Testimony to the Zoning Commission for 02-31
Larry Schuette
President, Washington Canoe Club
PO BOX 25449
Washington DC, 20007

Good Evening:

Thank you for this opportunity. I am the current president of the Washington Canoe Club. I was born in Georgetown, my father was born in Georgetown, my grandmother was born in Georgetown and my Great-Grandfather owned a feed-store in Georgetown, after having been kicked out of Ireland. I've been connected with the Potomac River, the C&O Canal, Georgetown and WCC all my life.

WCC is very concerned about 02-31 and what it allows in a Boathouse as a matter of right. It doesn't seem to us that a Rowing Tank is a dependent use of the River, and as such should not be placed in the flood plain of the Potomac River. Additionally, an exercise area for ergometer use for 100 to 150 athletes would not seem to be a dependent use of the River. In fact, the Rowing Tank and Ergometer areas are to be used when the River is unavailable due to ice or bad weather. Accordingly they are "Anti-Dependent" or orthogonal uses and should be stricken from the Boathouse definition.

WCC is very concerned that the W-O zone as written will continue to encourage these types of Monster structures. The proposed Georgetown Boathouse uses 80' long bays, yet the boats are only 58' at a maximum. Additionally, the structure will many more boats than GU currently, or could realistically be assumed to own. With a 12' first floor, this structure could hold 100 "8"s. This double what GU & GWU currently own combined.

The W-O zone needs to limit the size of these structures by limiting the height and size. It is recommended that the FAR be reduced from .75 to .5 for Boathouses by right, and .75 by exception, and that the Percentage of lot occupancy be .25 by right, .5 by exception. This will give greater control over the structures built to the Zoning Commission that is obviously needed to control these structures.

As the Committee of 100 stated in the review process for the W-O zone:

> "The 40' permitted height, the same as in W-1, when combined with the 18.5' penthouse allowance – and more for architectural embellishments and other purposes – raises concern for waterfront sites and their exceptional visibility. We realize these are standard provisions of the zoning code, but we question whether the

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
Case 02-31
Exhibit
ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.02-31
EXHIBIT NO.108

> should be imposed in waterfront open space. The visual impact of such roof structures in a commercial building row is very different than the impact along the water's edge."

According to NCPC:

> The C&O Canal NHP should be preserved as a legacy of inland waterway development. It should serve as a recreational area for non-motorized uses, such as bicycling, jogging, hiking, and boating **though preservation of the park's historic resources should take precedence over the provision of recreational activities.** Adjacent development should be kept at a low density, except east of Key Bridge."

Either a special zone should be created upstream of Key Bridge, or a more restrictive approach to the W-0 zone should be taken. Namely, special exception vice by right.

Additionally, WCC is very concerned about the "no parking" zone. We were informed by the NPS that parking would be allowed at WCC, and this seems to be a potential way to remove our right to park. We feel that parking can be done in an environmentally and view friendly manner. We have many members who range in age from very young to their 90s. While there are many who, cannot walk 200 meters, they can paddle, and they do enjoy WCC. Additionally, we feel that it is unrealistic to believe that Georgetown will not be parking at their facility. What is parking? According to the meter maid that I met last week means stopping the car and getting out. Our facility will have street access via a gate at the end of K street. The proposed GU facility (if built) will have street access via an access road at the end of K street as well.