

## INTRODUCTION

My name is Walter Borek. My family and I have lived at 4833 Alton Place for the last 29 years. We live 372 paces, less than a two minute walk, and less than .2 miles from the proposed development site. I have practiced architecture in DC, Maryland, and Virginia for the past 45 years, seven of which were at a commercial real estate development firm. I am not against development.

## DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS OVERVIEW

---

The developer, Valor, is asking for an increase of density.

Everything the developer has presented for approval to justify a larger building under the Design Review Standards can be divided into two components:

1. Those not related to the size of the building and therefore could be implemented with a building of a smaller size, or one allowed by “matter-of-right”
2. Those adversely affected by a building larger than what is allowed by “Matter of Right

## DOCUMENT 1 INTRODUCTION OVERVIEW

- A “MATTER-OF-RIGHT” DEVELOPMENT
- A BUILDING LARGER THAN “MATTER-OF-RIGHT” DEVELOPMENT

## DOCUMENT 2

Detailed Analysis: Design Review Standards that could be included in a Matter of Right development by a “Matter of Right” development

## DOCUMENT 3

Detailed Analysis: Design Review Standards Adversely Affected by a development Larger than what is Allowed by “Matter of Right”

## DOCUMENT 4

Illustrations/Visuals

Could be included in a “Matter-of-Right” development

The following standards could easily be met in a “matter-of-right” development. In no way does the proposed development’s size have any bearing on satisfying these standards.

- 604.7 (a) Street frontages designed to be safe, comfortable, and encourage pedestrian activity
- 604.7 (a) (1) Multiple pedestrian entrances 7
- 604.7 (a) (2) Driveway or garage access to the street is discouraged
- 604.7 (a) (3) Commercial ground floors containing active uses with clear, inviting windows
- 604.7 (a) (4) Minimized blank walls
- 604.7 (a) (5) Wide sidewalks
- 604.7 (b) Public gathering spaces are encouraged near major boulevards and public spaces
- 604.7 (d) (1) Elevated detailing and design of first and second stories
- 604.7 (e) Sustainable landscaping
- 604.7 (f) (2) Incorporate transit and bicycle facilities and amenities

Adversely affected by a building larger than “Matter-of-Right” development

Any increase in density over what is allowed under “matter-of-right” criteria would critically and negatively impact the following standards. Increase in density is directly correlated to degradation of these standards.

- 604.5 Proposed development is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan  
*see ILLUSTRATION # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5*
- 604.6 Adversely affects the use of neighboring property  
*see ILLUSTRATION # 1, 2*
- 604.7 Disregards the urban design of the site and the building  
*see ILLUSTRATION # 2*
- 604.7 (c) Disrespects the historic form of Washington’s neighborhoods and landmarks, specifically American University Park, a 103 year old neighborhood  
*see ILLUSTRATION # 2*
- 604.7 (2) Destroys the continuity of neighborhood architectural character  
*see ILLUSTRATION # 2, 3*
- 604.7 (3) Willfully and blatantly disregards key landscape vistas and axial views of historic landmarks  
*see ILLUSTRATION #9*
- 604.7 (d) (2) Is non-contextual because it creates unattractive, uninspired, antithetical façade design, inconsistent with AU Park’s architecture  
*see ILLUSTRATION # 1, 7*
- 604.7 (f) Ignores connectivity and integration with the surrounding neighborhood and pedestrian pathways
- 604.7 (f) (1-4) Creates significant pedestrian hazards at main access points which are already stressed  
*see ILLUSTRATION #10*
- 604.7 (f) (1-4) Makes streets and alleys pedestrian unfriendly and dangerous because it relies almost entirely on an internal service alley system that handles tractor trailers,

trucks and automobiles serving not only this site, but the AU's building, and the Spring Valley Shopping Center and funnels pedestrian into those alleys as well as pedestrians

*see ILLUSTRATION # 10*

### Conclusion

These deficiencies and flaws demonstrate that the proposed development is in no way superior to a "matter-of-right" development. To the contrary: the larger the development, the less it complies with the standards.

In no way does this design review application show a need for relief based on the criteria laid out by the Design Review Standards.