

Leach, Deonte (DCOZ)

RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING

From: Rumbaut@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 7:12 AM
To: bnadeau@dccouncil.us; Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Evans, Jack (COUNCIL); Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL); Todd, Brandon (COUNCIL); kmcduffie@dccouncil.us; Allen, Charles (COUNCIL); Alexander, Yvette (COUNCIL); lmay@dccouncil.us; vorange@dccouncil.us; abonds@dccouncil.us; dgrosso@dccouncil.us; esilverman@dccouncil.us; Mendelson, Phil (COUNCIL); DCOZ - ZC Submissions (DCOZ); Racine, Karl (OAG)
Cc: tfazzini@dccouncil.us; Grant, Schannette (COUNCIL); Werner, Ruth (COUNCIL); Willingham, Jonathan (COUNCIL); sneman@dccouncil.us; jmobley@dccouncil.us; rgulstone@dccouncil.us; lmarks@dccouncil.us; Lowery, Terese (Council); adavis@dccouncil.us; jbrown@dccouncil.us; dmeadows@dccouncil.us; ikang@dccouncil.us; dcalhoun@dccouncil.us; srosenamy@dccouncil.us; Moore, Brian (COUNCIL); clefevre@dccouncil.us; Bardin, Sara (DCOZ); Schellin, Sharon (DCOZ); Bergstein, Alan (OAG); Rushkoff, Bennett (OAG); Pittman, James (OAG)
Subject: Inclusionary Zoning, Genuinely; ZC Case 04-33G

2016 JAN 28 PM 12:40

Dear DC Planning Officials,

I'm very concerned that we're not taking real affordable housing seriously in this city. Some people in the area make a lot of money relative to many others, which can severely skew our perspective when making calculations about what is affordable. There isn't room for skewed perspectives. Housing can't wait; it's a baseline need for city residents to function, and, frankly, a human right.

What I keep coming back to when I look at what's happening in my hometown is: who is all this "development" for? Clearly not for everyone, and not for the people who need it most and contribute to this city through their paid or unpaid work, presence, and knowledge. What, then, is the use? Are we yet human, or are we automatons with dollar signs in our eyes?

We have Inclusionary Zoning requirements in DC. Any rule or statute is only as good as its content and enforcement, not its name. So how inclusionary are the IZ rules? From what I understand, they mostly benefit folks who make 80% of AMI, and, of course, "developers." That is crazy. That is the dangerous kind of crazy.

Can you set reasonable regulations? The suggestions below sound like a good start to me:

- * The definition of an affordable IZ unit should at most be 50% AMI, with 30% AMI a much better metric of 'affordability'. The current definition of an IZ unit set at 80% AMI is a joke, and so is 70% or even 60%.
- * IZ production requirements which live up to the housing crisis in DC must be implemented now. Current IZ production expectations must be doubled at least with 20% to 30% of any new building in the District to include IZ units so we can meaningfully contend with the number one priority in the DC Comprehensive Plan -- preserving and producing more affordable housing in the city.
- * No additional bonus density -- Developers know that DC is one of the hottest rental and condo markets in the nation. Marketing IZ units as affordable in any new building is a way for the development community to give back for DC's windfall real estate market -- a market with such rising housing costs and rents that tens of thousands of longtime District residents have been forced from their homes in the past decade. If additional bonus density is considered, it must only be given to developers who are willing to market IZ units to families requiring 3 or more bedrooms with eligibility for those with incomes at 30% AMI or less.

ZONING COMMISSION
 District of Columbia
 CASE NO. 04-33G
 EXHIBIT NO. 39

* There should be no exemptions from IZ in any district/zone in the City -- immediately. As it exists, exemptions to IZ is exclusive planning which stands in complete opposition to the DC Comprehensive Plan. This is our chance to fix this terrible mistake.

I'd like to know your thoughts on the above, and what you will do to assure dignified, truly affordable housing.

Respectfully,
Jazmin Rumbaut
Rumbaut@gmail.com

Ward: 4
Zip: 20011