untouched throughout - not even to mention the increase in gas-emission pollution. The traffic survey information, alone, has not been given its due." Dr. Carlos Rodriguez, former President of CSCA Board of Directors.

Neighborhood streets already serve as overflow parking for Arena Stage, dinner and tour boats, and clubs along waterfront.

We approve of the increase in residential units, however the parking does not appear to have kept up with this increase. There is 3x as many residential units (1505) with only 377 spaces allocated to them.

One space per 4 residential units is insufficient

CSCA has 1 space per unit and we are struggling to park for guests, contractors, and people with a second car.

We agreed with the Metropolitan Police Department Memorandum dated 3 May 2007, "Ensure private parking is allotted to these residents prior to approval—there is lack of off street parking there."

We request the minimum .8 spaces per unit as OP has applied to other Metro-proximate developments and monitor parking supply and demand to prevent spillover parking into the neighborhood.

Recommend the applicant allow shared use of the office garage parking during non-peak times by the general public, retail customers and others to reduce demand for on-street parking on neighborhood streets

Market Value

Real estate value is considerably higher for DC residences with parking. The current plan would create an abundance of less desirable real estate with low-end market value.

Loss of M Street parking

We failed to ask this in questioning ddot, I believe they are considering making the right turn lane a through lane? Would that mean off-peak parking on M St. would disappear?

Avoid curb cuts for M St. garages

We concur with Office of Planning that the proposed garage entrances for the buildings on M Street be relocated to any other street frontage. Additional curb cuts on M Street and any Median Cut will create an undesirable retail environment and prioritizes vehicles over pedestrians and disrupts pedestrian and shopper traffic.

15. Assumption of 80% transit rider-ship is unrealistic:

many office workers do not live in Metro-accessible locations,

many residents will have at least one car,

little incentive to ride transit is offered by the applicant, set at \$10 one time coupon. Require applicant to provide at a minimum: Discounted fare-media program. [Applicant's Transportation Demand Management Program woefully inadequate:]

Neighborhood streets already serve as overflow parking for area attractions

Morning commute already has overflowing trains

Further studies of pedestrian & vehicular traffic

More pedestrian improvements are necessary on the site and at all intersections. Parking is inadequate, Metro will not alleviate the problem.

16. On the Record and of Concern

Loss of Current Green Space

Loss of green space with mature tree canopy behind Waterside Mall with extension of 4 th Street.

Public Access Easements

Privatized green space in east and west courtyards. We ask that the commission require the applicant to provide public access easements to the east and west courtyards.

Plaza Space

We approve of increasing to 50,000 sf of public plaza space at Metro; however, this space has streets with bollards running through the east and west sections that compromise pedestrian safety. These same streets also compromising its use as a public gathering space, or v/v compromise traffic flow when used as a public space. We encourage further thought on how to provide a better environment for public gathering and to create a sense of place for the community and on-site users. We do approve of the suggested installation of fountains, and encourage adding more green space and public art that is meaningful to Southwest

Additional Pedestrian-scale Lighting

Additional pedestrian-scale lighting is strongly recommended, as mentioned by Mr. Parsons, this area could benefit from better lighting and overall safety improvements

Abatements for Rodent and Dust

Applicant's construction management plan does not include rodent and dust abatement. Rat migration from the site is a concern of the community's

This is our neighborhood and the proposed development should be an opportunity to tie the north

and south sides of M Street together, not create an enclave behind a wall of commercial buildings.

We have attached email from our constituency.

17. Summary

Main Concerns

M St. Buildings be modified from “fortress” to “inviting”

Parking and transportation elements need further study and improvement prior to phase 2.

This project be expedited as prudently possible.

Secondary Concerns

- Increased Public Lighting
- More Public Green Space
- Reduce Median & Curb Cuts
- Engage Retail Broker
- Bring Retail Online ASAP
- Consider 2nd Floor Retail
- Against vendor carts
- Against Gov. Use in Retail Space
- For Full Service Grocery Store
- For Increased Residential Use
- Abatements Needed