

**Before the District of Columbia Zoning Commission  
Hearing on the Zoning Regulations Review  
Wards 3 and 4  
February 11, 2014**

Good evening. My name is Bernard Ries. I have lived in the District for 53 years. Unlike many of the stalwart young folks who have previously appeared before you, neither I nor my wife is capable of carrying a week or two's worth of groceries on the handle bars of a bike.

Life without ready access to a car would be, in fact, a very diminished life for us. Having cheerfully paid District taxes for more than five decades, we take this opportunity to say, on behalf of older folks, the handicapped, and families with children, that it would be grossly unfair to adopt rules that might make it impossible to park near our homes. At the very least, we endorse the sensible advice of Councilmembers Evans and Cheh to shelve OP's proposal until DDOT acts on this subject.

We further oppose the creation of second homes in rear yards. To allow property owner Jones to erect a towering two-story, 20-foot high, 900 square-foot building in his back yard, perhaps just a scant distance from neighbor Smith's small lot, is little less than a taking of the property rights of Smith. Further, permitting Jones to house as many as five people in that looming building makes the proposal even more dismaying. For those purposes that OP has named as warranting such intrusive housing, it is more than sufficient to continue the practice of allowing internal ADUs in existing homes.

Finally, your close inspection of the massive document pending before you is crucial. Take this horrible example: An OP amendment would allow as a "home occupation" the tutoring of five musical students "at any one time." So, a teacher of drums or trumpets or saxophones could instruct five pupils simultaneously for hour after ear-blasting hour. This absurdity suggests that the Commission must carefully analyze all 1000 pages with a keen eye out for such instances of poor judgment.

Good luck, and thanks for your thoughtful consideration

Bernard and Barbara Ries  
3828 Legation St. NW  
Washington DC 20015

February 11, 2014

Testimony of Susan Farrell in the matter of Zoning Commission Case No. 08-06A;

Title 11, Zoning Regulations – Comprehensive Text revisions; Subtitle X, Chapter 1:

**Campus Plans and School Plans**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify this evening. As one who participated in the hundreds of hours in preparation for and discussion of the recent AU Campus plan, I am sure that we all share the same goal to simplify the process.

Based on the recent experience, there are several proposed changes with which I disagree and believe can and should be improved upon.

1. The rules for Further Processing in Subsection 101.8 should be changed to prohibit the combination of 2<sup>nd</sup> stage Further Processing with the 1<sup>st</sup> stage Campus Plan submittal. The experience of our yearlong process demonstrated the difficult task of trying to evaluate an overall plan concept at the same time as the specifics. On multiple occasions during the discussions regarding the massive AU East Campus proposal, Commissioners stated “well we will deal with that later during Further Processing” - only to be reminded that the submission *included* the Further Processing.

Combining the concept of a grand design with the detail of building facades and gradings under the argument that it had to be done quickly seems to set up a “deadline behavior” situation in which decisions with long lasting implications are made quickly. I propose the Further Processing should be separate from the Campus Plan Submittal and only filed after the Zoning Commission has issued its Order on the Campus Plan case.

2. Further, I oppose the Subsection 101.18 which allows the Zoning Administrator to unilaterally amend an approved campus plan. Again, there was much discussion during the AU Campus plan proceedings commenting that historically Campus plans have been simply amended along the way after the Order without any input from the community. Any amendment should be reviewed by the affected ANC so that the residents have an opportunity to be aware of and participate in the changes.
3. Finally, the proposed plan does not go far enough in Subsections 102.5 and 102.6 to address the university ownership of commercial property in residential neighborhoods. Universities should not be given the option of including the use of commercial property in the campus plan; rather since the acquisition of commercial property appears to be an integral part of universities' expansion strategies, transparency would demand that use of commercial space be overtly included in the Campus Plan.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to present these comments for consideration.

Susan Farrell  
4324 Massachusetts Avenue  
Washington, DC 20016



11 February 2014