

Case No. 08-06A
Comments Received via the ZRR Module

Subtitle A

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Ellen McCarthy	9/25/2015	200	Properties owned by the Government of the United States and used for or intended to be used for a Federal public building or use should be further defined see proposed definition in Sect.100.2 to make clear that land owned by the federal government which is ground-leased or otherwise utilized for commercial or private residential development must be zoned.

Case No. 08-06A
Comments Received via the ZRR Module

Subtitle B

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Ellen McCarthy	9/25/2015	100.2	The regulations need a precise definition of "federal public building or use", as it is used in Section 208.1a. I would propose a definition such as "Federal public building or use - a structure used primarily for the conduct of official federal government business, services or functions. Uses such as food service may be permitted, but must be clearly accessory to the primary governmental use." Alternatively, it could be defined as a "structure in which services or functions primarily involved in the direct conduct of federal government business are provided, either by federal government personnel or contractors hired and supervised by federal government employees."
Zachari Curtis	6/9/2015	200	The definition of agriculture should include any/all stages in the on-site cultivation of fungi.
Zachari Curtis	6/9/2015	200.2	This definition should be rewritten to include all stages in the cultivation of fungi.

Case No. 08-06A
Comments Received via the ZRR Module

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Ben Kolesar	9/24/2015	700	I would like to see the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements approved. With the growth of bike and car-sharing services, more residents are going without cars and parking minimums can make new housing more expensive.
Evan Handy	9/25/2015	700	Please approve the proposed lower parking minimums. Ideally, we would eliminate parking minimums altogether. Our half-century experiment with requiring plentiful free parking has hollowed out our cities and devoted way too much of our valuable land to unproductive car storage.
Dobromir Vassilev	9/25/2015	701	I support the current parking requirement. Removing it is not in the interest of the interest of Ward 8 and 7 residents where not that Metro Penetration, more difficult to bike due to the hills. It will limit our mobility and access to other parts of DC and we do need cars for running errands, go to work, etc. Removing parking requirement will lower the cost of building new housing which does not translate to lowering the housing cost. It will benefit the developers profit and not necessary pass that saving to the buyers/renters. Limiting parking requirement will be a burden to DC residents that need to drive to work. Please stop the war on cars! We need to be able to make choices fitting our life style, residential and work location.

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Harry Krejsa	9/25/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements! I do not own a car and know virtually no one who does, yet our entire community is still built around car usage. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Francis Lemon	9/25/2015	701	Please reduce the minimum vehicle parking requirement. This requirement has unnecessarily reduced the number of units that can be built in DC, and therefore has reduced the amount of affordable housing available in DC.
Uri Lerner	9/25/2015	701	Car ownership is down, alternatives like zipcar, car2go, or uber are appearing at a rapid clip. Many of my cohort have decided to forgo the expense and hassle of auto ownership and instead patronize public solutions like buses and trains. Developers can still gain competitive advantages by including parking, but the requirement to include it is outdated.
David Spett	9/25/2015	701	ease approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Asaf Reich	9/26/2015	701	I strongly advocate for the proposal reducing parking minimums. The Office of Planning and others often talk about the housing cost problem or crisis, and this rule clearly requires high cost investment for many buildings, driving up their cost whether a resident wants to use a parking spot or not. The bigger reductions near high-capacity transit lines are an especially obvious step. We've already made a huge investment in creating Metro and continue to invest in operating our transit services, so we should maximize the reward we reap by letting people live near those services and choose to use them instead of cars if they wish. Indeed the original plan to eliminate minimums downtown and near transit should have passed instead.
Daniel Foster	9/27/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce parking minimums. I actually think minimums could be eliminated entirely but Ill settle for half a loaf seeing that this process has taken over 8 years. Excessive auto parking simply creates a demand for more driving. Subsidy for cars is un-necessary and unfair to those who dont drive. More than enough public space is being devoted to automobiles. Bikes, walking, transit are healthier and safer and cheaper.
Paul Teicher	9/25/2015	701	I support reducing or eliminating parking restrictions for new construction. Particularly for areas within 1/3 of a mile of a metro station, bus station, or [future] light rail station, parking requirements add to the costs of new construction when DC should be finding ways to encourage an ROI friendly housing development environment to ensure there is enough housing to accommodate current and future residents.

Subtitle C			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Abby Lynch	9/25/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
John Cain	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the modification to minimum parking requirements. I believe there should be no minimum parking requirements at all in the zoning code, but if there are to be some, they should be relaxed as they are in the proposal. To do otherwise is to subsidize driving, add to construction costs, and waste space as weve seen in the mostly empty DC USA and Nationals Park garages.
Dane Yocco	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Brian Love	9/25/2015	701	The parking minimums should be significantly reduced if not eliminated entirely. Many parts of the District currently have or are prime candidates for high-quality transit and many District residents already have no car. Requiring new residential developments to have a specific number of parking spaces increases the cost of rent for everyone. By eliminating parking minimums, developers can provide parking quantities that correspond to the actual market demand for that location. This will decrease construction costs and make the District more affordable. When combined with increased transit services, this will shift more people from automobiles to transit, improving the quality of life for all residents.

Subtitle C			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Sarah Heaton	9/25/2015	701	I support fewer parking spots required for developments. We are an increasingly transit oriented city and the parking spots add unnecessary cost to housing.
Jeffrey Norman	9/25/2015	701	Please approve this proposal to reduce the minimum parking space requirements. These requirements are usually unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Many of us who live in apartments, whether rental or condo, do not have cars and dont need parking spaces. Issues with street parking should be solved by street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Zeke Sexauer	9/25/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements drive up the cost of new housing. Keeping parking requirements as-is is an implicit endorsement of auto-oriented development and undercuts efforts to improve transit and other alternate forms of transportation in this city. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Richard Day	9/25/2015	701	Ive lived in DC for five years. I dont own a car. Mandatory parking minimums make my housing costs higher because developers build parking spaces instead of more housing units. The additional parking spaces that wouldnt otherwise get built make it cheaper to park in the city. Im forced to pay more for rent, so richer people who own cars can park at a low cost. Thats not fair. The mandatory parking minimum shouldnt just be reduced - it should be abolished.
Alexander McDiarmid	9/25/2015	701	Please increase the requirements for parking spaces.

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Bryan Rodda	9/25/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. I support a full elimination of minimum parking requirements city-wide. There is no compelling public policy interest in such mandates. Instead, minimum parking requirements cause active harm to the city by increasing the cost of housing and promoting additional driving, with its follow on impacts of increased air pollution, fuel consumption, and traffic injuries and fatalities.
Rebecca Piazza	9/25/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Jenna Jacobson	9/25/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce the minimum parking requirements. Affordability of housing in the District will only improve if we be make systematic changes that increase the housing supply such as this one. Developers often build fewer units than they could otherwise because of the parking requirement. Excessive surface parking is an inefficient use of space in the District. This is particularly true as the millennial generation has a dramatically lower rate of car usage and ownership than past generations. By approving this provision, you would be keeping up with the trends in the city fewer cars per resident and directly increasing the future supply of housing therefore starting to alleviate the affordability issue DC is facing.

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
David James	9/25/2015	701	I strongly support reducing the minimum parking requirements. Requiring the provision of parking increases costs even for tenants who do not own automobiles, reduces the efficiency of structures by substituting automobile storage space for living or working spaces, and has at best indirect and possibly negative effects on availability of street parking. For all of these reasons and others, I feel that minimum parking requirements should be minimized or eliminated entirely.
Timothy Stackhouse	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. It makes new housing unnecessarily expensive and the requirements are excessive. I live in a building above the Georgia Ave metro that has an underground garage thats less than 1/2 full. Im sure this is typical around the city. Why should everyone in the building pay higher rent because the developer was required to build parking space that arent even being used?
Dan Malouff	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. Many DC residents dont have cars, and it is unfair to force them to pay for housing that has parking. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Reid Sherman	9/24/2015	701	A reduction in the minimum parking requirements would be great for the city. If developers want to build off-street parking as an extra perk, that is still allowed. Requiring extra parking drives up costs unnecessarily, as more and more residents are using public transit, including car-sharing and bike-sharing.

Subtitle C			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Raff Viglianti	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Kelly Bell	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Vijay Kapur	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. If at all possible, please consider reducing them even further, or making easy for developers to opt out of providing any parking upon approval. Mandatory parking increases the cost of construction, therefore increasing the cost of real estate, and provides a subsidy encouraging people to drive. Driving, when necessary, should be done with due consideration for the costs, and should not pose undue cost on those who choose not to drive. Street parking issues should be handled on the street, with strict and strictly enforced limitations and market-rate metering on street parking.
Gregory Matlesky	9/24/2015	701	Please remove parking minimums from the zoning code. Making builders put in parking drives up the cost of construction, and in turn rent, and forces those without a car to subsidize those with cars. Mandating parking will increase automobile use at a time when our streets are already choked with traffic. It makes no sense to include parking minimums and I believe the District should implement parking maximums, as other cities have recently done, to stem the tide of automobiles.

Subtitle C			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Andrew Eberle	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. The parking requirements are unnecessary and should no longer be allowed to drive up the cost of new housing. I agree that OPs original proposal was better, but this is at least a positive step.
Matt Eldridge	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the changes to parking minimums. This is a common sense proposal and is supported by evidence, changing market demands, and principles for good urban planning.
Sara Conrath	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to lower minimum parking requirements, which can drive up the cost of new housing.
Matt Vanderwerff	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code. In fact, I would encourage considering elimination of these requirements all together as they increase costs and make housing more expensive.
Steven Feingold	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the reduction in parking requirements. The current requirements add unnecessary costs to business in a city where many locations are walkable or accessible to public transit. There is ample parking available in almost every part of the city for a minor fee. We dont need to force business to give parking away for free if they dont think it is necessary to get customers through the door.

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Matthew Wilshire	9/24/2015	701	I am a long time DC resident and homeowner. Even though I rely on street parking, I support the proposal to loosen parking minimums. DC has gotten significantly denser over the years, and many residents would prefer to purchase or rent housing without incurring the cost of parking.
Cooper Martin	9/16/2015	701	Your section on "minimum vehicle parking requirements" is unnecessary and has only become worse as this process has dragged on. The code should better reflect the stated planning goals of MoveDC.
Zach Ferguson	9/17/2015	701	I believe the minimum vehicle parking requirements should be significantly loosened so that less parking spots are mandated by the city. With Car2Go, ZipCar, Capital Bikeshare, more bike lanes, Split, Uber/Lyft/Sidecar - not to mention WMATA and improved pedestrian access - we should not mandate development be so car-centric. This is bad for the environment, public health, and impedes making our communities more active and livable. And it increases the cost of housing in DC, which is already too high.
David Alpert	9/23/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code. Even the currently-proposed minimums are unnecessary and too high; OPs original proposal was much better. However, this change is a meaningful step forward.

Subtitle C			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Matthew Dickens	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code. The minimum parking requirements should be even lower than what is proposed here - the original proposals were even better.
Jonathan Daniels	9/24/2015	701	Street parking should be handled through rules, not zoning. Parking is often an issue that stops construction of more units, which are needed to reduce rent and create more inventory for people who want to live in DC.
Steve Seelig, 3922 Ingomar Street	9/24/2015	701	These minimum parking requirements should be set even lower than proposed. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Zach Teutsch, SMD 4C05, Vice Chair 4C	9/24/2015	701	We face a choice about whether to displace people through higher rents or to displace cars by adding housing without adding much parking. It is critical that we choose to protect people. Doing that will require sacrificing some parking and as such, these revising parking rules are prudent. Letting the market decide on parking is an especially good strategy near major transit corridors where less parking is demanded. The new rules are important because they promote affordable housing and limit displacement of longtime district residents.

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Adam	9/24/2015	701	It is critical that the District approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing - helping leaving middle class and low income people out the growing city. Given that one parking spot can be as much as 45,000 - this effectively makes only luxury housing possible. Development of parking garages in places like Logan Circle have remained largely empty while the street still deals with lack of public parking places. Therefore, issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Michael Matthews	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements that were in the original proposal. If possible, these restrictions should be abolished all together. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing and subsidize cars ownership in city where most residents don't own cars. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code."
Tom Szollos	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the new parking minimums. We really need to reduce the footprint of "car storage" to provide more space for people. More living units can be built into a new or existing building if there aren't parking spots that are mandated to build with the building. Parking spots drive up the cost of development as well.
Nikolaus Schnermann	9/24/2015	701	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. Minimum parking requirements are unnecessary and impose indirect costs on city residents in the form of less affordable housing. Although I would be in favor of eliminating parking requirements all together, this proposal is a reasonable compromise that would greatly benefit the city.

Subtitle C

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Andrew	9/24/2015	701	You must reduce minimum parking requirements. It is unnecessary to have so much parking in an urban environment where many use public transit and other modes to travel. We must do more to discourage cars in our city and not encourage them to proliferate. In a perfect world, the minimum parking requirement would be 0, but I'm willing to accept something close to that number.
Patricia Leeb	9/25/2015	701.5	Please approve the proposal to reduce the minimums. DC has great mass transit and bike-ability. Keep handicap areas as most physically disabled people have no choice other than to use private vehicles.
Matthew Dickens	9/25/2015	800	I wholeheartedly support the bicycle parking requirements - all buildings should have bicycle parking!

Case No. 08-06A
Comments Received via the ZRR Module

Subtitle D

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Martin Hardy	9/25/2015	602	I am against tightening restrictions on height and "pop-ups". It does not make sense from a public policy point of view to restrict building even further in a capital city with a hub and spoke transport system. Pop-ups should conform to appropriate aesthetic standards and review.
Laure Fuller	9/10/2015	999	I approve of the change making an accessory apartment a matter of right in residential neighborhoods as long as the listed requirements are met. Thank you.

Case No. 08-06A
Comments Received via the ZRR Module

Subtitle E

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Nicholas Rubenstein	7/31/2015	900	901.1 has a typo referring to R zones. Also, why is the RF alley lot language so much less comprehensive than the R alley lot section? It looks as though the 2014 version had the 2013 text accidentally replaced.
Michael Cushman	9/24/2015	900	My comment is on the entirety of section 900 and also include sections 1000 special exceptions. Living next to an alley lot I am very concerned with the alley lot residences on alleys of 15 feet. Capitol Hill has many alleys of 15 feet with residences with non-conforming rear yards. The alley lot residence will be two stories tall and 25 feet away. Add a rooftop deck and I have NO PRIVACY left. Matter of right give me NO PROTECTION.
Michael Cushman	9/24/2015	900	I do not expect the BZA to protect my residences privacy, light and air from the a development project where alley dwellings are now a matter of right. The alley lot provisions got very little publicity, with the result that homeowners will be surprised. Savvy developers are aware and will move forward quickly when the new zoning regs are final.
Michael Cushman	9/24/2015	900	Parking required for alley lot residences? When the garage on an alley lot is converted to residences and the parking spaces are made to disappear -- will the new alley lot residence be required to have a parking space. The answer should be YES. One for one replacement.

Case No. 08-06A
Comments Received via the ZRR Module

Subtitle U

Name	Date	Section	Comment
Steve Seelig, 3922 Ingomar Street	9/24/2015	200	This is an important proposal that needs to be approved to permit ADUs. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Michael Matthews	9/24/2015	200	Owners in this zone should be able to subdivide there property and create duplex style attached housing. I would also recommend remove in any set back requirements. DC needs more housing and then existing single.family requirement are needlessly restricting the supply of homes.
Zach Ferguson	9/25/2015	200	I think you should approve the proposal for accessory apartments. I know that a large number of homeowners have extra space and need money to help pay a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, and other expenses. Further, many people need places to live in DC. This is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Ben Kolesar	9/24/2015	253	I would like to see the proposal for accessory apartments approved. There is a severe shortage of affordable housing in District and this proposal is a small but concrete way to increase the housing supply.
Erick Gutierrez - 253.8 Accesory Apt	9/24/2015	253	Accessory apartments: This proposal will let homeowners in detached house zones rent out a basement, other room, or existing garage to earn some more money from otherwise-unused space as well as providing someone else a place to live. Comment here, and select section 253.8. Im saying, "Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs."

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Ben Giliberti, homewoner	9/24/2015	253	ADUs of do not make housing more affordable. In urban areas such as DC, studies have shown that the increased income potential of being able to add an ADU is immediately translated into a higher market prices, making homes LESS affordable. Moreover, the increased values also lead to higher assessments, raising everybodys taxes in the neighborhood, including the taxes of people who dont have ADUs, making them much worse off.
Dane Yocco	9/24/2015	253	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Adam	9/25/2015	253.3	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code."
Adam	9/24/2015	253.3	Accessory dwelling units are a proven strategy to create more diverse neighborhoods, bring money to cash strapped homeowners who dont want to leave their neighborhoods, and would help DC alleviate its current housing supply crisis. The units, usually smaller, attract empty nesters and young people in other cities-alleviating pressure to turn rowhouses from single family uses. Furthermore, it can bring more people to neighborhoods, putting more eyes on the street and helping public safety. This is a win win for DC.
Ben Giliberti	9/24/2015	253.7	Finally, While the 2900 block of 28th St is presently located just outside the boundary of the Old Woodley Park Historic District, we are now working with the HPO to obtain historic district status presently. We would especially like to maintain the the staus quo and preserve the historic character of our block while this process is pending.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Ben Giliberti	9/23/2015	253.7	I live on the 2900 block of 28th St NW. Zoning is R-3. All of the houses except for two at the very end are situated on built up berms of land in front. Thus the street side of the "English basement" is completely below ground. Access to the basement is presently provided through the ground level entrance on the alley. Section 253.7 d would appear to permit someone to dig a trench in the front of the house to expose the basement wall in order to add a new entrance on the street side. This would be highly detrimental to the historic character of the homes and of the block.
Ben Giliberti	9/23/2015	253.7	I live on the 2900 block of 28th St NW. Zoning is R-3. All of the houses except for two at the very end are situated on built up berms of land in front. Thus the street side of the "English basement" is completely below ground. Access to the basement is presently provided through the ground level entrance on the alley. Section 253.7 d would appear to permit someone to dig a trench in the front of the house to expose the basement wall in order to add a new entrance on the street side. This would be highly detrimental to the historic character of the homes and of the block.
Ben Giliberti	9/24/2015	253.7	While 253.7c has been in ZRR for some time,d is an addition that must have been incorporated at last minute. I checked, and the ANC 3C commissioners were completely unaware of d until I pointed it out to them yesterday, and have not had time to consider it. In R-3 there are many row houses with below grade second entrances; I have no problem allowing that that practice to continue on those areas. I think it is madness to allow it on my block, where they have never been before, and would change the character of the street terribly.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Ben Giliberti	9/24/2015	253.7	While 253.7c has been in ZRR for some time,d is an addition that must have been incorporated at last minute. I checked, and the ANC 3C commissioners were completely unaware of d until I pointed it out to them yesterday, and have not had time to consider it. In R-3 there are many row houses with below grade second entrances; I have no problem allowing that that practice to continue on those areas. I think it is madness to allow it on my block, where they have never been before, and would change the character of the street terribly.
Robert J Rooney	9/24/2015	253.7	I live in the 2900 block of 28th Street NW which is in an R-3 Zone.The proposed provision of 253.7dis highly detrimental to this block of row houses for both aesthetic and the construction requirement of lengthy and deep retaining walls from the sidewalk to the house, passing beneath the concrete porches. At a minimum 253.7d should not apply as a blanket entitlement, especially in the Woodley Park "English Village" presently undergoing planning work with the HPO for designation as an historic district. This is one of Mr. Harry Wardmans finest residential works, indeed worthy of preservation rather than piecemeal dismantlement.
Steven Feingold	9/24/2015	253.7	Please approve the proposals for easing the creation of accessory housing. This is the easiest way to immediately add housing for the District and will bring many tenants/landlords out of an existing state of "roommate" agreements and into clear legal standing.
Jonathan Daniels	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners are happy to use their extra space to earn more income, and obviously more people want to live in DC than there is even space for right now. This is a win-win.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Matt Vanderwerff	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Dennis Mayo	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
marlene zolciak	9/24/2015	253.8	This is a critical component for helping fixed income and elderly persons stay in their homes with extra income. The rental market in DC is very tight and this also helps persons in DC temporarily and can't sign a one year lease.
Matthew Wilshire	9/24/2015	253.8	I am a long time District resident and homeowner, I ask that you approve the proposal to allow accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover their mortgage and other expenses. This proposal benefits everyone, especially those struggling with high housing costs.
John Cain	9/24/2015	253.8	The proposal allowing accessory apartments should be approved. It provides flexibility to existing homeowners to possibly take on a renter with the ensuing income. It also expands the overall supply of housing in the city, especially in well-off neighborhoods where rent-seeking zoning and historical protection have long prevented any new construction.
Andrew Eberle	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Increasing the housing supply is an important step in creating affordable housing.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Elliott Mogul	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Vijay Kapur	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Homeowners should be allowed to monetize their extra space, and potential tenants should be allowed an affordable and available place to live. This is a win-win for current and prospective residents alike!
Kelly Bell	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and would benefit from extra money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other cost of living expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC, and accessory apartments are often more affordable than large apartment buildings. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Reid Sherman	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve this proposal. With so many new people wanting to move to DC, opening up new housing without any new construction is an obvious benefit to the city. If homeowners have extra space and want to rent it out as they see fit to help cover their expenses, they should have the right to do so.
Shannon S. Christmas	9/24/2015	253.8	Approve the accessory apartments proposal. Residents with expansive homes requiring additional income can absorb the demand for rentals, provide homes to those who need them, and mitigate the existing pressure on DCs rental market by expanding the supply of affordable rental options. Moreover, this proposal enables the diversification of neighborhoods which may, in turn, facilitate new retail and small business opportunities that currently do not or cannot exist in certain swaths of the District of Columbia.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Jeremy Welsh-Loveman	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Chris K.	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
John A	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Dan Malouff	9/24/2015	253.8	DC has a desperate need for MORE housing units, especially small ones suitable for single people and couples. You must approve the proposal for accessory apartments. This proposal is a win-win that helps the city provide a desperate need, and helps homeowners offset the cost of their mortgage, which is overpriced because DC doesnt have enough housing units.
Matthew Dickens	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. This proposal is a win-win. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. We also need more places for people to live in DC. This proposal meets both of those needs.
Richard Hinds	9/3/2015	253.8	In addition to roof decks I believe that subsection e should prohibit balconies or projecting windows. This prohibition is required for Section 253.11 to make sense. Otherwise balconies and projecting windows are a matter of right.

Subtitle U

Name	Date	Section	Comment
David Alpert	9/23/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Michael Matthews	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Nikolaus Schnermann	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Measures like this are important to create affordable housing for DC residents. It would also allow homeowners to make additional money from unused space in their homes and impose minimal to no cost on DC residents.
Zach Teutsch, SMD 4C05, Vice Chair 4C	9/24/2015	253.8	Allowing accessory dwelling will create opportunities to develop additional affordable housing, to house people without displacing people, and to help build the city's tax base enabling the provision of better services more efficiently.
Brian Love	9/25/2015	253.8	Accessory apartments should be approved because they will enable homeowners who have extra space to get extra money to cover their expenses and will increase the housing supply in the District. This will be essential to enabling the District to meet its population growth goals over the coming decades. This provision will provide clear benefits for both homeowners and renters.
Doug Wilson	9/24/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. This helps people who need housing in the District, property owners who want to rent their space, and the District as a whole.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Paul Teicher	9/25/2015	253.8	I support the proposal for accessory apartments. I think it will allow additional flexibility to homeowners while not significantly impacting the character of neighborhoods.
Sam Wetzel	9/25/2015	253.8	Accessory apartments are absolutely vital to ensuring that families have the means to cover their mortgages while providing affordable housing choices. This is a win-win for everyone in the community.
Abby Lynch	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC myself included - I have struggled to find apartments that fit my budget and I aspire to own a home in the District one of these days. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
SMisra	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Allowing residents to use otherwise unused residential space can help the resident cope financially in an increasingly unaffordable city. It also provides additional housing which is sorely needed. Additional housing stock, in turn, will increase supply which hopefully will help bring rental costs down in, again, an increasingly unaffordable city. Thanks.
Jeffrey Norman	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve this proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. In addition, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win one that addresses both needs.
Zeke Sexauer	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Its wasteful and inefficient to leave extra space empty, especially when that space can be monetized to bring extra income to homeowners while also providing a larger number of and wider variety of living options in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Richard Day	9/25/2015	253.8	We all know this city is facing an affordable housing crisis. Allowing accessory apartments will help make things a little better. People will have the opportunity to make some money by renting out excess space. Plus, it will create more more housing units. More supply translates into lower costs for everyone, as people living in accessory units wont be bidding up prices on other units in DC.
David James	9/25/2015	253.8	I support allowing accessory apartments. These are a minor but elegant way of providing housing without major investment or alterations in the external appearance of a neighborhood.
Bryan Rodda	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and this allows them the opportunity to earn additional money from their property. Meanwhile, housing supply is very constrained in DC and accessory dwellings would provide much-needed additional housing units and options to residents. The proposal should be approved.
Ronald Coeman	9/25/2015	253.8	We need more affordable housing in DC, and the proposal for accessory apartments would help provide more!
Paul Jutton	9/25/2015	253.8	As a homeowner, I think this is an important proposal that needs to be approved to permit ADUs. I would like to have this option.
David Spett	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Quinn Libson	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Rebecca Piazza	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. This would allow homeowners to help cover high mortgage costs in DC and would increase the amount of available housing.
Dan Levine	9/25/2015	253.8	Accessory dwelling units are a fantastic way to accommodate a growing district population within the existing building footprint of the city's neighborhoods. It is a win-win for property owners higher property values and renters more possible rental units—including units of different sizes and in different neighborhoods. I am offended at the way this sensible provision has already been opposed and limited and urge you to approve the current proposal expeditiously.
Avantika Krishna	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory apartments. Many homeowners have extra space and need money to help cover a mortgage, pay for needs in retirement, or other expenses. Meanwhile, many people need places to live in DC. This proposal is a win-win that addresses both needs.
Evan Handy	9/25/2015	253.8	Please approve the proposal for accessory units. Vibrant communities need thriving small businesses, and thriving small businesses need customers. With the long-term trend toward smaller families and years of anti-density zoning, many DC neighborhoods are underpopulated to support a healthy scattering of stores, restaurants, and bars. More places to live will bring more people and more life into our neighborhoods.
Steven Feingold	9/24/2015	254	Please approve the creation of corner stores in more neighborhoods. These stores fill an important niche in providing services within walking distance of homes and add greatly to the unique character of a neighborhood.
Richard Hinds	9/3/2015	254.6	Subsection e should include R-19 as well as R-20.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Richard Hinds	9/3/2015	254.7	Subsection e should be revised for simplicity by deleting the unnecessary repetition at the end . Specifically delete "shall not be deemed eligible for a corner store use" as redundant. Purely a drafting comment.
David Alpert	9/23/2015	301.1	301.1c1 and 301.e are contradictory. c1 says that a matter-of-right apartment must be in a building constructed before January 1, 2013, and then e explains a rule for buildings constructed later. OPs intention, as OP staff have explained it, is to allow later-constructed buildings to qualify but require a sort of vesting period of 5 years to discourage building an accessory building solely for the purpose of making an accessory apartment. This is a sensible proposal. Therefore, c1 should be deleted as it conflicts with e.
Adam	9/24/2015	600.1	The city is growing and we need to develop land to increase the supply of housing. Allowing for dwelling units on alley lots is a critical step in this process. This needs to be by right, made easier, and without restrictions
Jay Austin	9/9/2015	601.1	Regulations are needlessly restrictive and take dangerous steps toward criminalizing homelessness, which has not been DCs stance. Further, the camping-in-alley provisions address an hypothetical instance not known to exist today, creating bloated zoning rules right at the outset. New urban trends like the tiny house movement require flexibility in conceptions of space, and these revisions could curtail innovative possibilities that current and future DC residents have not yet thought of. Suggested removal of all new provisions relating to camping that target a small portion of DCs land-owning residents.
Jeremy Welsh-Loveman	9/24/2015	700	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Shannon S. Christmas	9/24/2015	700.1	Approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These unnecessary requirements needlessly elevate the cost of new housing development. Eliminate parking minimums near metro stations.
Elliott Mogul	9/24/2015	700.1	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Dennis Mayo	9/24/2015	700.1	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Avantika Krishna	9/25/2015	700.1	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. These requirements are often unnecessary and drive up the cost of new housing. Issues with street parking should be solved through street parking rules and not in the zoning code.
Doug Wilson	9/24/2015	700.1	Please approve the proposal to reduce minimum parking requirements. There's no good reason to impose parking requirements above and beyond what a developer would do voluntarily.
DC Homeowner	9/24/2015	999	In the future, I request that commenters be required to state whether they are real estate agents, builders, construction companies or the like when commenting on provisions that affect our communities. A large number of the comments in favor of ADUs are quite similarly worded, and appear to be part of an organized industry effort to tilt the decision in ways that favor their interests, rather than that of residents. They do not speak for the people who live here.

Subtitle U			
Name	Date	Section	Comment
Sam Wetzel	9/25/2015	999	These incremental changes in our zoning regulations have been delayed for way too long. Please publish these regs without delay.
District of Columbia Association of REALTORSR DCAR	9/25/2015	999	In accordance with previous comments submitted by DCAR, we continue to support less restrictive conditions for accessory dwelling units. Overall, DCAR supports easing restrictions on ADUs across the board so long as there are adequate checks and balances for safety and neighborhood preservation. We believe this will not only reduce onerous administrative burdens faced by homeowners, but increase the variety of housing stock much needed housing in the District. Thank you for your consideration.
Uri Lerner	9/25/2015	999	Please approve this. Accessory apartments are an important way for homeowners to capitalize on their property. Without this, they will have to use unregulated options like Airbnb, the mechanics of which are confusing to many seniors. Please allow them to capitalize on their savings with the protection of the law.
Jeremy Hessler	9/24/2015	999	Please approve this proposal. This proposal will supply additional housing in DC where the demand far exceeds the supply in many areas of the City. This means that many homeowners will be able to efficiently and legally maximize the potential of their homes, while adding additional housing to the current supply. This is a win-win for landlords and tenants, and therefore should be passed.
John Serrao	9/24/2015	999	This city needs more housing. Stop listening to these neighborhood activists and get more housing built.