

**Comments on Revisions to Waterfront Zoning
ZC 08-06-11 – January 7, 2010
The Committee of 100 on the Federal City**

The Committee of 100 has long supported the goals embodied in a number of the recommendations advertised in the Public Hearing Notice for this hearing. However, too many years' experience with overdevelopment through PUDs force us to oppose opening our most protected waterfront lands to the excesses possible through PUDs. The almost universal consequence of PUD proposals is upzoning and other special provisions that result in greater burdens on the land.

Particularly in light of the very small percentage of waterfront lands that are not in the control of local or Federal government, adopting such sweeping provisions seems especially unwise. We strongly oppose Recommendations 1 and 2.

It is not clear whether Recommendations 5 and 6 are intended as free-standing provisions or how they would be affected by PUDs. Would/could the proposed 75' setbacks be amended through PUDs? The maximum building dimension of 500'?

We strongly recommend that the Commission direct OP to create a special rule that would control **how** W zone properties are measured, which should be from the water side of the property, as was discussed at meetings of the Working Group. Particularly in light of changing elevations in W zones, we see clear proof that it is possible to construct 100' buildings on land zoned W1, which at the time carried a 40' maximum (the Incinerator building on K Street). Such consequences block views from the water to the land, in addition to cutting off views to and of the water. Many concerns have been expressed about how much of this will occur at the Maine Avenue waterfront, including concerns about the Banneker Overlook and the NCPC Framework Plan.

Similarly, special rules should apply to penthouses at the water's edge, where their visual impact (even at current limits) can be most disruptive.

We support Recommendation 3 with regard to special exception requirements for surface parking. Indeed it was leaders of C100 who, working through the then-Zoning Advisory Committee, wrangled through an amendment that made it permissible to use permeable paving at a time when it was illegal to use anything **but** impermeable surfaces.

Similarly Recommendation 4 is inoffensive.

The bottom line is that we believe some of these proposals will cut off the waterfront from the views we all say we are trying to reclaim and will reduce enjoyment because of barricade-like buildings providing impressive views for the privileged few.

Barbara Zartman, Chair
Zoning Subcommittee

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 08-06-11

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
EXHIBIT NO. 7
CASE NO. 08-06-11
EXHIBIT NO. 7