



## Forest Hills Citizens Association

Dedicated to the enhancement, maintenance, protection, and promotion of  
a positive community spirit in the Forest Hills neighborhood.

September 5, 2002

### VIA HAND DELIVERY

Mr. Alberto P. Bastida, AICP  
Secretary to the Zoning Commission  
Office of Zoning  
Suite 210  
441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001

Re: In Re: Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District  
Case No. 02-19

Dear Mr. Bastida:

This letter is written in response to the September 3, 2002, letter from Mark Baughman on behalf of a group known as the Forest Hills Neighbors for Responsible Preservation ("FHNRP"). The FHNRP letter repeats the myth espoused by opponents of the Overlay that the neighborhood is "sharply divided" and that there is "substantial" opposition. As the documents submitted to the Zoning Commission demonstrate, this is simply not true.

When the documents submitted by opponents of the Overlay are examined, a number of things become immediately clear:

1. Mr. Baughman himself has submitted at least three of the "pink postcards" in opposition to the Overlay. Several other persons have submitted three or more postcards in an attempt to stuff the Zoning Commission's file in this case. There are many duplicates between pink postcards and the so-called petitions.

**ZONING COMMISSION**  
**District of Columbia**

**Case** 02-19

**Exhibit** 222

**ZONING COMMISSION**  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO. 02-19  
EXHIBIT NO. 222

2. The pink postcards themselves are of little, if any, value, except perhaps to show how little opposition there is to the Overlay. The pink postcards were mailed to each household within the Overlay (and some outside of the Overlay) by Mr. George Magher, Jr., a retired builder and a principal opponent of the Overlay,<sup>1</sup> along with four pages of text on two double sided "pink sheets." (A copy of the pink sheets is attached as Exhibit 1).

The pink sheets adopted an extremely alarmist tone, filled with inaccuracies concerning the Overlay. Leaving aside for the moment that the pink sheets described the original Overlay rather than the revised overlay recommended by the FHCA and the ANC3F Ad Hoc Tree and Slope Committee after extensive neighborhood input, the pink sheets were still inaccurate in many material respects, including: (1) the pink sheets claimed that there were no other similar overlays in DC, including one in Massachusetts Heights (of course the original overlay is in Massachusetts Heights); (2) after stating that certain things were absolutely prohibited, the pink sheets then misdescribed the special exception process, claiming that the reviewing agencies could indefinitely delay a BZA case; and (3) the pink sheets threatened the specter of reduced property values (in fact since June 27, 2002 two empty lots in Forest Hills have sold for more than the asking price<sup>2</sup>, and a third for the asking price<sup>3</sup>).

It is significant that the pink sheets purported to address the original overlay rather than the amended overlay, because extensive work was performed to gather information and amend that proposal based upon comments from the neighborhood. Had the pink sheets described the amended overlay (and done so accurately), fewer postcards would have been elicited because many concerns had been addressed.

The pink sheets were preceded by a mailing from Mr. Baughman that claimed that even adding a backyard patio could be prohibited by the Overlay. (A copy of the letter is attached as Exhibit 2). After these two alarmist letters that described an overlay proposal that would not be recommended to the Zoning Commission, it is surprising that there were so few pink postcards returned.

3. Although FHNRP claims over 150 postcards and letters, there are only about 15 letters submitted in opposition to the Overlay, and five of those are from Mr. Baughman. Fifteen letters must be contrasted with close to one hundred letters submitted in support of the Overlay, all of which are individually composed, with thoughtful reasons in support of the Overlay (in addition to over 100 signatures on petitions in support).

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Magher has also filed an intemperate letter in opposition, which is Exhibit Numbers 120 and 121, and speaks volumes about the nature of the opposition to the Overlay.

<sup>2</sup> These lots were the subject of Exhibit 116, in which the property owner claimed that the overlay "serves to precipitously depreciate the value of property in Forest Hills without compensation."

<sup>3</sup> The owner of this lot submitted Exhibit 46.

4. Virtually all, if not all, of the "pink postcards" submitted in August are duplicates of previous postcards. One of these is from Mr. Buaghman. There is a very simple explanation why this is true. On August 6, 2002, FHNRP (via Mr. Baughman) sent a letter (without any return address) to all persons whom it claimed had filed oppositions to the Overlay and enclosed two more pink postcards and asked that they be mailed in (a copy is attached as Exhibit 3). A number of persons did that, while failing to note that they had previously sent in a pink postcard with their name preprinted on it. Few, if any, of these recent postcards have any address of the signer (the original postcards had preprinted addresses), and many of the signatures are illegible. This entire episode is explained in an e-mail from Ann Schneider dated August 11, 2002 that was copied to Chairperson Mitten (a copy is attached as Exhibit 4).

5. Ms. Schneider's e-mail also explains another FHNRP error. Not all of the pink postcards submitted to the Zoning Commission are in opposition to the Overlay. If those postcards are examined, a number state that they are in favor of the Overlay and some are uncertain. (Copies of several examples are attached as Exhibit 5). Nevertheless FHNRP counts all postcards as opposed.

6. Opposition to the Overlay centers on an area on Lenore Lane that is physically isolated from the rest of Forest Hills. Although that area is only several hundred yards from Albemarle Street, the driving distance is over two miles. That area was principally developed after 1980 and has the luxury of being able to free ride on the trees that surround it in Soapstone Valley Park, the Hillwood property, and the property of the Netherlands Embassy, which are subject to less development pressure than the rest of the neighborhood. A third leader of the opposition, Karen Foreit, lives in that area. Although Mrs. Foreit has acknowledged that the June 6, 2002 report on the amendments proposed to the Overlay "addresses many of my concerns" (see Exhibit 6 attached), only 10 days later she was opposed to the entire Overlay in the public meeting before ANC3F.

7. Even at this late date, the "coherent and meaningful presentation" containing a vast "amount of substantive and detailed information... not available from other sources" promised in the FHNRP letter of July 30, 2002 has yet to materialize. Perhaps this is because the writers of that letter are already on record as being opposed to each and every provision in the Overlay as "grossly defective" (see Exhibit 82, Minority Report). Their promise that if this proceeding is dismissed they will work towards drafting an acceptable Overlay should be examined in that context.

8. Finally we wish to address the canard that the FHCA did not act properly in filing its Petition. The filing of the petition was ratified by the FHCA Executive Committee. The FHCA does not routinely take votes of its members before it takes a position. And the Ad Hoc Tree and Slope Committee of ANC3F endorsed the amended Overlay.

The FHCA is available to answer any questions from the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

FOREST HILLS CITIZENS  
ASSOCIATION

By                     /S/                      
Barbara M. Simons  
President



June 11, 2002

Dear Neighbor:

We have belatedly become aware of a zoning change rapidly moving toward adoption by the DC Government that could have serious and far reaching consequences for all of us who own property in Forest Hills. We're sending you this letter in some haste, to alert you before this process becomes irreversible.

This zoning change has a benign and deceptive name: The Tree & Slope Overlay. Just the sort of name to grab our attention and keep us from focusing on the Sunday afternoon football game. They really want us to look carefully at it.

Besides, who could be against trees? And isn't there an advisory commission, or something like that, whose job it is to worry about trees and curb maintenance and neighborhood parking and such? Why get involved with that? We have to take the kids to the soccer match, don't we?

Read on.

Under the above rubric, the zoning changes are roughly as follows:

1. All newly subdivided lots must be a minimum of 12,000 square feet in size, much larger than the present 7,500 square feet limit.
2. All new buildings on your lot must be 16 feet from the side property line, rather than the present limit of 8 feet.
3. All buildings on your lot, taken together, including any additions you may want to add in the future, must cover no more than 30 percent of your lot, rather than the present limit of 40 percent.
4. The total "impervious surface" on your lot, including buildings, driveways, tennis courts, patios, swimming pools, *etc.* must cover no more than 50 percent of your lot (there is no limit at present).
5. All new buildings must be set back from the street by at least the average setback of all other houses on the same side of the street (the only limit at present is the building restriction line, usually 30 feet from the curb).

6. You can't add a building to your lot if the process would change the existing topography of your lot, and if your lot is steeply sloped you may not be able to build at all (there is no such requirement at present).
7. The tree rules are more complicated, but essentially you can cut up to three medium size trees, and no big ones. If you violate the rules, you can't build on the property for seven years. There is no limit at present unless your property borders on park land).

These new restrictions will apply only to Forest Hills. No one else will be restricted: not Cleveland Park, not Foxhall, not Chevy Chase, not Massachusetts Heights, not Wesley Heights—you get the idea.

OK, what is the real impact of this proposal? First, imagine a person who seeks to move to DC. He has looked at Forest Hills property and has seen a couple of houses he likes, and (except for the swimming pool or tennis court he wants to add) they're just what he wants. He talks to the real estate agent, negotiates a price he can accept, and is ready to sign the deal. Just as a precaution, he asks a contractor for a preliminary estimate of the cost of the swimming pool, and is surprised to hear that the newly adopted zoning rules won't allow him to build it because it would add too much to the "impervious surface" of the lot. Does he want to be trapped in a piece of property that he can't change in the future, as his needs change? What does he do? He abandons the sales contract, and starts looking in Cleveland Park or Wesley Heights or Foxhall.

What about the owner of the Forest Hills home this person was ready to buy? He has lost a buyer, and has to start over again. And what happens to home prices in Forest Hills if buyers become aware of the headaches they will face if they want to make future changes to the property they are considering? Just as stock prices fall when buyers become nervous, so will prices of homes in Forest Hills.

A more subtle effect on home prices: when you improve or expand your home, you add value. As your neighbors do so, they add value as well. The collective effect of these improvements is to elevate property values throughout Forest Hills. If these new rules inhibit improvements, this growth in property values can slow or stall.

Needless to say, if you simply want to stay in Forest Hills, you will lose a lot of the flexibility you now have to make changes in the future as your needs change.

The DC zoning regulations are already pretty thick. Do you really want to give more rules, and more power, to the zoning bureaucrats? It's probably easier to negotiate away a speeding ticket than to get those folks to bend their rules. Do you really want to be placed in the role of supplicant if you decide to add a tennis court, or build a garage at the side of your lot, or just cut a tree that blocks the new deck you want to construct? Oh yes, don't forget the criminal penalties for misstating something on the multitude of forms that will be required.

Suppose you absolutely have to have that new deck, and you think that by bending the new rules just a bit...

Here is a list of the folks you will have to ask for permission to bend the rules:

- The Office of Planning
- The Department of Transportation, Tree Maintenance Division
- The Department of Recreation and Parks
- The Department of Health, Soil Erosion Branch; and
- The National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

They will all be waiting with bated breath, ready to get right on it and write the necessary reports approving your request. Fortunately, they have nothing else to do and have no agendas of their own that might conflict with your request.

We are all aware that Forest Hills is not Beverly Hills, or the Hamptons, or Santa Barbara. It's really a very nice neighborhood, but most of us are not multi-millionaires with lots of acreage and a fleet of Bentleys. We may secretly wish that we lived in Beverly Hills, but we aren't going to achieve that objective by changing the street signs or requiring new residents to have houses and lots bigger than our own. There may even be good reasons to transform Forest Hills into something it is not, but hopefully such a proposal would be brought into the open and debated thoroughly, not rammed through in midsummer under a deceptive title.

And what is the problem to which this proposal is the solution? Apart from the phrase "to protect the character of our park-like neighborhood from future destructive development" the proposal is silent on the problem.

Has anyone proposed to build a strip mall across the street from your home? Has your neighbor laid plans to replace his large and elegant home with a dozen purple and yellow row houses? We didn't think so.

Doesn't it seem reasonable that a sweeping change such as this one should be based on a clear and compelling statement of a real problem, rather than the fuzzy and unsupported whim of a small committee and a couple of lawyers?

In the same vein, the Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC3F) voted to recommend that the DC Zoning Commission hold a hearing on this proposal. Who voted against? The two commissioners who represent Forest Hills.

You may see this situation differently than we do. If so, you needn't do anything. But if you share our concern that these proposed changes are too sweeping to accept without a lot of careful deliberation, sign the enclosed postcard and send it right away to the DC Zoning Commission. If these changes really are worthy of overwhelming support, they can just as well wait a few months until all our neighbors have a chance to understand them fully and endorse them. If not, your postcard "vote" will help us all avoid a railroad job we will spend the next few decades regretting.

Finally: You could join those of us who are concerned about this proposal at the meeting of the DC Zoning Commission at 6:30 pm on June 27, in Room 220 at One Judiciary Square, 441 Fourth Street NW. If they don't see enough opposition, they could approve it in a matter of weeks.

Please don't just throw this postcard away. There is too much at stake, and we have gone to a lot of trouble to alert you to it.

Sincerely,

George R. Magher, Jr. and neighbors  
2901 Ellicott Terrace NW  
Washington DC 20008  
(202) 244-7727



My name is Mark Baughman. I am an architect who has practiced in the district for over 20 years. I live at 4835 Linnean Ave., NW in a 1931 Tudor house where a very large, very old but healthy oak tree leans completely over our house threatening to crush the roof. We should take this tree down, but, out of respect for that tree, my wife and I instead have spent thousands of dollars to cable it and fertilize it and trim it regularly. So I share our community's intense love of trees.

The loopholes, inaccuracies, vague language, over-protective prescriptions and overreaching restrictive covenants contained in the Tree & Slope Overlay now in effect are bad for our community and I oppose it. I am encouraged by the fact that the Tree Subcommittee apparently agrees at least in part that the original version is flawed and has attempted to rectify many of the problems with proposed amendments.

In my limited time I would like to review some of the problems that would still exist, even if the Zoning Commission were to accept the recommendations of the Tree Subcommittee and revise the TSO only that far.

#### FIRST, THE STATED RATIONALE IS FLAWED

The TSO presumes that development, if not rigidly controlled, threatens the natural topography of Forest Hills. Its supporters presume that current zoning has failed. But they offer no support, beyond assertions, for these conclusions. No detailed surveys, no impartial calculations, no appropriate studies that show that it is the zoning itself, rather than enforcement of existing zoning, that is the problem, or even that we have a problem. We must remember that nearly everyone who has a house in this neighborhood lives in a legacy where aesthetic pain was inflicted on their neighbors when that house was constructed. and yet the neighborhood exists as we all love it in spite of - or in some cases because of - our development.

Beyond the flawed rationale, the fundamental problem here is the use of an existing overlay as a template for a large area of multifaceted sub-neighborhoods, without careful consideration of the differences of each of these sub-neighborhoods. There are some areas of Forest Hills that feature large lots with large houses, and others that feature much smaller lots with denser long-standing construction. Even a casual review of other DC overlay districts shows that these regulations tend to be crafted with great care and understanding at the smallest urban scale. The TSO before us slaps one uniform standard on a neighborhood that exhibits many differing features.

#### THE SPECIFIC TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

I would like to review very briefly problems with six changes the TSO would require, problems that would exist even if the amendments suggested are incorporated.

## (1) Tree Cutting Limitations

As we all know, the TSO establishes new rules for what trees can and cannot be cut down. These rules assume, incorrectly, that all trees above a given size are good, and that maintaining them will preserve the character of the neighborhood. It does not consider, for instance that thinning out large healthy trees might permit others to grow larger and stronger. In addition, the method of enforcement is so convoluted that it defies credulity.

In short, the TSO now puts me and others in the neighborhood in the position of having to consider taking down smaller trees before they get so big I will need a special exception to remove them, or even to clear cut property now so that seven years from now I will have a special exception-free opportunity to do something with that property, if I so choose. Instead of viewing trees as an asset, we are now forced to view them as potential problems.

## (2) Ground Coverage

The TSO reduces the amount of ground a building can cover from 40% to 30%. The 30% number is entirely arbitrary. Why not 25%? Why not 35%? The impact of a house has as much to do with its height as its area. By squeezing the plan you force people to increase the floors.

## (3) Impervious Surface

The TSO would restrict the amount of a lot could be covered by impervious surfaces to 50%. This 50% is also arbitrary. I have not read or heard anything from the Department of Public Works that indicates that the City's current stormwater management system for Forest Hills is a problem. I have certainly not heard any other experts present a specific problem here that needs fixing. The suggested amendments provide only vague language that will have to be sorted out during the onerous Special Exception process. And because this particular issue involves many departments, the process could drag on for months. I appreciate that the Committee recommends modifying the definition of impervious surfaces and expanding the kinds of materials that would not be counted as impervious. But the current TSO now in effect does not include these changes.

## (4) Lot Size

The TSO would increase the current minimum lot size to 12,000 square feet. In a fascinating cavalcade of numbers, the Committee sets out to use statistics to rationalize the 12,000 SF rule. Because not all numbers are shared and because there is no qualitative or substantive planning information provided, they are vacant abstractions and still they don't seem to support any change to the current minimum lot size. There seems to be no consideration of the area or

mass of the house or how the other regulations would work together with them. So, for example, one might discover after a little thought that with a combination of graduated side-yard restrictions and a fixed front yard equal to the contiguous block, the resulting house on a 7,500 SF lot would be quite satisfactory.

(5) Definition of "New"

The original TSO, now in effect, was written in such a way that no one could put an addition on his or her house without getting a special exception. So I applaud the Committee for trying to rectify this problem, created by the haste of the TSO supporters to put this thing into effect. Unfortunately, however, the new definitions are still vague and clever developers will find ways around it.

(6) Steep Slopes

The TSO restrictions construction on slopes. The slope provision is completely flawed and I applaud the Committee for recognizing this. Unfortunately the Committee's new language still seems to want to keep the idea in play and the vagueness is an open door for trouble.

This review is really just the highlights of what is wrong with the TSO, even if amended as suggested by the Committee. It demonstrates the problems that arise if you rush something this important. TSO supporters want us to "Think before you cut;" I recommend we all "Think before we file."



August 6, 2002

Re: Forest Hills Tree and Slope Protection Overlay Proposal

Dear Neighbor,

Thank you for your help opposing the proposed Forest Hills Tree and Slope Protection Overlay. While the consensus of those of us who attended the June 27 Zoning Commission Hearing was that it will be an uphill climb to convince the Commission not to adopt some form of the original TSO Proposal, we also came away with the impression that the signed pink cards had a positive effect and represented an important demonstration of the extent of neighborhood opposition to this Proposal.

At the next hearing this September, those in opposition will have a chance to present their case, and in anticipation of that hearing we would like everyone who wants to sign and mail in one of these cards to have had a chance to do so.

We have enclosed two additional cards for you to give to any of your neighbors who would like to send in a card but have not as yet done so. Please feel free to do as many of us have, and address letters directly to the Commission\* or sign other petitions opposing this Proposal. The actual hearing will be on Thursday, September 5 at 7:00 pm, Room 220, One Judiciary Square, 441 Fourth St. NW. Please join us at that hearing if you are able. We are hopeful that a large turnout in opposition will influence any decision by the Commission.

Again thank you for your help. If you have any questions please contact Mark Baughman at mbaughman@skbarch.com

Sincerely,

Forest Hills Neighbors for Responsible Preservation

\*Write to: Carol J. Mitten, Chair  
Zoning Commission  
District of Columbia Office of Zoning, Suite 210  
441 Fourth St. NW.  
Washington, DC 20001.

Refer to Case No.02-19 (Text Amendment - Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District.)



## Clark, George R.

---

**From:** Aimplahs@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2002 5:19 PM  
**To:** mbaughman@skbarch.com; kpatterson@dccouncil.washington.dc.us;  
gclark@ReedSmith.com; BardinD@arentfox.com; maudlin@alum.mit.edu;  
dmitchellcae@myvzw.com; donovan2@cais.com; Patrileyj@aol.com; ChantalGMD@aol.com;  
mschneid@erols.com; levyi@gunet.georgetown.edu  
**Subject:** "Opposition" Letter, FYI

August 11, 2002

Mr. George R. Magher, Jr.  
2901 Ellicott Terrace, NW  
Washington, DC 20008

Ref: Case No. 02-19

Dear Mr. Magher:

The letter received two days ago from "Forest Hills Neighbors for Responsible Preservation" causes me some concern. It shows no return address (according to post-anthrax instructions, I should not have opened it), thanks me for my "help in opposing the proposed Forest Hills Tree and Slope Protection Overlay" (I favor the overlay), and includes two stamped "petitions in opposition" to be sent to the DC Zoning Commission. Looking back on my growing file on the issue, yours is the only name and mailing address that I find, so I am addressing this letter to you.

I am NOT opposed to the proposed overlay, or to the proposed increase in minimum lot size. The environmental concerns voiced by the National Park Service representative seem to me to be particularly important. My communications to the Zoning Commission have expressed my support for the proposal, and my attendance at the June hearing was intended to do the same.

Your letter also seems a little deceptive for any recipients not familiar with the issues, since it contains no summary of your organization's arguments. And where do you get your funds for another expensive mailing? I hope that your efforts are not funded by individuals or companies hoping to benefit irresponsibly from further "development" of Forest Hills. Having no wish to use the cards, I am returning them.

Please remove my name from any list of presumed "opponents."

Sincerely,

Ann I. Schneider

Enclosures: As stated.

cc: Carol J. Mitten  
(by e-mail): mbaughman@skbarch.com  
kpatterson@dccouncil.washington.dc.us  
gclark@ReedSmith.com  
BardinD@arentfox.com  
maudlin@alum.mit.edu  
dmitchellcae@myvzw.com  
donovan2@cais.com  
patrileyj@aol.com



The people who sent me this rd don't know what they're talking about, as was clear at our local ANC meeting. They have no constructive alternative to offer. And their facts are wrong.

To the DC Zoning Commission:

Re: Case No. 02-19 (Text Amendment—Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District)

*SUPPORT!!*  
~~Petition in Opposition~~

*Strongly Support*  
I/we are ~~opposed to~~ the petition for a Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District filed by the Forest Hills Citizens Association on April 5, 2002 and respectfully request and urge the Zoning Commission to ~~reject~~ the petition.

*APPROVE*  
JAMES L. CASSERLY  
2839 ALLENDALE PLACE, N. W.  
WASHINGTON DC 20008

Signature(s): *James L. Casserly*

To the DC Zoning Commission:

Re: Case No. 02-19 (Text Amendment—Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District)

~~Petition in Opposition~~

*Not*  
I/we are ~~opposed to~~ the petition for a Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District filed by the Forest Hills Citizens Association on April 5, 2002 and respectfully request and urge the Zoning Commission to ~~reject~~ the petition.

*approve*  
ANN I. SCHEIDER  
3319 FESSENDEN STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON DC 20008

Signature(s): *Ann I. Scheider*

To the DC Zoning Commission:

Re: Case No. 02-19 (Text Amendment—Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District)

~~Petition in Opposition~~ *in Support*

*in favor of*  
I/we are ~~opposed to~~ the petition for a Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay District filed by the Forest Hills Citizens Association on April 5, 2002 and respectfully request and urge the Zoning Commission to ~~reject~~ the petition.

*approve*  
KIYOE O. SILVERBERG  
2741 BRANDYWINE STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON DC 20008

Signature(s): *Kiyoe O. Silverberg*



## **Clark, George R.**

---

**From:** Foreit, Karen [K.FOREIT@TFGL.COM]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 06, 2002 7:50 PM  
**To:** 'Bardin, David J. '  
**Cc:** Clark, George R.  
**Subject:** RE: Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay

Dear Mr. Bardin:

Thank you for forwarding your report; I also received a copy from Phil Kogan.

The report addresses many of my concerns, and I hope there will be ample public debate before the issue is voted on by the ANC and the zoning commission. Responsible development is crucial not only to maintaining our current property values but to augmenting the city's ever-shrinking tax base. I strongly support the footprint and impervious surface restrictions, as well as the more flexible side-yard set-backs that you propose. Once this issue is resolved, might it be possible to harness the civic interest generated in the debate, to collaborate with the city's efforts to document and augment our forest cover?

Sincerely,  
Karen Foreit

-----Original Message-----

From: Bardin, David J.  
To: 'Foreit, Karen'  
Cc: 'gclark@ReedSmith.com'  
Sent: 6/6/02 6:25 PM  
Subject: RE: Forest Hills Tree and Slope Overlay

Dear Ms. Foreit:

Thank you for the thoughtful letter.

I, too, believe some changes should be made in the Overlay proposal and intend to press to have the Zoning Commission do just that. (The Zoning Commission has already made some changes on the original version before scheduling its public hearing.)

To that end, a new Committee Report to the ANC recommends several changes.

I attach that Report, in both a "Word" and a "WordPerfect" version, in the

hope you will be able to open and read it in one of the versions. I co-chaired that Committee with George Clark. Either of us would be happy to

go over the issues you raise with you and explain why we think that changing

the Overlay proposal as the Report recommends will do the job.

My number is 202-857-6089.

Faithfully, David J. Bardin

c: George Clark

-----Original Message-----

From: Foreit, Karen [mailto:K.FOREIT@TFGL.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2002 9:45 PM  
To: 'ANC3F@juno.com'; 'Phil.Kogan@HHS.gov'; 'karenperry2@juno.com';  
'maudlin@alum.mit.edu'; 'BardinD@ArentFox.com';  
'dmitchellcae@myvzw.com'; 'schumannwiss@juno.com'; 'tstrauss@erols.com'