

Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

From: Shelly and Barbara Repp <sbrepp@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2019 2:32 PM
To: DCOZ - ZC Submissions (DCOZ)
Cc: Cheh, Mary (COUNCIL)
Subject: Case number 19-10 Valor Development, LLC Consolidated PUD Square 1499, Lots 802, 803, 806, and 807 Letter in Opposition

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DC Government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. If you believe that this email is suspicious, please forward to phishing@dc.gov for additional analysis by OCTO Security Operations Center (SOC).

4704 Windom Place NW
Washington, DC 20016
September 30, 2019

Mr. Anthony Hood, Chairman
District of Columbia Zoning Commission
441 4th Street NW
Suite 210 S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Case number 19-10 Valor Development, LLC Consolidated PUD Square 1499, Lots 802, 803, 806, and 807 Letter in Opposition

Dear Chairman Hood,

We write, once again, to express our strong opposition to the current Valor Development proposal to redevelop the former SuperFresh property. Our objections focus around:

1. Height and density:

While the current proposal is now a Planned Unit Development application, the developer has chosen to retain a design that remains too large and too dense for the site and for the neighborhood of American University Park, where we live. This oversized design attempts to squeeze in many many units of housing onto a parcel of land that is just under two acres in size and that happens to be directly across two, 30-foot wide residential streets from 2-story, single family homes. This project is simply too big for the neighborhood.

2. Increased traffic:

There will be a significant increase in traffic volume on our local streets and also in the alleyways around the site. Pedestrians - new residents from the project, visitors, workers, neighborhood residents — will be put at increased risk as they walk along the sidewalks around the project and also when they enter the new alley system with two-way traffic and trucks going forward and then backing up.

3. Use of alleyways:

The project claims that the current alleyways around the Project site will handle additional usage by cars, delivery trucks (including 50 foot wheelbase trucks), bicyclists, and pedestrians. Alleys were not intended to be used in this manner. We understand the city-wide policy of utilizing alleys in an effort to remove truck traffic from residential streets. The Applicant's proposal, however, to force two 20-foot wide alleys to carry the burden of truck traffic

PLUS additional cars from new residents and grocery store customers is not based in reality. The increase in pedestrian flow, added to cars, trucks, and bicyclists, will lead to disaster.

All communities deserve to be treated with respect, especially when their homes and neighborhoods will be so adversely affected. Quite a different story might be unfolding, right now, if the developer had chosen a path of including the voices of residents in the drafting of their design and plans. From the beginning, we have expressed our willingness to work in good faith with the developer so that a compromise might be reached. Most neighbors, we are sure, would welcome a lower-rise development in the neighborhood. Nearly four years ago, when we asked the developer's team if they would consider building townhouses, we were told that they would "not make enough money." Other lower-rise alternatives that neighbors would support also seemingly have been rejected.

We respectfully ask that the Zoning Commission give its utmost attention to the size and density of the Valor proposal; to the consequences of the increase in traffic; to the Applicant's intention to repurpose the alleyways; and finally, to the repeated concerns of neighborhood residents.

Thank you for your time and fair consideration.

Sincerely,

Barbara and Shelly Repp