

Thanks for the opportunity.
Elissa.

- 1. Do you favor surplusing the available air rights of the Civic Core site that have not and never will be needed for the public facilities (the new library, community center, revitalized open spaces, and parking) so that it can be used for housing consistent with the [Chevy Chase Small Area Plan](#) and zoning regulations?**

I support building housing that is consistent with the Civic Core envisioned in the Chevy Chase Small Area Plan. If I understand the process, the city would declare the air rights not needed for the library and community center surplus, then work with what I hope would be a nonprofit developer to put mixed-income affordable/workforce housing there. I would not want the library or community center surplus, just the air rights. The library and community center are important civic spaces, real anchors for the neighborhood.

I have an older brother, Jonathan, who lived at the Livingston Apartments for two decades until recently so I know the neighborhood well. I understand the concerns about preserving the library, which has one of the highest circulation rates in our system, as well as the community center. And I know the basketball court and outdoor spaces are valuable and well used. I

also understand the pressures on Lafayette Elementary, which is oversubscribed because it is so high-performing. And parking.

We've struggled to keep retail and restaurants open in our neighborhood retail areas like in Chevy Chase, and what I have realized is that density is an asset. Those future residents are future movie-goers at the Avalon, shoppers and eaters at neighborhood restaurants. They will help make Chevy Chase a vibrant urban village.

2. Given the ten-year process of planning and community engagement that has taken place (described in detail on our [website](#)), do you support acting this year to approve the project so that it can move forward expeditiously?

Yes, and as a newly returning Councilmember I want to understand why we landed where we did on the number of affordable units, and if there is any way to get more affordable units into the project. In my prior experience on the Council, I often worked with developers to try to get more affordability into a project. It is regrettable that the process has taken so long; however, I am concerned that the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development may be squandering an opportunity to develop affordable housing that will benefit more people.

All of the planning contemplated the addition of affordable housing *only* on this site, yet DMPED selected a modified proposal where just 30% of the housing units will be affordable--that means less affordable housing than any of the eight RFP respondents had proposed. So I cannot say that DMPED's slow process has led to a desirable outcome.

Again, I'd need to hear DMPED convincingly explain why it is a sound decision to back away from the initial goal of 100% affordable housing. The small area plan focused on inclusive development, and I'd want to make sure we aren't straying from that North Star.

3. Do you support the mix and amount of affordable housing that the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Development's selected vendor, Risk Valley, originally proposed — one-third deeply affordable housing (30% to 50% MFI), one-third workforce housing (80% MFI), and one-third market-rate housing based on a total of 209 units? If not, what amount and degree of affordable housing do you support at the site?

Yes, Rift Valley's original proposal was more desirable than the modified proposal recently announced by DMPED. I could support a housing development where two-thirds of the units are affordable (which Rift Valley had initially proposed), and I also

could support a development where all of the units are affordable (which most of the other RFP respondents had proposed). Again, I see these residents as future customers at Little Beast, Macgruder's, and Chevy Chase Lounge.

- 4. Would you support a change to the draft [Future Land Use Map](#) from the current proposed “Small Scale Residential Neighborhood” in Chevy Chase to permit multi-family units to be built so long as they are consistent with the overall look and feel of the neighborhood (e.g., through the use of form-based codes)?**

Yes, and I understand the concerns. As I said above, I think some additional density on Connecticut Ave. helps support neighborhood businesses, and it can be done in a way that enhances, not detracts from the historic residential neighborhood. I live in historic Capitol Hill two blocks from H Street NE. If you stand in front of my house, you'd never know there were multi-unit buildings a block away. In Chevy Chase, I believe small multifamily buildings could be consistent with the overall look and feel of the neighborhood and help enhance it.