

# **ANC 6B**

## *Capitol Hill / Southeast*

**Testimony of Kenan Jarboe, ANC 6B**  
**Re: ZC Case # 08-06-2 (Comprehensive Zoning Regulations Rewrite: Parking)**  
**July 31, 2008**

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Kenan Jarboe. I am ANC Commissioner for ANC 6B05 and Vice Chair of ANC 6B. My colleague Commissioner Garrison has already given you the reason why ANC 6B does not believe that the proposed recommendations gets us to where we want to go – that is the alleviation of parking problems and a reduction in traffic. I would like to touch upon a couple of other points in the regulations.

First is the proposed transportation fund. The recommendations do require minimum parking spaces in certain places where there might be significant spillover effects, specifically in commercial uses in and near residential areas. But later on, the recommendations allow developers to buy their way out of that requirement by contributing to a DDOT transportation fund. This seems to me to be an unfair distribution of costs and benefits. The affected neighbors bear all the costs of the spillovers, where as the public in general gets the benefits. In other words, in concentrates more pain on those already in pain for the benefits of those not even affected. If there is a reason to require minimums to alleviate negative impacts on the community, then there is no reason waive that requirement simply for a few dollars.

Second is the requirement to set aside space for car sharing. I am fully in favor of the car sharing process. However, I would urge that the regulations be drawn up in such a ways as to not favor one form of car sharing over another. There are many ways that a car can be shared. For example, will these spaces be available to van pools and other forms of car pooling? What about requiring a taxi stand?

I would also suggest that there are other ways of reducing traffic. If I was going to subsidize anything, I would propose subsidizing telecommuting. For example, we could require all developments of a certain size to include space for telecommuting—the same way we used to have a recreational space requirement. Reducing the need for all those commuter trips would be a much more effective way of reducing traffic and all the problems associated with traffic.

I would also point out that the OP study seems to combine the commercial (office & retail) parking situation with the residential parking situation. The recommendations are based on the analysis of commercial parking, what I will call destination parking. But the recommendations affect residential parking, what I would call home parking. I would

submit that these two situations need to be looked at differently. The analysis is further confused. Where the OP report does specifically address the issue of excess parking spaces, it is in sites that are Metro accessible. For sites that are at or near Metro facilities, a reduction in the number of parking spaces may make sense – and is already in our zoning regulations. But the proposal is to eliminate the parking minimums regardless of access to transit.

I would like to close with one other comment. Regardless of the merits of the proposal – pro or con – I am concerned about the process. This is supposed to be an implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. As Commissioner Garrison pointed out, this proposal is outside of the boundaries of the what was called for in the Comp Plan. I hope we are not in the process of effectively throwing out the Comp Plan and starting over again under the guise of rewriting the zoning regulations.

Thank you for your attention. I would be happy to answer any questions.