

Subject: Comments Subtitle C Proposed Zoning Regulation – Parking and Popups
November 19, 2013

Sonia Conly
623 North Carolina Avenue South East
Washington DC

My name is Sonia Conly. My husband and I are nearly 40 year residents of Capitol Hill. I am here to express our support of the compromise requirement reducing the minimum parking requirement in new multi-unit dwellings in transit rich neighborhoods by 50% i.e. to one per six units from one space for every 3 units. The district has a major competitive advantage in its already rich transportation options. Reducing parking requirements will stimulate further innovative transportation options and potential reduce housing costs for those who choose to go car ownership free.

Although we believe that the market will, at least in the near future, typically provide parking above the minimum requirement the proposal will allow developers to provide innovative options. We believe that the proposal will enable additional current and future residents to take advantage of auto ownership-free life and thus spend their consumption dollars on other residential or non-residential goods and services.

My husband and I anticipate that when we decide to move from our row house to an apartment, we will not own a vehicle. Thus we would prefer not to subsidize parking spaces for other residents. The growth of alternatives to own car transportation will be critical to our ability to access the community.

We believe that density is key to more efficient transportation options and also to the necessary growth of the city. Providing city services to the entire population and special housing, medical and other services to the many low income residents of the city requires additional revenue. Additional revenue requires additional population as the city tax rates are already higher than neighboring jurisdictions. It seems peculiar to us then that the zoning proposal proposes limiting popups with the result of limiting development and increasing the cost of housing.

The pop-up proposal appears to have the effect of creating an historic type zone without the extensive public process required for such zoning. Moreover it appears to be placing some individual's notions of what constitutes beauty over the need for affordable housing. Additionally it limits the ability of families to expand on lots that are of insufficient size to expand horizontally.