

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
234	C	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports allowing accessory apartments in low-density residential house zones, if specified criteria and conditions are met.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
297	C	Alexandra Dodds Testimony	11/12/2013	accessory apartments	Express strong support for the proposed changes to DC's zoning ordinance, including easing restrictions on accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
395	C	Brian Cohen ANC 3B Testimony	11/19/2013	accessory apartments	The proposal also contains reasonable limits on accessory dwelling to prevent overcrowding of neighborhoods or accessory dwellings that are not consistent with the fabric of traditional residential neighborhoods.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
416	C	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	accessory apartments	Support of the proposed Zoning Re-Write as it pertains to accessory dwelling units.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
420	C	Capitol Hill Village Comments Vira Sisolak Testimony (on behalf of Donna Barbisch)	11/21/2013 2/8/14	accessory apartments	Another area of concern in the zoning rewrite is alley dwellings. As you know, Ward 6 has the largest number of properties that might be appropriate for alley dwellings of any ward in the city, and many of these are on Capitol Hill. Under certain circumstances, carriage houses and garages would be eligible for conversion to dwelling units. While the rewrite presentations claim that these units would provide low-cost housing for seniors, many of them will contain interior stairs that we do not want. Also, it is likely that these dwellings would not include any parking. In fact, some spaces that are currently used for parking might be lost in the conversion. So, there will be more pressure on street parking. Finally, there are currently a substantial number of illegal alley dwellings on Capitol Hill. One of our members counts five such units in her square alone, all belonging to rowhouses that also contain at least two other units. While this is not an issue for the zoning rewrite, it is clear that encouraging additional alley dwellings will only exacerbate this problem. As there has been no enforcement activity related to these illegal units in the past, there is no reason to believe there will be any in the future. Thus, illegal units will proliferate and housing stock for seniors will not expand.	According to the DC Office on Aging, the proposed update to the zoning regulations is an opportunity to create and advocate for more housing for seniors. Mayor Gray has charged the Office on Aging to help create a more Age Friendly City. The proposal regarding accessory apartments updates rules that are outdated and need revision. The proposed regulations clarify that only one ADU per property is allowed, allow greater flexibility for ADUs within the primary home, and provide greater control for ADUs within an accessory building. ADUs provide additional housing opportunities for small households and can make home ownership and aging in place more affordable for more District residents. In 1995, working with the DC Commission on Aging we advocated and got the codes revised to allow for accessory apartments within single family homes. This allowance was to create more housing for seniors in need by allowing a senior homeowner to modify their single family home in the inside to allow for a separate unit. This would allow a senior homeowner to have a person living within their home with a separate living area with conditions related to parking and number of persons that can occupy the space. The thought was for a single elderly living alone who may need rent or trade for services from the individual living in the accessory apartment. Very few elderly homeowners ever took advantage of this change. The change to zoning regulations should encourage universal design for the living area.
450	C, D	ANC 3D Comments	12/9/2013	accessory apartments	ANC 3D voted to support giving the DC Department of the Environment (DDOE) an expanded role as part of the Special Exception process for inspecting, testing, and certifying that an existing accessory structure is free of toxic substances prior to its use as an accessory structure.	Thank you for the comment. Application, license and permit information from DDOE can be found online at http://green.dc.gov/service/applications-licenses-permits .
616	C, D	Jonathan Parker Comments	3/5/2014	accessory apartments	We should not only allow, but encourage more accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
427, 428	C, D	Elizabeth Carswell Comments	11/22/2013	accessory apartments	Please update the zoning codes regarding accessory dwelling units so that we can continue to feed the fantastic growth this city is experiencing.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
450, 451	C, D	ANC 3D Comments	12/9/2013	accessory apartments	Oppose changes recommended by OP to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in residential zones as a matter right if ADUs are located within the main house or in an existing accessory structure; but supporting OP's recommendation to revise the zoning regulations allowing an accessory dwelling in a newly constructed accessory structure with Special Exception review.	Thank you for the comment.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	accessory apartments	Chevy Chase ANC Task Force disfavours allowing accessory apartments in exterior accessory buildings other than by a special exception that is reviewed by the ANC. ANC's judgment should be guided by objective criteria to guard against any arbitrary judgments that an ANC might make in this regard.	OP is proposing that accessory apartments in the principal dwelling or an existing accessory building be by-right and by special exception in new or expanded accessory structures, subject to specified criteria.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	accessory apartments	Chevy Chase ANC Task Force does not understand the leeway provided to the Board to modify or waive any two requirements, with the exception of the owner occupancy requirement. If these are requirements, they should be requirements. The Board should not have unfettered discretion to simply waive any of them.	The provision to modify or waive not more than two of the requirements is being carried forward from the existing code. See Section 202 Accessory Uses (R-1).
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	accessory apartments	Chevy Chase ANC Task Force favors allowing interior accessory apartments as a matter of right, subject to the various D 1606 conditions that apply, both within D 1606.4(e) and otherwise.	Thank you for your comment.
123	D	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	accessory apartments	Should provide comprehensive data on the effect of zoning changes on ADUs established in the residence and residential use of alley lots before the Commission considers the expansion of the permission to accessory structures, which would transform single family lots to two-family lots.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. The proposal would not transform single family lots to two-family or flat lots, but would update provisions of the current regulations pertaining to accessory apartments.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	accessory apartments	Introduces matter of right home occupations, corner stores and accessory apartments in these zones. Where these uses cannot meet the conditions of the zone, a special exception can be granted. Only the Georgetown residential zone requires a special exception for accessory apartments. Why is Georgetown any different than the other 129 residential zones noted in the Comprehensive Plan? Even though there has been substantial opposition to this permission, accessory apartments currently exist without permits in all neighborhoods. The Zoning Commission must decide whether to continue to require a special exception which guarantees some level of tenant safety or simply wave a green flag and allow more of the same as a matter of right.	Thank you for the comments. The Georgetown proposal is the result of an extensive, community led, grass-roots planning effort by the residents that lasted about three years and which recognizes the unique conditions of this historic neighborhood. OP feels this extensive community research, discussion and compromise initiative should be supported and recognized in the code.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	accessory apartments	Matter of right accessory apartment units in the main home have been introduced into the code. The Georgetown zone requires a special exception for accessory apartments. Why is Georgetown being treated differently with regard to "special exceptions" for the same zoning change?	The proposed provisions for Georgetown are the result of an extensive, community led, grass-roots planning effort by the residents that lasted about three years and which recognizes the unique conditions of this historic neighborhood with its tight density of the houses and the integrated proximity of a major university.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	accessory apartments	The Residential House Zones are designed to provide for stable, low to moderate density residential areas suitable for family life and supporting uses. Subtitle D § 100.2(f) specifically notes the R zones are intended to discourage multifamily development; however, and in contradiction to the previous statement, § 103.2 states that one (1) accessory apartment shall be permitted per lot of record in all R zones.	Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10) and the draft text proposes the same, other than the proposed reduction in the potential number of units from 3 to 2 in the R-1 zones.
141	D	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	accessory apartments	The significantly more permissive provisions allowing accessory dwelling units either internal to the house or in a garage are also in opposition to the Comprehensive Plan which directs the preservation of the low-density character of single family neighborhoods. The permissiveness of the new zoning rules is a threat to neighborhood stability and character. At the very least, to avoid substandard housing, a certificate of occupancy should be required before renting out such accommodations.	Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code and the draft text proposes the same, other than the proposed reduction in the potential number of units from 3 to 2 in the R-1 zones. This proposal is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and will help to ensure neighborhood stability - in 1993, the Department of Aging petitioned doe accessory apartments to facilitate aging in place.
158	D	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	accessory apartments	Accessory apartments should not be permitted in garages or other outbuildings at this time. Further study is necessary.	Thank you for the comment.
158	D	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	accessory apartments	New regulations allow accessory rental apartments only within a primary residence in a single-family home but end the need for BZA authorization to do this. The city should ensure that all applicable inspections and permits are obtained.	Thank you for the comment. One of the goals of code is to help ensure that more accessory apartments go through the required permitting process.
171	D	Dorcas Adkins Comments	10/31/2013	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartment proposal. Doesn't go far enough -- should allow new construction for AA by-right.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
174	D	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	accessory apartments	Subtitle D, section 1606 (accessory apartments): We recommend adopting the OP proposal, except: Consider further reducing or eliminating minimum lot sizes in 1606.4(a).	The original proposal was based on the current zoning language for accessory apartments. OP is reviewing the impact of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments and will recommend revised language to the Zoning Commission.
174	D	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	accessory apartments	Subtitle D, section 1606 (accessory apartments): We recommend adopting the OP proposal, except: Remove the exception for the R-19 and R-20 zones (Georgetown), until and unless there can be a separate hearing where OP and/or neighborhood leaders justify any exception and the Commission takes separate action to approve such. Strike "except the R-19 and R-20 zones" from 1606.2, and delete the entirety of 1606.3 and 1606.5.	Thank you for your comment. The Georgetown proposal is the result of an extensive, community led, grass-roots planning effort by the residents which recognizes the unique conditions of this historic neighborhood.
186	D	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	accessory apartments	ANC 4D proposes that Accessory Dwelling Units in the principal dwelling or in an accessory building be allowed by special exception only.	OP is proposing that accessory apartments in the principal dwelling or an existing accessory building be by-right and by special exception in new or expanded accessory structures.
197	D	Sue Hemberger Comments	11/4/2013	accessory apartments	Require Certificate of Occupancy for all accessory apartments, as well as safety inspection and valid business license. Include legal, tax and insurance info. with notification that C of O has been issued. Amnesty program to bring existing illegal units into compliance. Could allow internal accessory apartments if C of O is required. External accessory apartments should be by special exception only. Ensure that the no more than 6 unrelated persons provision applies to the lot and not just the house.	Accessory apartments must be licensed, inspected, and registered. These processes are handled by DCRA and DHCD. The requirements can be found online at http://rentmydcbasement.wordpress.com/steps-to-get-licensed/ . OP's current proposal is that new external accessory apartments be by special exception. The 6 person limit is intended to apply to the lot; OP will clarify the language as needed.
209	D	Ronald Eichner Comments	11/4/2013	accessory apartments	Making the process for obtaining a permit to build an ADU on one's property easier rather than more difficult is a small way to make the city more inclusive and diverse. Granny flats, carriage houses - whatever one calls them - serve a purpose in urban life, making housing more affordable for both the renter and the homeowner. I have been in active discussion with people in Ward 3 and in particular in my ANC and have yet to hear one defensible reason why it might be necessary to have this activity be subject to a Special Exception. Just set the physical criteria for the structure and then let people do what they want on their own property. Please vote in favor of the proposed revisions to the zoning code to facilitate the creation of more ADU's.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
219	D	Linda Schmitt Neighbors 4 Neighborhoods Comments	11/5/2013	accessory apartments	ADUs are ripe for elder abuse	OP has been made aware of no actual evidence that accessory apartments are harmful to seniors; extensive research also found no credible evidence that this is an issue with accessory apartments. On the contrary, AARP, the DC Office on Aging, and groups representing seniors around the country are strongly supportive of accessory apartments, to help seniors be able to remain in their homes and in the neighborhoods in which they wish to live. Cases of elder abuse, whether in a principal building, an accessory building, a nursing home, or anywhere else should be reported to the proper authorities.
227	D	Bernard Ries Comments	11/5/2013	accessory apartments	No second residential buildings should be permitted on a property, not even with a "special exception" requirement imposed upon the neighbor wishing to build. Give the clear basic intent of the proposed rule change, such special-exception proceedings would seldom if ever result in the outright defeat of the external accessory apartment by neighbors who opposed the building. Should the ZC choose to favor the proposal, the number of external accessory apartments allowed should be severely limited, as Arlington and Montgomery County have done, and treated as an experimental project for future consideration.	Thank you for your comment. OP is not proposing that multiple accessory apartments be permitted. Only accessory apartment would be permitted.
228	D	John M. Clifford Comments	11/5/2013	accessory apartments	Because 1606.4(c) says a total of 6 persons may occupy the "house," the provision would appear to apply to internal accessory apartments but not to external apartments (which would be located outside the house). If the intention is not to allow up to 12 people to live on a property with an external ADU, then "house" should be replaced with "lot." Alternatively, limit the number of residents in an ADU to two or three. That's what some other jurisdictions (e.g. Fairfax) do.	The 6 person limit is intended to apply to the lot. OP will add clarifying language.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
228	D	John M. Clifford Comments	11/5/2013	accessory apartments	Certificates of Occupancy should be required for all accessory apartments, whether internal or external. CofOs should be granted only after the unit has passed the required safety inspection(s) and the owner has acquired a valid business license for renting out the property. Notification that a CofO has been approved should be accompanied by a statement outlining the legal, tax, and insurance implications of renting out an apartment. A significant penalty should be imposed for renting out a unit without a CofO. A well- publicized amnesty program, designed to bring existing illegal units into compliance, should precede the imposition of penalties.	DCRA's Office of the Zoning Administrator reviews applications for conformity with DC Zoning Regulations; including building permit applications, C of O applications for allowable uses, occupancy load, verification of address, lot and square, and to determine whether inspections and building plans are required for C of O approval. In most cases, no person can use a building, structure or land in the District of Columbia for any purpose other than a single family dwelling until a valid C of O has been issued.
228	D	John M. Clifford Comments	11/5/2013	accessory apartments	If you're going to allow external ADUs (whether conversions or new construction), then they need to be permitted by special exception only. These units require a more complex balancing of potentially conflicting interests than internal ADUs do – tenants' safety is no longer as closely related to landlord's (because the two households will be living in separate structures) and the neighbors' interests in privacy, property values, quiet enjoyment, etc. are more likely to be at stake. Matter-of-right is a really bad idea in this context.	Thank you for your comment.
228	D	John M. Clifford Comments	11/5/2013	accessory apartments	Internal ADUs could be matter-of-right if CofOs were required and the requirement was enforced.	Thank you for your comment.
228	D	John M. Clifford Comments	11/5/2013	accessory apartments	Strongly oppose the proposal to allow ADUs as a matter of right. Unregulated ADUs will permanently change the character of our single family home neighborhoods.	Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code and the draft text proposes the same.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Accessory Dwellings – Interior only. Strike 801.3, 801.4 and 801.8 There should be no use of the garage or exterior units for housing. Such a major change from interior English basement concept should require a special exception or variance. It must not be "by right." I have heard from seniors who do not want this option at all. Plus, there may be some unintended tax consequences to the proposal.	Thank you for the comment.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	NUMBER OF UNITS PERMITTED – Hold steady and do not increase the number of households beyond what is currently here. We don't want to see lots split and the area carved up.	Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code and the draft text proposes the same. Lot size for a subdivision is not proposed to change from the current requirements.
235	D	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports allowing accessory apartments in low-density residential house zones, if specified criteria and conditions are met.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
238	D	Claudia Phelps Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	External ADUs present height, mass, and neighborhood character issues. The proposed rule would permit another house in neighbor's back yard with no setback at the alley. OP wants to raise the number of "affordable rental units" in DC without addressing neighborhood changes effected by an increase in the ratio of such rental units to family-oriented housing. The complex problems attending such multiple-family lots necessary raise questions about the quality of the planning that preceded OP's recommendation. OP has provided no evidence that they have done the kind of research, analysis, and planning that justifies breaking with the familiar and prized past; has it explored and prepared for the likely issues that the new external ADU provisions would give rise to. We can only assumer that OP has failed to explore such issues before undertaking this important change.	OP is proposing that accessory apartments in new or expanded accessory structures be subject to special exception to provide an opportunity for neighbors to weigh in with any potential concerns about height, mass, and neighborhood character. Accessory apartments can improve neighborhood safety by increasing eyes on the street, provide affordable housing options, and promotes neighborhood diversity.
238	D	Claudia Phelps Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	I believe second residential buildings should not be permitted on a property, not even with a "special exception" requirement imposed upon the neighbor wishing to build. See exhibit for list of questions posed to OP.	Accessory apartments are allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10) and the draft text proposes the same, other than the proposed reduction in the potential number of units from 3 to 2 in the R-1 zones.
238	D	Claudia Phelps Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	To permit a householder's neighbor (or perhaps both neighbors) to create a house in their rear yards is little less than a taking of the property rights of the householder. The external ADUs clearly (by definition) transform single family zones into 2-family zones. The Comprehensive Plan states that in some neighborhoods low density is an element to be preserved, yet the proposed external ADU zoning code conflicts with the Plan. I think that the potential needs which OP describes can more readily be met by continuing to allow homeowners to create internal ADUs. ADUs have fewer externalized effects. The home owner experiences both the benefits and the negatives and since there are a lot of illegal units, it would be good to have them inspected, insured, and taxed. The city should encourage affordable housing units for targeted young professionals and students as has been done successfully, instead of encouraging homeowners to open their homes and retrofit garages for this purpose.	Accessory apartments are allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10) and the draft text proposes the same, other than the proposed reduction in the potential number of units from 3 to 2 in the R-1 zones. OP is proposing that accessory apartments be permitted by-right, subject to conditions similar to existing ones, in the principal dwelling or an existing accessory building and by special exception in new or expanded accessory structures. The proposal helps to further many objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and other important District initiatives. OP has heard from many homeowners who would like the option to provide an accessory apartment for a family member, as a mortgage helper, or as a way to facilitate aging in place.
239	D	Brian Levy Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	I strongly support the proposed expansion of accessory apartments, and believe that accessory dwellings should be allowed by right in R-1, R-2 and R-3 zones, and by special exemption in R-5.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
241	D	Diann Heine Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Disappointed in how the Zoning team is handling a VERY important topic - Accessory Dwelling Units. To be able to have 5 additional residents added to living quarters on alleys is going to change many neighborhoods. There could be more crime, noise, garbage in places people chose to live and have made investments in homes expecting peace, quiet and space. This idea will change the character of many neighborhoods and should NOT be imposed on us. It will certainly reduce property values in many areas and cause some people to leave the district. Please be more creative in developing areas that make sense instead of reconfiguring the areas when have chosen for what they are now. Who you think you are to change the way we live? Isn't this the center of the free world where decency and leadership sets an example for others? For Accessory Dwelling Units - build more apartments in neighborhoods that make sense. Stay away from our alleys!!!	It is not clear if this comment is referring to alley dwellings, to accessory apartments in an accessory building on a street-fronting lot, or both. Accessory apartments are allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10) and the draft text proposes the same. Accessory apartments, dwelling units that are secondary to the principal dwelling unit, would be located on the same lot as the principal dwelling and would be subject to the limitations of a "household", including the 6 unrelated persons limit.
242	D	Woodley Park Community Association Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	The association has supported relaxing the rules on accessory apartments. We hope that the Commission will listen to the community and the residents most affected by this change and permit these units in neighborhoods like ours. We supported the change proposed in the erratum in OP's Hearing Report on Subtitle D that reduces the minimum lot size to permit an accessory apartment to 2,000 sq. ft. for R-3, as a 4,000 sq. ft. minimum would effectively prohibit them in our neighborhood. This change in accessory apartment regulation allows equitable treatment for residents while also allowing for increased density in areas that are best able to support the density.	Thank you for your supportive comment. OP is continuing its review of the minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments and will recommend revised language to the Zoning Commission.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
243	D	Anne Morin Comments	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	I do not support allowing Accessory Dwelling Units as a "Matter of Right." Any approval of ADUs should need approval and be required to go through the "Special Exception" process. My reasons for opposing the ability of homeowners to unilaterally create ADUs are multifold: Quality of life in neighborhood. We all bought houses in neighborhoods of a certain density, character and parking situation. I believe that allowing the density to be greatly increased by individual homeowners could be deleterious to both the neighborhood and neighbors. It should be a considered process not one in which neighbors have not right to be informed of before hand. Other density issues are simply the effect on schools and public infrastructure. Any ADUs should be subject to building and safety codes. A certificate of occupancy should be required. The number of people living in an ADU should be limited to 1-2.	OP is proposing that accessory apartments in the principal dwelling or an existing accessory building be by-right and by special exception in new or expanded accessory structures. DCRA's Office of the Zoning Administrator would review any application for conformity with DC Zoning Regulations; including building permit applications, C of O applications for allowable uses, occupancy load, verification of address, lot and square, and to determine whether inspections and building plans are required for C of O approval.
245	D	Cliff Majersik Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	I ask that you accept the zoning proposals to allow accessory dwelling units in single family residential zones in homes and accessory buildings like carriage houses and converted garages.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
246	D	Donna Brockington ANC 4D Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Proposes that Accessory Dwelling Units in the principal dwelling or in an accessory building be allowed by special exception only. ANC 4D is principally concerned with the increase in noise which additional occupants in dwellings may cause and the impact of the increased noise on residents living next door to or between accessory units on either side. The increased noise may come from accessory units in the principal building or separate accessory buildings.	Thank you for the comment. OP is proposing that, as in the current regulations, that the owner of the property be required to reside on the property to address noise or other concerns.
247	D	Dorcas Adkins Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports proposed zoning changes allowing accessory apartments. Ability to create low-cost housing units in basements and garages. Increased diversity in race, age and profession. Should include additions and new construction on garages as a matter of right.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
248	D	Alan Budde Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports zoning code updates to allow accessory dwellings in parts of the City. Could increase the supply of modest housing - opportunity to better use space and create new affordable housing without significant financial cost to the city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
249	D	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Among the positive recommendations are by right accessory dwellings created in the home.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
250	D	Elinor Hart Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	In favor of the changes which will make accessory apartments easier to establish. Will make more housing available in and near some of the City's most desirable neighborhoods. Will provide additional housing in areas easily accessible to jobs, restaurants and cultural attractions. Additional income from accessory apartments will be welcomed by older and less affluent residents eager to remain in the homes they have lived in for years.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
251	D	Richard Layman Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports the proposed changes to the zoning regulations. Proposes allowing more than 1 accessory unit per lot, if the lot and building footprint can accommodate more. Could focus this proposal on areas with access to transit.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
252	D	Susan Kimmel Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartment provisions. Need to revise code to reflect growth that is occurring and to enable more sustainable, transit-oriented development. Reduced parking minimums, more accessory apartments, corners, and simplifying the organization of the code are all important steps.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
253	D	Tad Baldwin Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartment provisions. Affordable housing, diversity, income for homeowners, and makes legal something that people are already doing. Would change the minimum square footage to 1,750 versus 2,000 to capture more homes.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
254	D	Cheryl Cort Coalition for Smarter Growth Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartments, but questions the 24-foot alley width requirement. Can help address affordable housing and create a safer and more vibrant community. Supports corner store provisions, including restrictions to ensure that there are no negative impacts.	Thank you for your supportive comment. The alley width requirement pertains to accessory apartments in an accessory building only, and was the result of discussions with FEMS. This access requirement could also be met by providing dedicated open access to the street.
256	D	Michael Farrell Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartment provisions. Should apply to more and higher density neighborhoods. New accessory units should be by right and not special exception if they comply with lot coverage and height limits. Parking for accessory units should be permitted but optional.	Thank you for your comment. Parking for the accessory unit would be permitted.
259	D	Ellen McCarthy Ward 3 Vision Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory apartments	Express strong support for the proposed updates to the zoning code, particularly the proposed changes to the rules for creating accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
414	D	John Robin Lollar Comments	11/21/2013	accessory apartments	Please consider updating the zoning code to allow accessory dwellings in the District again. My neighbors have them and I believe adding more will only increase the density, diversity, and vibrancy of our neighborhood and other across the District.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
417	D	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	accessory apartments	Support of the proposed Zoning Re-Write as it pertains to accessory dwelling units. Encouraged that DC is being forward-thinking and would urge the Board to consider that the chorus of opposition to these changes, while vocal, are not indicative of the broad public opinion within our communities.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
440	D	Citizens Association of Georgetown Comments	12/4/2013	accessory apartments	We understand that OP has proposed amendments to Section 1604.4(a) which provides for minimum lot areas for a house with an accessory apartment. We agree with OP that the minimums set forth in this section need to be significantly reduced but we do not agree with OP's proposal of 2,000 sq. ft. as the minimum in Georgetown. The median lot size of homes sold in Georgetown during the last twelve months is 1872 square feet and we are aware of basement apartments in houses significantly smaller than that number. Accordingly we propose the minimum lot size in Georgetown for purposes of this section be reduced to 1750 sq. ft.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments.
480	D	Mike Gold Vice Chair ANC 3D Comments	1/29/2014	accessory apartments	Oppose changes recommended by OP to allow accessory dwelling units in residential zones as a matter of right if ADUs are located within the main house or in an existing accessory structure; but supporting OP's recommendation to revise the zoning regulations allowing an accessory dwelling in a newly constructed accessory structure with Special Exception review. Support giving DDOE an expanded role as part of the Special Exception process for inspecting, testing, and certifying that an existing accessory structure is free of toxic substances prior to its use as an accessory structure.	Thank you for the comment. Application, license and permit information from DDOE can be found online at http://green.dc.gov/service/applications-licenses-permits .

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
489	D	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	accessory apartments	Accessory apartments of Subtitle D have become controversial. I support the proposal. I believe that these will help make my neighborhood more affordable for seniors and younger people, especially students. Since I was first elected, only two accessory apartments have been proposed in ANC 3F. Both were unanimously approved. Each was uncontroversial when proposed, and I see no reason why we wouldn't be in favor of these developments. The restrictions on where they can be and owners living on the lot mitigate any of the concerns that might be raised by the ANC.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
492	D	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	accessory apartments	Accessory Dwelling Units - We do not support accessory dwelling units in garages.	Thank you for your comment.
496	D	ANC 3E Tom Quinn Testimony	1/30/2014	accessory apartments	An important means of increasing housing opportunities and maintaining affordability in the District is by enabling more accessory dwelling units ("ADUs"). We believe the additional revenue from renting such units will give aging homeowners more opportunities to age in place by renting excess space and will also enable more middle class families to afford living in the District while also increasing rental stock in the city which should reduce the upward pressure on rental prices. We believe that the proposal sensibly makes in house ADUs matter of right. We share the view expressed in the proposal that where a new accessory building is constructed or an existing accessory building expanded or subject to an addition for use as an ADU, BZA approval should be required. Where an ADU is added in an existing building without expanding or adding to the building approval should be matter of right but that an element of the approval process should be evidence that the owner has provided written, individual notice to neighbors within 50 feet and an opportunity for such neighbors to provide suggestions of potential modifications. Moreover, we would urge that any such converted units be subject to full inspection, regulatory and tax obligations. There should be strict penalties for lack of compliance with such requirements.	Thank you for your comment. DHCD monitors and enforces compliance with the requirements for ADUs in DC.
509	D	AIA-DC (Ward 1) Comments	2/5/2014	accessory apartments	Recent Census Data shows that Washington DC is the city with the largest percentage of people living alone in the country. This warrants greater attention and our Chapter is currently looking at many housing alternatives, some of which would be lower cost. Included in those alternatives are well-designed accessory apartments that can provide both lower cost housing and help to improve the age and income diversity of neighborhoods. Making these conversions easier will improve housing choices around the city and also help to support neighborhoods where large numbers of citizens are aging in place.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
513	D	Christopher Winnike (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	accessory apartments	Supports allowing accessory apartments by right. Believes the regulations are still too restrictive and will greatly limit the number of accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
514	D	Jamal Kadri (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	accessory apartments	Bad BZA experience with an external ADU. Refers to "Alley Life in Washington" book. Suggests a way forward in terms of compact, more affordable urban living.	OP is proposing that accessory apartments in the principal dwelling or an existing accessory building be by-right and by special exception in new or expanded accessory buildings. OP is not proposing any modification to the BZA review criteria for special exception cases.
515	D	Brian Levy (Ward 1) Comments	2/6/2014	accessory apartments	Under 1606.4 pertaining to ADUs, I understand the Board may waive up to 2 of the conditions set forth in 1606.4(g) (and potentially more with a variance). However the special exception process, by requiring a public hearing, can be time consuming, and I feel that several of the conditions set forth here are unnecessary and onerous. This I strongly oppose certain conditions of the draft language under sections: 1606.4(a), Minimum Lot Area (minimum lot area should be reduced to 1,600 sq. ft. under this section for all R zones; 1606.4(e), Gross Floor Area (the current rule is discriminatory against those who have smaller homes who wish to have an ADU, I believe the minimum house size requirement should be reduced to 1,000 sq. ft.; 1606.4(f) (newer accessory buildings should be allowed an accessory apartment without a specific Board waiver if other conditions are complied with), (10-foot easement requirement should be eliminated and required minimum alley width should be reduced to 15 feet), (5 year waiting period provision should be deleted).	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
516	D	Eva Wingren Comments	2/6/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
523	D	Stacey Kornegay Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	I strongly support the current language in Chapter 16 Use Permissions R Zones that allows an accessory apartment by right in the R zones, and by special exception in R-19 and R-20 (Section 1606.2 , 1606.3).	Thank you for your supportive comment.
523	D	Stacey Kornegay Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
524	D	Mark Lopes Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
526	D	Leslie Thomas Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
527	D	Aaron Foster Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
531	D	Sheila Gudiswitz Comments	2/10/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
538	D	Ethan Landis Testimony	2/11/2014	accessory apartments	8 reasons for supporting the proposed zoning changes to make ADUs a matter of right for qualifying properties. 1. Having a rental income unit in a home or on the property could make these homes more affordable, especially for owners in existing properties. 2. It increases the supply of reasonably-priced housing available for students and local employees. 3. Having other persons living on the property could provide more security for owners. This is especially helpful in our increasingly international city where many homeowners travel regularly for work, family, or when in retirement. 4. ADUs also allow owners more flexibility to age-in-place by providing an apartment for caretakers or family. 5. Some homeowners are finding it financially and socially preferable to have an older generation or returning younger generation move in, yet have the privacy an ADU can afford. 6. Creating an apartment in an unfinished basement allows the building to be more energy-efficient from a building science and an occupancy load perspective. 7. Approving this zoning change would likely create hundreds of new well-paying architecture and construction jobs for design build firms and other professional service companies that support the remodeling industry. 8. Lastly, it should be noted these new jobs, along with more valuable real estate, would create greater employment and real property tax revenue for the District. Would like to note that Montgomery County, after much public comment and review, recently passed an update to their zoning guidelines to make it easier for homeowners to incorporate ADUs.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
538	D	Ethan Landis Testimony - attached letter of support from National Association of the Remodeling Industry, Metro DC Chapter	2/11/2014	accessory apartments	With regards to the zoning changes under discussion specifically related to allowing the construction of ADUs, we would like to voice our support of the change. Changing the zoning regulations to allow for the remodeling of an existing home that would include an ADU, would these types of project be completed by contractors whom are licensed by the District of Columbia. Many of our members have dedicated themselves to being professional and following the rules and regulations established by the District. Any increase in additional remodeling projects will require additional hiring, meaning more jobs in the District. Further, we are in support of allowing homeowners in the District to maximize their living spaces to accommodate the way they live and to do so within the zoning regulations.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
540	D	Gary Malasky Testimony	2/11/2014	accessory apartments	For most of the city, I strongly support the accessory apartment proposal. It is the quickest way to provide additional housing choices, much of it likely to be affordable, throughout the city. It is also far less costly than constructing new buildings to meet the same demand. I suspect that many of the people occupying the accessory apartments will not have cars, but some will. To the extent the regulations would apply in areas such as Georgetown and Glover Park where parking is already tight, that is an impact the Commission might want to consider.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
543	D	Bernard Ries Testimony	2/11/2014	accessory apartments	We 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 a 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.	Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10) and the draft text proposes the same. Construction of a new or expanded accessory building for an accessory apartment would be permitted only by special exception.
550	D	Peter Waddell Testimony	2/11/2014	accessory apartments	Support accessory apartment by right only in the main house; do not support accessory apartments by-right in accessory buildings or garages, regardless of conditions; support maintaining the differences between the current R-3 and R-4 uses and standards that currently exist.	Thank you for your comment.
556	D	Ross Dannenberg Comments	2/12/2014	accessory apartments	I strongly support the current language in Chapter 16 Use Permissions R Zones that allows an accessory apartment by right in the R zones, and by special exemption in R-19 and R-20 (Section 1606.2, 1606.3). I also support parking reforms as currently stand in the draft, as a compromise that can support ADUs.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
557	D	Commissioner Carolyn Cook ANC SMD 3/4G01 Comments	2/12/2014	accessory apartments	Against external ADUs. By applying a one size fits all solution that could allow for two residential units on a single family home lot, you disproportionately disadvantage suburban dwellers who forfeited the higher home values of urban living in favor of single family homes with quiet, green spaces and free, unlimited parking for their cars that transport kids, pets and grandparents when needed in town and out of town. Adding apartments to many backyards would diminish the Chevy Chase DC neighborhood's character and charm. It would negatively impact our quality of life, increase traffic on residential streets which poses a greater safety hazard for children, pets and senior pedestrians. How will you handle the very real disputes that will ensue over whether the children of rental dwellers should be given a preference for attending schools located within neighborhood boundaries over other homeowners? Are you prepared to answer to angry parents who are suddenly forced to participate in a lottery system to attend a school in their own ward boundary? This will be a very big issue for Ward 4 residents living west and east of the Park.	Thank you for the comment. Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10) and the draft text proposes the same, other than the proposed reduction in the potential number of units from 3 to 2 in the R-1 zones.
557	D	Commissioner Carolyn Cook ANC SMD 3/4G01 Comments	2/12/2014	accessory apartments	Support internal ADUs. Keep them indoors in private residences to minimize impact to neighbors and neighborhood. Establish a process for complying with safety code regulations and tax laws before removing BZA authorization.	Thank you for the comment.
570	D	William H. Mosley Comments	2/18/2014	accessory apartments	Making it easier to establish rental apartments in single-family houses will contribute to density and walkability in our neighborhoods.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
572	D	Will Couch Comments	2/28/2014	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartments, but opposes minimum lot area requirement and suggests reduction to 1,600 sq. ft.; gross floor area requirement and suggests reduction to 1,000 sq. ft.; as well as other requirements (conversion and 24-foot alley access - suggests 15 feet).	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments.
575	D	Jim Feldman Comments	2/20/2014	accessory apartments	Strongly supports zoning changes that would allow for additional accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
576	D	Jamal Kadri Testimony Revised	2/20/2014	accessory apartments	Concerned that a Special Exception would be required for new construction for an accessory apartment.	Thank you for your comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
581	D	Daniel Levine Testimony	2/25/2014	accessory apartments	I support provisions that would increase flexibility for accessory dwelling units.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
599	D	Sebastien Guilnard Testimony	2/26/2014	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartments because having separate rentable spaces in a larger residential single-family home gives owners greater flexibility in living their lives, and remaining in their communities.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
604	D	Megan Kanagy Testimony	2/26/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the proposed update to the DC zoning code, especially the reforms concerning accessory dwelling units.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
610	D	James Daniel Malouff Comments	2/27/2014	accessory apartments	Supports efforts to allow more housing and more variety of housing types (such as accessory units).	Thank you for your supportive comment.
613	D	Frances Seymour Comments	2/28/2014	accessory apartments	Supports accessory apartment provisions. The proposed regulation would better reflect the District's changing demographics and lifestyles. Homes with detached garages are common throughout the city's neighborhoods. Many of these garages are no longer needed to house a vehicle: for example, I commute to work downtown using the D5 or D6 Metrobus or on my bicycle via the Capital Crescent Trail. I am not alone: my understanding is that the average number of cars per household in the District is declining. These unneeded garages are thus available to be converted to low-cost housing - whether for students, seniors, elderly family members, domestic employees or lower-income workers - which is in high demand. The income to the owner can help offset the rising property tax costs, especially in retirement.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
681	D	Alex Block Comments	3/15/2014	accessory apartments	I support the provisions to allow accessory dwelling units by-right in residential zones. I would work towards expanding the provisions to make accessory dwelling units easier to build and occupy. Adding additional housing units is an extraordinarily important way for the District to address the price pressures of rising demand for living within the city, add affordable housing stock to the city and do so without major changes to the 'look and feel' of the urban design. When asking why we should allow these dwelling units, the real question should be why aren't they allowed already? What is the compelling case to ban them?	Thank you for your supportive comment.
684	D	Melissa and Michael Henry Comments	4/2/2014	accessory apartments	We propose the following changes to the language in Subtitle D, Chapter 16 Section 1606 (because of the length and detail of these comments, OP broke them up into a series of comments): (1) The accessory building was in existence on January 1, 2013; Proposed change: Allow owner-occupied homeowners in the R zones to build no more than one accessory apartment in the rear of their home by right, subject to the provisions in Subtitle D Chapter 17, Section 1701.3 (no adverse effect on the use or enjoyment of any abutting or adjacent dwelling or property) NOT by special exception. Special exception approval would place an undue burden upon the homeowner to submit additional documentation to obtain a special exception permit and adds substantially to the cost of the permit. (2) No expansion or addition may be made to the accessory building to accommodate an apartment except by special exception; Proposed change: Strike this restriction for owner-occupied homeowners in the R zones. (3) There shall be permanent access to the accessory building dwelling from a dedicated and improved right of way; We have no proposed changes to this item. (4) The dwelling use of the accessory building shall be coterminous with the permanent access; and We have no proposed changes to this item.	Thank you for your detailed comments. OP is proposing that an accessory apartment in an existing accessory building, or in the principal dwelling, be permitted by right; a new accessory apartment in a new or expanded accessory building would require special exception review. The provision requiring the owner occupy a unit on the site is carried forward from the current accessory apartment provisions, and is intended to ensure that potential impacts are minimized. OP would not support elimination of this criteria.
684	D	Melissa and Michael Henry Comments	4/2/2014	accessory apartments	We propose the following changes to the language in Subtitle D, Chapter 16 Section 1606 (continued): (5) The permanent access shall be provided by either or both of the following: (A) An easement for a permanent passage, open to the sky, no narrower than ten feet (10 ft.) in width, and extending from the accessory building to a public street through a side setback recorded in the land records of the District of Columbia; or We have no proposed changes to this item. (B) Through an improved public alley with a minimum width of twenty-four feet (24 ft.) that connects to a public street. (FYI...none of the alleyways in our area are 24 ft. wide) To our knowledge, none of the alleyways in the R4 zone have been widened to 24 ft. so this section would automatically preclude an accessory apartment to be built even if other parts of the code would allow a homeowner to do so. Our proposed change is to strike the 24 ft. wide restriction for owner-occupied homeowners as we have no control over the width of a public alleyway. (6) An accessory building that houses an apartment shall not be used simultaneously for any accessory use other than as a private vehicle garage for a dwelling unit on the lot; Proposed change: This section would not allow for storage space which might be necessary for the homeowner or the renter. Propose that this section be modified to allow for owner-occupied homeowners to use an accessory building for uses such as storage or an artist studio; uses which would not detract from the enjoyment of the property by the homeowner or the renter. (7) An accessory building that houses an apartment shall not have a roof deck or balcony; We have no proposed changes to this item.	Thank you for your detailed comments. The 24' width requirement would apply only to an accessory apartment in an accessory building, and was arrived at following accessibility requirements with FEMS. As proposed, an accessory building with an accessory apartment would be permitted to also contain other conforming uses, such as parking or an artist studio.

<i>ZC Exhibit #</i>	<i>Subtitle</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Comment/Testimony</i>	<i>OP Response</i>
684	D	Melissa and Michael Henry Comments	4/2/2014	accessory apartments	We propose the following changes to the language in Subtitle D, Chapter 16 Section 1606 (continued): (8) An accessory building constructed as a by right accessory building after January 1, 2013 shall not be used as, or converted to, an accessory apartment except by special exception for a period of five years after the approval of the building permit for the accessory building; and This appears, on its face, to have no purpose other than to unnecessarily further restrict a homeowners rights. Proposed change: Strike this section for owner-occupied homeowners. (9) Any proposed expansion of an accessory building for residential purposes shall be permitted only by special exception approval pursuant to Y Chapter 8, and shall be evaluated against the applicable standards of D § 1701.3. The Board may modify or waive not more than two (2) of the requirements (g)specified in paragraphs (a) through (f) of this subsection; subject to the following limitations: (1) The owner-occupancy requirement of paragraph (b) shall not be waived for all R zones; and (2) Any modification(s) approved shall not conflict with the intent of this section to maintain a single household residential appearance and character in the `R zones." Proposed change: Allow owner-occupied homeowners in the R zones to build no more than one accessory apartment in the rear of their home by right, subject to the provisions in Subtitle D Chapter 17, Section 1701.3 (no adverse effect on the use or enjoyment of any abutting or adjacent dwelling or property) NOT by special exception. Special exception approval would place an undue burden upon the homeowner to submit additional documentation to obtain a special exception permit and adds substantially to the cost of the permit.	Thank you for your detailed comments. Regarding point (8), this was proposed to address the future conversion of a newly constructed accessory building to include an accessory apartment.
689	D	29th Street Neighbors Comments	4/4/2014	accessory apartments	We are opposed to the stands taken by Peter Brusoe, purportedly speaking for the Woodley Park Community Association, on accessory apartments in our neighborhood, and on uniform zoning for all row houses in Woodley Park. Do not support any proposed changes which would allow matter-of-right accessory apartments in our neighborhood. We do not want any greater density in our immediate neighborhood, nor do we think it is warranted.	OP is proposing that accessory apartments in the principal dwelling or an existing accessory building be by-right and by special exception in new or expanded accessory structures.
692	D	Daniel Winston Comments	4/11/2014	accessory apartments	Strongly urge ZC to support a revision of the District's Zoning Code. Allowing the development of accessory dwellings, in a thoughtful manner, will have a positive impact on our city's livability and affordability.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
693	D	Dana Landry Washington Fine Properties Comments	4/14/2014	accessory apartments	Strongly oppose the proposed regulations as they are not in the best interests of the residents of the District of Columbia nor of the Real Estate industry in this city.	Thank you for your comment.
705	D	Justine Kingham Dexter Street Coalition Testimony	4/24/2014	accessory apartments	Dexter Street Coalition is concerned with three aspects of the ZRR. The very nature of the Berkeley and similar neighborhoods, we believe, will be undermined by the proposed changes to the R-1-A zoning and loss of what limited overlay protections we enjoy. We chose not to live in row houses or apartment in Georgetown, Capitol Hill, or other denser neighborhoods, and the OP and Zoning Commission has in the past supported the value of single-family detached zoning through multiple sections of the Comprehensive Plans, and through the Wesley Heights and 24 other overlays. This wholesale rewrite of the Zoning Code automatically up-zones one-family areas to 2-family accommodation, thereby doubling the density and destroying the intent of the Wesley Heights overlay.	Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10) and the draft text proposes the same, other than to reduce the potential number of accessory apartments in the R-1 zones from 3 to 2, and to permit by right an accessory apartment within a dwelling unit or in an existing accessory building by right.
421, 422	D	Louis Thomas Comments	11/21/2013	accessory apartments	In strong support of updating the outdated zoning code, particularly in regards to creating reasonable allowances for accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
472, 473	D	Colleen Hawkinson Comments	1/10/2014	accessory apartments	Urge ZC to update and simplify the zoning code and support accessory dwelling units, parking minimums and corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comments
525A	D	Jeff Tackes Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
525B	D	Sarah Stevens Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	Strongly support the current language in Chapter 16 Use Permissions R Zones that allows an accessory apartment by right in the R zones, and by special exception in R-19 and R-20.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
525B	D	Sarah Stevens Comments	2/7/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
484	D, E	ANC 3B Testimony	1/30/2014	accessory apartments	Urge Zoning Commission to approve the draft revisions to the zoning code. Supports accessory apartment proposals. The proposed changes are not radical; they are long overdue modifications to an out-of-date, 1950's zoning vision.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
486	D, E	ANC 3B Brian Cohen Testimony	1/30/2014	accessory apartments	The updated draft proposal offers improved options for homeowners to create accessory dwelling units. The neighborhoods positively affected by these proposed changes include Glover Park and Cathedral Heights. These units create more affordable housing, increase the value of existing housing stock, allow for neighborhood population growth without modifying existing building density, and can provide an income source to allow seniors to age in place in their own homes. The proposal also contains reasonable limits on accessory dwelling to prevent overcrowding of neighborhoods or accessory dwellings that are not consistent with the fabric of traditional residential neighborhoods. Accessory dwellings would improve quality of life for those who live here now, and provide space for new, vibrant residents of the District. We therefore support changes to the zoning code that would make it easier to create accessory dwelling units.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
491	D, E	ANC 3D10 Joe Wisniewski Testimony	1/30/2014	corner stores	To me the zoning rewrite is about much more than the convenience of being able to bike on a bike lane, walk down to a store, or easily park on a busy street. It's about opening this city and affording its opportunities to everyone. It's about making sure that Alexander, a senior citizen I present and others like him, live in walkable neighborhoods because of businesses like comer stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
491	D, E	ANC 3D10 Joe Wisniewski Testimony	1/30/2014	accessory apartments	To me the zoning rewrite is about much more than the convenience of being able to bike on a bike lane, walk down to a store, or easily park on a busy street. It's about opening this city and affording its opportunities to everyone. It's about a young college student living in an accessory dwelling unit that makes it possible to help pay tuition at American University.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
508	D, E	Robert Ehrmann (Ward 6) Comments	2/4/2014	accessory apartments	Supports allowing accessory dwellings.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
510	D, E	Carolyn Stoesen (Ward 1) Comments	2/5/2014	accessory apartments	Affordable housing is also good for our older citizens who want to stay in DC, like many of my neighbors. Our city is actually a great place to age in place. Many seniors don't have cars, don't want to drive, or are no longer able to drive, but in DC it is easy to get to services and stores without a car. Our connected neighborhoods help seniors maintain community, avoid isolation, and stay independent. Ensuring that we are prioritizing housing, and not parking, will help us remain a great place to grow old. These are reasons I also support the Subtitle D and E proposals on accessory dwellings. Increasing accessory housing in the city will make a difference, both for homeowners in an increasingly expensive area, and for those who can live in these units.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
512	D, E	Christian Alexander (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	accessory apartments	The accessory apartment provision also provides more options for housing.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
519	D, E	Donna Barbisch Testimony	2/8/2014	accessory apartments	Ward 6 has the largest number of properties that might be appropriate for alley dwellings on any ward in the city, and many of these are on Capitol Hill. Under certain circumstances, carriage houses and garages would be eligible for conversion to dwelling units. While the rewrite presentations claim that these units would provide low-cost housing for seniors, many of them will contain interior stairs that we do not want. Also, it is likely that these dwellings would not include any parking. In fact, some spaces that are currently used for parking might be lost in the conversion. So, there will be more pressure on street parking. Finally, there are currently a substantial number of illegal alley dwellings on Capitol Hill. While this is not an issue for the zoning rewrite, it is clear that encouraging additional alley dwellings will only exacerbate this problem. As there has been no enforcement activity related to these illegal units in the past, there is no reason to believe there will be any in the future. Thus, illegal units will proliferate and housing stock for seniors will not expand.	Thank you for your comment. Accessory apartments must be licensed, inspected, and registered. These processes are handled by DCRA and DHCD. The requirements can be found online at http://rentmydcbasement.wordpress.com/steps-to-get-licensed/ . OP's current proposal is that new external accessory apartments be by special exception. The Zoning Commission will determine whether to bring this proposal forward.
535	D, E	Kathleen Quinn Testimony	2/11/2014	accessory apartments	I support and urge you to support the proposed changes to accessory apartments as currently proposed by the Office of Planning.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
539	D, E	Larry Martin Testimony	2/11/2014	accessory apartments	Pitch for accessory apartments - they create affordable housing. Reducing parking minimums in areas well served by transit is a good move.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
560	D, E	Garrett Honea Testimony	2/12/2014	accessory apartments	Emphatically supports the proposed update to the DC zoning code - in particular the proposed reforms to accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
580	D, E	Jeff Speck Testimony	2/25/2014	accessory apartments	Supports small accessory apartment to live in.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
594	D, E	Jeremy Van Ess Testimony	2/26/2014	accessory apartments	Support for provisions regarding accessory apartments and corner stores - two things that along with parking updates will make our city more livable, accessible and friendly.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
607	D, E	Lyn Stoesen Testimony	2/26/2014	accessory apartments	Affordable housing is a benefit for aging in place.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
174, 175	D, E	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	accessory apartments	Subtitle D, section 1606 (accessory apartments): We recommend adopting the OP proposal, except: Combine 1606.4(f)(1) and (8) into a single section that more clearly describes the construction date criteria for eligible accessory buildings. Make the same change to the proposed E 1101.1.	Thank you for your comment.
504, 505	D, E	Malcolm M. Kenton Testimony	2/2/2014	accessory apartments	Supports allowing homeowners to add accessory dwelling units on their properties.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
556	D, E, F, G	Ross Dannenberg Comments	2/12/2014	accessory apartments	Supports the less restrictive conditions for accessory apartments outlined in Exhibit 515.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments as well as access requirements particularly for corner lots. However, the 24-foot requirement was arrived at through discussions with the Fire Department.
63	E	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	accessory apartments	Accessory Units - ANC 6B supports the proposal to allow two dwelling units to be located either within the principal structure (current regulation) or one each in the principal structure an accessory structure (e.g. a carriage house).	Thank you for your supportive comment.
175	E	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	accessory apartments	Subtitle E, section 1101 (accessory buildings): We recommend adopting the OP proposal to allow a second permitted unit in an accessory building, but also: Ask OP and the fire department to justify in more detail their reasons for requiring 24-foot alley access to a unit in an accessory building.	Thank you for your supportive comment. The 24-foot alley access requirement is the result of discussions with the Fire Department.
263	E	Robert Robinson & Sherril Berger Comments	11/7/2013	accessory apartments	ADUs only if owner lives onsite.	D 1606.4(b) specifies that, "either the principal dwelling or accessory apartment unit must be owner-occupied."
265	E	Susan Carr Comments	11/7/2013	accessory apartments	ADUs as a "matter of right" would be a very detrimental change in zoning. Of course there are exceptions which the BZA might allow, a system that has worked well in zoning controversies: democracy at the grassroots level. The BZAs capacity should be increased to decide on these exceptions, rather than an increase in backyard ADUs under the guise of helping the elderly age in place.	Thank you for your comment.
409	E	ANC 6C Comments	11/21/2013	accessory apartments	Subtitle E, Section 801, support the amendments proposed in Chapter 8, but noted that section 801.4(b) needs to be revised to include the construction of a new accessory building for residential purposes (in order to correspond to section 1201.2(b)).	OP will review the proposed language to ensure that the provisions are consistent throughout the document.
518	E	Lynn Grosso and Ann Taylor Testimony	2/8/2014	accessory apartments	Support the revisions to the unnecessary and outdated restrictions on the use of accessory buildings as dwellings. Concerns about the 24-foot access requirement for corner properties. Should also permit simultaneous live/work use.	Thank you for your comment. OP will review the issue and propose a modified access standard for corner properties that is more in keeping with the 10-foot easement option for interior lots.
568	D	Maureen Gehrig Cook Comments	2/14/2014	accessory apartments	Opposes accessory apartments.	Thank you for your comments.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	accessory buildings	Chevy Chase ANC Task Force approves these standards for all accessory buildings in R zones (20 feet, 2 stories, etc.), which are independent of whether an "accessory apartment" is or is not located within such accessory building. We understand D 1501.6, which is in a different Chapter, to limit the absolute height of any accessory building, inclusive of any roof structures, to 20 feet (from the existing grade to the highest point of the roof). To be clear on this point, D 1301 should cross-reference D 1501.6.	Thank you for your comment. OP will review the format to make it clear and concise within and between subtitles.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
67	D	ANC 3C Comments	10/24/2013	accessory buildings	Increased height for garages and accessory structures should not be permitted in ANC 3C in low and moderate density residential zones where the increased size would affect light, air and privacy. We have not had any requests in ANC 3C for taller garages or accessory structures and we know of no Comprehensive Plan policies encouraging larger garages. In the absence of convincing data that supports the need, apartment in garages or accessory structures and non-residential uses, such as home occupations, in garages or accessory structures should not be permitted as a matter of right in low and moderate density residential zones in ANC 3C. The existing character of ANC 3C neighborhoods is built on community and respect for the quality of life of neighbors. In our experience preserving community is partly dependent on minimizing external uses that could negatively affect neighbors' quality of life. We do not want to transform our neighborhoods into 2-family zones, or locate home businesses outside the home, without neighborhood input and oversight.	Thank you for your comment. The height of accessory buildings for residential purposes is currently permitted at 20 feet in the R-1 zones (Sections 2500.5 and 2500.6). Otherwise, the maximum permitted height is 15 feet and 1 story.
123	D	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	accessory buildings	Maintain the existing 1-story, 15-foot by-right height for accessory structures.	Thank you for your comment. The height of accessory buildings for residential purposes is currently permitted at 20 feet in the R-1 zones (Sections 2500.5 and 2500.6). Otherwise, the maximum permitted height is 15 feet and 1 story.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	accessory buildings	Accessory buildings as tall as 20 feet will be permitted in low density residential zones, theoretically turning a single family zone into a two-family residential zone. The addition of another dwelling unit on the same lot is contrary to the purpose of low density residential zones.	Accessory apartments are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202.10). This is particularly the case in R-1 zones where an accessory unit for a domestic is permitted by right in an accessory building with a height of 20 feet and 2 stories (Sections 2500.5 and 2500.6), in addition to an accessory apartment within the house permitted by special exception.
249	D	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	accessory buildings	Should not allow accessory structures to go to 20 feet and 2 stories - will have an impact on light and air and privacy. Should only permit taller structures by special exception.	Thank you for your comment.
482	D	ANC 3C Comments	1/29/2014	accessory buildings	ANC 3C urges the Zoning Commission to prohibit accessory structures in the front yards and within the side yard allowance in all single family home residential zones.	Accessory buildings would not be located within a front yard per Subtitle C 801.2. An accessory building is currently allowed within the side yard; OP is not proposing to change that.
488	E	ANC 6C Mark Eckenwiler Testimony	1/30/2014	accessory buildings	Supports the modification proposed to the existing accessory building regulations, including the change allowing a maximum of one dwelling unit with an accessory building. Suggest clarifying section 801.4(b) by inserting "(or construction of a new accessory building)" before "after January 1".	Thank you for your supportive comment. OP will provide clarifying language in Section 801.4(b).
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	alley	§ 403.3 Alley lots: This section should be limited to alley lots for residential development. Subsection (a) is not necessary for all uses.	Thank you for the comment. OP will revise the language -- intent was not to require 24-foot width for all uses.
520	C, D, E	Donna McLean and Marcus Peacock	2/8/2014	alley	Concerns about allowing additional alley dwellings without parking.	A new single household residential unit on an alley lot would be required to provide 1 parking space per principal dwelling unit.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	alley	ALLEYS – The proposal would permit “alley dwellings” by right in the R3 to R5 zones. We were assured that all alley lots in ANC 4S are in R-1 and R-2 zones. That is not comforting, because this proposal changes the R-2 zones and this assumes that using alleys for more than trash pick-up or emergency calls is in the public’s interest. It is not. And alleys are not supposed to be used for parking. The city has an obligation to abide by the laws. Alleys are public space and subject to the DC Street and Alley Closing Act. That public land should not be permitted to be used for non-public purposes. People may be surprised that their property line does not extend as far as they may think. It may be an unpaved public alley or street. This proposal would permit other uses, including car-sharing. We recommend striking Chapter 14 and strike 1608 – Alley Lot by Right Uses for Zone Group A, B. To do otherwise would put demand on areas with a lot size that is large and change the fundamental character of neighborhoods in Colonial Village, Crestwood, Shepherd Park.	It is not clear whether this comment is referring to new dwellings on alley lots, or accessory apartments in a carriage house or garage along an alley. The current regulations permit residential units on alley lots in all zones, provided they meet the conditions outlined in the regulations. In the ZRR proposal, residential uses on alley lots in the R-1 and R-2 zones would not be permitted (D Sec. 1608.1), and in other zones would only be permitted by right on an alley of 24' wide or more. There is no proposal in ZRR for the private use or development of the public alleyway itself.
239	D	Brian Levy Comments	11/6/2013	alley	I strongly support the proposed changes to new zoning rules that allow residential alley dwellings in all residentially zoned alley areas. In addition, I support a change that allows an accessory apartment on an alley dwelling by special exemption, as some alley lots are very large and could easily accommodate both a primary and secondary structure.	Thank you for your supportive comment. As proposed, an accessory apartment within an alley dwelling would not be permitted.
243	D	Anne Morin Comments	11/6/2013	alley	Alley dwellings are problematic. Most alleys are in poor repair and cannot really take more traffic. More traffic would also be a safety hazard to walkers and children playing in the alleys.	Alley dwellings require access to the street via a 24-foot wide alley network, of which there are a limited number in the District. Therefore, traffic impacts should be limited. Alley dwellings also could provide improved neighborhood safety by increasing the "eyes on the street" in the alleys.
572	D	Will Couch Comments	2/28/2014	alley	Supports residential use of alley lots in R-1, R-2, and R-3 - suggests 15-foot alley access and MOR with no sp.ex.	OP will be looking at the issue of minimum lot size requirements for accessory apartments, but is not proposing to permit by right alley dwellings in the current R-1 and R-2 zones.
515	D, E, F, G	Brian Levy (Ward 1) Comments	2/6/2014	alley	I support allowing residential use of alleys in R-1, R-2, and R-3. For residential uses, I believe there should be no limits on R zones, and minimum alley width should be 15 feet because 24 feet doesn't allow us to use most alleys in DC. I believe alley lots in R-3 zones should be afforded residential use by right, not by special exception. I believe alley width should be 15 feet, or less than 24 feet. I understand that fire codes concerns resulted in the 24 foot language, but believe this code is excessive.	Thank you for your supportive comment. The 24-foot alley access requirement is the result of discussions with the Fire Department. An alley dwelling on a lot with an alley of less than 24 feet would require special exception review, including FEMS review of accessibility and safety issues.
516	D, E, F, G	Eva Wingren Comments	2/6/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
523	D, E, F, G	Stacey Kornegay Comments	2/7/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
524	D, E, F, G	Mark Lopes Comments	2/7/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
526	D, E, F, G	Leslie Thomas Comments	2/7/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
527	D, E, F, G	Aaron Foster Comments	2/7/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
531	D, E, F, G	Sheila Gudiswitz Comments	2/10/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
556	D, E, F, G	Ross Dannenberg Comments	2/12/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
525A	D, E, F, G	Jeff Tackes Comments	2/7/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
525B	D, E, F, G	Sarah Stevens Comments	2/7/2014	alley	Supports additional alley lot provisions, consistent with those of Exhibit 515.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
63	E	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	alley	Alley Lots - ANC 6B supports the proposal to allow residential use (renovation or new construction) of alley lots on narrow alleys (less than 24 feet wide) by special exception.	Thank you for your supportive comment. The 24-foot alley access requirement is the result of discussions with the Fire Department. An alley dwelling on a lot with an alley of less than 24 feet would require special exception review, including FEMS review of accessibility and safety issues.
269	E	Marcus Peacock & Donna McLean Testimony	11/7/2013	alley	Concerned that the proposed changes could abruptly and negatively alter our alley and reduce the value of their home. Require additional zoning board restrictions and neighborhood review if more than 10% of a block's alley lots were to be changed during a 12 month period.	OP has proposed restrictions on the development of alley lots; OP found very few alley systems of more than 24 feet in width (required for by-right alley dwellings) with multiple alley lots. Any alley lot on an alley system less than 24' wide would require BZA and neighborhood review.
420	C	Capitol Hill Village Comments Vira Sisolak Testimony (on behalf of Donna Barbisch)	11/21/2013 2/8/14	alley	Another area of concern in the zoning rewrite is alley dwellings. As you know, Ward 6 has the largest number of properties that might be appropriate for alley dwellings of any ward in the city, and many of these are on Capitol Hill. Under certain circumstances, carriage houses and garages would be eligible for conversion to dwelling units. While the rewrite presentations claim that these units would provide low-cost housing for seniors, many of them will contain interior stairs that we do not want. Also, it is likely that these dwellings would not include any parking. In fact, some spaces that are currently used for parking might be lost in the conversion. So, there will be more pressure on street parking. Finally, there are currently a substantial number of illegal alley dwellings on Capitol Hill. One of our members counts five such units in her square alone, all belonging to rowhouses that also contain at least two other units. While this is not an issue for the zoning rewrite, it is clear that encouraging additional alley dwellings will only exacerbate this problem. As there has been no enforcement activity related to these illegal units in the past, there is no reason to believe there will be any in the future. Thus, illegal units will proliferate and housing stock for seniors will not expand.	According to the DC Office on Aging, the proposed update to the zoning regulations is an opportunity to create and advocate for more housing for seniors. Mayor Gray has charged the Office on Aging to help create a more Age Friendly City. The proposal regarding accessory apartments updates rules that are outdated and need revision. The proposed regulations clarify that only one ADU per property is allowed, allow greater flexibility for ADUs within the primary home, and provide greater control for ADUs within an accessory building. ADUs provide additional housing opportunities for small households and can make home ownership and aging in place more affordable for more District residents. In 1995, working with the DC Commission on Aging we advocated and got the codes revised to allow for accessory apartments within single family homes. This allowance was to create more housing for seniors in need by allowing a senior homeowner to modify their single family home in the inside to allow for a separate unit. This would allow a senior homeowner to have a person living within their home with a separate living area with conditions related to parking and number of persons that can occupy the space. The thought was for a single elderly living alone who may need rent or trade for services from the individual living in the accessory apartment. Very few elderly homeowners ever took advantage of this change. The change to zoning regulations should encourage universal design for the living area.
409	E	ANC 6C Comments	11/21/2013	alley	An error was pointed out in the zoning proposal text: a requirement of 10% pervious surface is inconsistent with 100% lot occupancy.	Thank you for the comment. OP will review the pervious surface requirements for alley lots.
409	E	ANC 6C Comments	11/21/2013	alley	Subtitle E, Section 901, alley lots - disapprove 100% lot occupancy for all alley lots. Rather, a gradual change in lot occupancy based on lot size is recommended: 100% lot occupancy for a lot of 900 square feet or less; a percentage reduction equal to 2% per 45 feet above 900 square feet up to 1800 square feet; and 60% for lots 1800 square feet and larger. Reasons for this recommendation include the excessive lot occupancy permitted under the proposal, and the undesirable "stairstep" effect of sharply reducing allowable lot occupancy at specific lot area thresholds.	Setback, pervious surface and other requirements will serve to limit occupancy on residential lots.
599	D, E	Sebastien Guilnard Testimony	2/26/2014	alleys	Concern about 30-foot alley access requirement. Could require that alley construction is non-combustible.	The 24-foot alley access requirement is the result of discussions with the Fire Department. The current standard for alley access is 30 feet and OP is proposing a reduction.
691	F	ANC 1C Report	4/11/2014	apartment	ANC 1C Commends OP for having dropped the proposal to allow new commercial and office uses to intrude into residential neighborhoods under the new "A" zoning; Urges the Zoning Commission to reject any suggestion that those uses be reinstated in whole or in part; and Notes, however, that in other respects, the "A" zoning is inadequate to protect those rowhouse neighborhoods from "pop-ups" and other grossly excessive over-redevelopment, and should be considered for downzoning in appropriate areas.	OP is not proposing modifications to the development standards the R-5 (A) apartment zones - development other than a detached or semi-detached building would continue to require BZA and neighborhood review.
511	A	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	applicability	We request that the Zoning Commission consider vesting provisions for the new Zoning Regulations in addition to a transition period of at least six months from the final adoption of the regulations. Vesting provisions are critical given the time it takes to design and develop a building. We recommend that the Commission consider vesting provisions similar to that incorporated in the new Construction Codes. Specifically, buildings and structures under contract for design on the effective date of the new Zoning Regulations, for which no permit applications have been filed, shall be allowed to be filed, processed to issuance of permit, and any work authorized thereby shall be allowed to be carried to completion, under the provisions of the current Zoning Regulations, provided that (1) the applicant files the permit application within one year of the effective date of the new regulations, (2) the applicant includes with the permit application a copy of the design contract, with a notarized affidavit stating that contract was effective prior to the effective date of the new regulations, and (3) a permit be obtained and the permit fee be paid in full within one year after the filing date. In addition, we recommend that vested rights be provided to the following types of projects: PUDs and BZA cases that have been filed prior to the effective date of the new regulations; Projects that have received concept approval from the Historic Preservation Review Board or the Commission of Fine Arts prior to the effective date of the new regulations; Projects that have completed the Large Tract Review process prior to the effective date of the new regulations; Projects for which a building permit has been officially accepted by DCRA prior to the effective date of the new regulations.	Thank you for your comment. The Zoning Commission, with the Office of Attorney General, Office of Zoning, Office of Planning, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Zoning Administrator, and others, will determine vesting provisions and effective date.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
308	C	Jim Schulman Testimony	11/12/2013	applicability	Land owned by the Federal or District Governments, as of 1990, is exempted entirely from Zoning (on page A-10). If our region is to have a chance of integrating its land-use functions, green infrastructure, and human activity, all land, regardless of ownership, should be zoned. If the Federal Government bridles at having to comply with local laws, please urge the NPCC to develop its own "Federal Interest" Zoning rules- or otherwise abide by those developed by and for the citizens who reside in the Federal District.	While it is true that land owned by the Federal Government and developed for Federal purposes is not subject to District Zoning (this is the case throughout the country), land owned by the District of Columbia, other than lands in the Central Area, and developed for any use are subject to all zoning regulations.
178	C	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	bicycle parking	Subtitle C, chapter 20 (bicycle parking): We recommend adopting the OP proposal.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
293	C	Gerald Fittipaldi Testimony	11/12/2013	bicycle parking	Bicycle Parking detail: In Section 2001.3(c) the draft proposal states, "Racks shall be placed a minimum of 30 inches apart from one another and any other obstructions." I would like the ZC and OP to consider revising the 30 inches of spacing to 36 inches.	OP will work with DDOT and look at the bike rack spacing requirement.
298	C	Clark Larson Testimony	11/12/2013	bicycle parking	Here to speak in SUPPORT of staff's proposed revisions to Subtitle C of the DC zoning regulations, specifically regarding Chapters 19 and 20 on vehicle and bicycle parking standards. I believe that staff's proposed revisions offer a good balance between the basic parking needs for a site and recognition that downtown DC and other areas of the District with high-quality transit and bike service can and should support multi-modal transportation opportunities for all residents, workers, and visitors. Overall, I see these revisions as a positive step toward greater choice and livability in the city and I ask that you adopt them as proposed.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
410	C	ANC 6C Comments	11/21/2013	bicycle parking	Subtitle C, section 2002.1, bicycle spaces provided for large apartment buildings - the commissions voted to change the ratio of bicycle spaces per building resident from 1 space per three dwelling units to 1 space per two dwelling units.	Thank you for your comment. The OP proposal is consistent with current DDOT standards, and was revised from an earlier proposal to require 1 space for every dwelling unit.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	bicycle parking	Section 2005 - The provisions relating to the quantity of long-term bicycle parking within office buildings should be reduced from 1 space per 2,500 square feet to 1 space per 7,500 square feet. For a typical 300,000 square foot office building, 120 bike spaces is excessive. As a point of reference, the bike parking available on the G-2 level at 1100 4th Street, SW is approximately 475 square feet, a ratio of approximately 1 space per 10,000 square feet (excluding the retail).	OP will look at the bicycle parking requirements and refine as necessary.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	bicycle parking	Section 2006 - The provision of lockers, showers and changing facilities should be required only for the building's dominant use. In practice, retail tenants are often not permitted for security reasons to use office and residential apartment building's fitness and locker rooms, which is the location of shower and changing facilities. Furthermore, complying with this requirement for many small retail spaces totaling 25,000 square feet poses operational challenges for use, access and security. Accordingly, we recommend that shower and changing facilities only be required for users of the use which occupies 80% or more of the building. In addition, the number of showers and locker rooms should be reduced by 50% in the event that a building owner provides gender-neutral shower spaces (i.e., such as individual rooms with a shower) and/or communal locker space. Furthermore, the Zoning Administrator should have flexibility to approve lockers that are generally within the size parameters proposed. For example, some popular lockers do not include a full height of 36 inches due to the unique interlocking configuration within an overall height of 72 inches but would be appropriate and satisfy the intent of the regulations (see "Attachment B".)	OP will look at the bicycle parking requirements and refine as necessary. However, the provisions as proposed are intended to ensure that necessary bicycle support facilities are made available for all uses within new buildings.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	bicycle parking	The provisions relating to short-term bicycle parking should provide more flexibility for location and a reduction in the quantity required. Specifically, for many developments - especially mid-block developments - there will be limited space within 50-feet of the entrance to provide the required number of short-term bike parking spaces. First, most buildings are constructed to the property line to create the urban street wall. There will be little to no private property space within the 50-feet of the entrance to locate short-term bike parking spaces. Second, given the streetscape design requirements, there is limited space within the 20 feet of the property line and 50-feet of the entrance to provide these short-term bike parking spaces within public space. The streetscape includes multiple other features, such as street trees, street lights, benches, fire hydrants, underground utilities with setback requirements and manholes, and trash cans further limiting the ability to locate bike parking. More flexibility should be provided in the distance from the entrance for these short-term bike parking spaces. Finally, because the number of required short term bike parking is cumulative (i.e., additive for each use), mixed-use developments may have a significant impediment to provide the required short-term parking spaces. While § C 2002.2 limits the maximum number of short-term bike parking spaces to 100, there are few sites that could accommodate the large number of required spaces, especially within the distances prescribed in § C 2004. For purposes of understanding the impact of the short-term bike parking requirements, attached please find a plan showing compliance for the required 1100 and 1101 4th Street, S.W., buildings (see "Attachment A".) In order to meet the requirements, three street trees and planters, two benches, two flagpoles, and a streetlight would be lost. In order to prevent the elimination of other important aspects of the streetscape while still providing an adequate number of short-term bike parking spaces, we recommend that the distance requirements be eliminated or expanded to the entire street frontage or alley, the required ratio for calculating the number of short-term be reduced by half for all uses, and the cap be reduced to 25 spaces.	Thank you for your detailed comments - OP will look at the bicycle parking requirements and refine as necessary.
568	C	Maureen Gehrig Cook Comments	2/14/2014	bicycle parking	Opposes promoting bicycling as an alternative mode of transit.	Thank you for your comments. The OP proposal does not promote any one form of transportation, but is intended to address the needs of all residents, and to lessen the current code's bias towards automobiles.
113	B	Daniel Schramm Comments	10/28/2013	big box	Supports a special exception process for big box retail.	The Zoning Commission has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
487	C, D, E, X, Y, Z	ANC 5B Shirley Rivers Smith Testimony	1/30/2014	big box	Last October ANC 5B submitted three resolutions, including: 3. Approved: The DC Zoning Rewrite Process Amending The Board Of Zoning Adjustment Rules To Require A Special Exception For "Big-Box" Commercial Developments. Because without a special exception requirement for big-box stores, these developments are considered "Matter-of-right" and thus DC residents and ANC's are not afforded any public review and approval.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
188	G	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	big box	ANC 4D proposes and recommends that the Zoning Commission adopt a policy whereby a developer who proposed a big-box store must secure a special exception prior to proceeding with said development.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
276	G	Andrea E. Rosen Comments	11/11/2013	big box	Define big box retail by creating a new use. Adopt a process by which big box retail must secure a special exception to be built in the district. Broaden the BZA's authority to include approving special exceptions to big box stores.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
277	G	Informed Growth Coalition Comments	11/12/2013	big box	Supports the proposal advanced by the Law Office of G. Macy Nelson, LLC, to require approval by special exception for big box stores.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
313	G	Carolyn Dungee Nicholas Advocates for Elder Justice Comments	11/13/2013	big box	Supports a special exception process for big box retail.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
315	G	Gary Cha Yes Organic Market Testimony	11/13/2013	big box	In favor of requiring special exception for big-box retailers for the following reasons: 1) DC is ranked #1 in the country for worst traffic congestion. 2) When a big-box retailer generates sales revenue of \$100 - \$150 million/year, that business is not coming from Maryland or Virginia residents. That revenue is siphoned from many existing small and local businesses. 3) Please do not believe in rhetoric of big-box retailers bringing in new tax revenue for DC. 4) Please do not believe in rhetoric of big-box retailers brining in jobs to our city.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
320	G	Bobbi Krengel Informed Growth Coalition Testimony	11/13/2013	big box	Support proposal to require big box stores to be approved by means of a special exception.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
322	G	Renee Bowser ANC 4D Testimony	11/13/2013	big box	Urging the Zoning Commission amend the law to require big box development by special exception.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
370	G	ANC 5B Comments	11/19/2013	big box	Require a special exception for "Big-Box" commercial developments.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
547	G	Carol Newmyer Spiegel Testimony	2/11/2014	big box	Big box stores should be defined and required to obtain a special exception which would include community input and an economic impact study.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
557	G	Commissioner Carolyn Cook ANC SMD 3/4G01 Comments	2/12/2014	big box	Against big box stores (stores larger than 75,000 sq. ft.) being permitted as a matter of right.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
563	G	Eugene Puryear Testimony	2/12/2014	big box	Require special exception for big box stores.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
321, 326	G	Perry Redd Sincere Seven Testimony	11/13/2013	big box	Petition the Board to mandate that developers of big-box stores secure a special exception from the BZA before they may proceed with their developments.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
712	G, H, I, K	Kimberly Mitchell Submittal	4/28/2014	big box	Submission of Prince George's County Zoning Documents.	Thank you for providing the Prince George's County information. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
463, 464, 465, 466	G, H, I, K	Law Office of G. Macy Nelson Comments	1/3/2014	big box	Copy of a petition from the D.C. Big Box Zoning Coalition with additional residents who support the goals of the Coalition. This coalition seeks to regulate the adverse impact of large retail projects in the District by proposing that these projects secure a special exception from the Board of Zoning Adjustment before they may proceed with development. The zoning rewrite underway is the best opportunity to incorporate this policy.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
127, 128, 129, 130	G, H, I, K	G. Macy Nelson, LLC Comments	10/28/2013	big box	Proposed amendments: (1) Special exception for "Big-Box" Development in the District (a) Define Big-Box Retail by creating a new use (b) Require a Special Exception for Big-Box Retail, including the following type-specific conditions (1) Economic Impact (2) Compatibility with the Physical Environment of the Surrounding Community (3) Traffic (4) Parking (5) Conditional Approval.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
135, 136, 137, 138	G, H, I, K	G. Macy Nelson, LLC Comments	10/28/2013	big box	Copy of petition from the D.C. Big Box Zoning Coalition. The Coalition seeks to regulate the adverse impact of large retail projects in the District by proposing that these projects secure a special exception from the Board of Zoning Adjustment before they may proceed with development. The zoning rewrite underway is the best opportunity to incorporate this policy.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
443, 444, 445, 446	G, H, I, K	G. Macy Nelson, LLC Comments	12/6/2013	big box	Supplemental Comments Concerning Big-Box Retail Development	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
159	H	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	big box	Retail stores that are larger than 50,000 square feet be housed in buildings with at least 2 stories.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
334	I, K	Brenda Platt Institute for Local Self Reliance Testimony	11/14/2013	big box	Require a special exception for big box (over 75,000 sq. ft.) stores.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
534	K	ANC 1B Report	2/10/2014	big box	The ANC proposes and recommends that the DC Zoning Commission adopt a policy whereby a developer who proposes to build space for a large retailer must secure a special exception, allowing for ANCs to hold community hearings and make a recommendation, before proceeding with said development.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail.
219	D	Linda Schmitt Neighbors 4 Neighborhoods Comments	11/5/2013	BZA	Demand fixes to the BZA to expand its capacity - shouldn't make everything Matter of Right, demand BZA expand capacity to handle its workload.	Thank you for your comment.
212	X, Z	Renee Bowser ANC 4D Testimony	11/4/2013	BZA	ANC 4D proposes a procedural change in the length of time agency reports are due before the Zoning Commission and Board of Zoning Adjustment and recommends that reports must be filed at least 60 days in advance of public hearings. ANC 4D urges the Commission to change the procedures for issuing oral decisions so that a decision or order of the BZA shall become final upon its filing in the record and service upon the parties within 60 days.	OP and OZ are proposing revised filing deadlines to allow the community and government agencies more time to review and process additional information provided by the applicant and to allow the BZA time to review ANC and government agencies recommendations prior to the public hearing and taking action. Supplement information would have to be filed by the applicant 21 days before the hearing (14 days in existing code); the transportation consultant report must be filed 45 days before the hearing (20 days in existing code); and government agency reports must be filed 10 days before the hearing (7 days in existing code).

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
57	Y	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	BZA	Should amend Y 604.8 to read, "For purposes of this chapter, a decision or order shall be and become final upon its filing in the record and service upon the parties within [45, 60, 90 days].	OP and OZ are proposing to maintain the current timeline for decisions and orders, which establishes that "a final order shall become final upon its filing in the record and service upon the parties." "No order of the Board shall take effect until ten (10) days after it becomes final pursuant to Y Section 604.9."
57	Y	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	BZA	WECA questions what "a party for...limited purposes" means in Y § 404.4 and strongly objects to this unfair restriction on the rights of the directly affected.	Thank you for your comment.
57	Y	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	BZA	WECA recommends the addition of a maximum number of extensions for BZA cases.	Thank you for your comment.
57	Y	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	BZA	WECA strongly objects to the provision of Y § 404.5 which is an unfair restriction on the rights of the directly affected.	Thank you for your comment.
57	Y	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	BZA	WECA supports the provision at Y § 404.2 that allows any party to file a response to a request for party status.	Thank you for your comment.
143	Y	Carter Barron East Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	BZA	Notice to property owners of a special exception application should be extended to 1,000 feet. Need for standards as to what is a minor and what is a major variance. New provisions -- BZA Orders must identify the specific purpose of the regs for which they are granting a variance, discuss how the design drawings comply with the regs and the agencies (OP/DDOT) advising the BZA in the special exception process must review and respond to the design drawings in their reports. New Provisions -- Applicants, the agencies which advise the BZA and the BZA must track the SSH regulations when preparing relevant documents (applicants, reports, order) regarding properties within the Overlay. New Provision -- The hand-off at the end of the zoning process to the licensing/certifying, agencies (i.e. DCRA/DDOE/OSSE) must incorporate a review of applicant's compliance with the BZA order and the BZA regs. New Provision -- Change in ownership should require a compliance review. New Provision -- Requirements for ANC reports should be supplemented to ensure uniformity in compliance and consistency in the level of acceptance and review by the BZA.	OP and OZ are proposing the following modifications to BZA and ZC processes: allow affected ANC(s) to submit an ANC Setdown Form prior to a ZC Setdown Meeting in contested cases other than stand-alone map amendments, in which the ANC(s) can provide comments on particular items related to the proposed project (an administrative instrument separate from ANC report that must receive "great weight"); allow individuals wishing to testify to identify themselves as "in favor," "in opposition," or "undeclared;" update to reflect electronic filing procedures; clarify that the application must be complete when filed; institute a two-year sunset clause for all ZC setdowns; and make explicit that ZC can choose to consider a variance that is part of another application before the Commission.
207, 208	Y	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	BZA	Both subtitles have a section regarding Requesting Party Status that do not address problems that CHRS has encountered in past cases. The required statement applies only to persons and not organizations. Such things as what property you own and the distance from the subject property don't apply to an organization such as CHRS. CHRS is concerned that it will not qualify for party status under these conditions. The second problem is the timing of party status. Party status should be decided weeks prior to the hearing. The third problem is that service on a party should be amended to require service on someone requesting party status.	OP and OZ will continue to work with OAG to review the party status provisions.
617	Z	ANC 4C Report	3/5/2014	BZA	(1) Recommend that all of the requirements listed in the Application Forms be specifically listed in the regs. The current regs include some but not all of these requirements. This is confusing to the public. The zoning revision process is an opportunity to list the complete set of requirements. (2) Recommend that the Application Forms are modified to require the applicant to include statements, information, briefs, reports (including reports or statements of expert and other witnesses), plans, or other material that the applicant may wish to offer into evidence at the hearing. Any map, plan, or other document, or matter readily available to the general public need only be fully referenced and the source given by the applicant in place of filing a copy. The current regs do not clearly require that these be submitted with the application but appears to allow these to be submitted 14 days before the hearing. See Comment #3 below, which addresses why this timeframe is unfair and should be changed. (3) Recommend that where an applicant is applying for a variance for more than one location, the BZA Board require a separate application for each location. This ensures that the applicant is in compliance with all the requirements on the application form. For example, the application for a variance, Form 120, requires the applicant to set out in detail how the property at each location meets the tests for a variance. In the past some institutions submitted one (1) application even though variances were being sought for multiple locations and this requirement to set out in detail how each property met the tests was not addressed for all the locations. (4) Recommend that a hearing not be scheduled until all information required in the application is provided. In its recent zoning regs rewrite, the City of Baltimore requires that a complete application be submitted before a hearing will be scheduled. It is unfair to the community to do otherwise.	Thank you for your detailed comments. OZ and OP are proposing modifications to the BZA Rules of Practice and Procedure. The major modifications reflect electronic filing procedures, change to filing dates as set forth below, clarification that an application must be complete at time of filing with a full statement how the application meets the variance or special exception standards, and guidance provided. The filing deadline for supplemental information by the application has been extended from 14 days to 21 days; the filing deadline for the Transportation Consultant Report has been extended from 20 days to 45 days; and the filing deadline for Government Agency Reports has been extended from 7 days to 10 days. The increase in filing time is to allow the community and government agencies time to review and process additional information and to allow the Board time to review the recommendations of the ANC and government agencies prior to public hearings or action.
617	Z	ANC 4C Report	3/5/2014	BZA	Recommend that BZA specify the standards that ANCs must include in their written reports on zoning application decisions. The current language is too vague and as a result ANCs are challenged in complying with this provision, leading to the denial of great weight, disenfranchisement of the community and arbitrary decisions by ANCs and the BZA. Specifically, the BZA rejected an ANC4C unanimous protest on a zoning application because the ANC did not state any specific issues or concerns about the application in its written report as it relates to these standards. This is also confusing for the ANC since subsequent ANC4C written reports that supported the applicant were given great weight even though these written reports did not specifically state the standards against which the ANC review was conducted.	The Office of Zoning has developed a form that can be used by ANCs to transmit comments on zoning applications. The form can be found online at http://dcoz.dc.gov/services/pdf/Form129.pdf .
617	Z	ANC 4C Report	3/5/2014	BZA	Recommend that residents within five hundred feet (500 ft.) of the property be able to voice their concerns about the proposed changes. In some areas in this community, particularly in the Sixteenth Street Heights Overlay, there is a concentration of institutions in close proximity of each other. As a result a 200 foot notification radius excludes a significant segment of the impacted residential community. So communities in which zoning changes have a significant impact were not informed of pending changes or were only notified at the last minute. By then it is too late to take action to mitigate problems.	Thank you for your comment. At present, OZ and OP are not proposing to modify the 200-foot notification radius.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
617	Z	ANC 4C Report	3/5/2014	BZA	Recommend that this be changed to no later than thirty (30) days before the date of the hearing on the application. Under the current regs, in many cases, the "meat" of the application (for example, traffic impact studies, traffic management, expert reports) is provided within days of the hearing. This may even be a misinterpretation of the current regulations, which uses the term "additional", which would appear to imply that some form of these documents was submitted with the initial application. If the Applicant wishes to supplement an application with additional info, it should be allowed to do so within certain days of the hearing but the community should get to see these changes at least 30 days prior to hearing to allow time for adequate review, particularly given that most community organizations meet monthly and these documents can impact whether a community needs to become involved.	OZ and OP are proposing modifications to the BZA Rules of Practice and Procedure. The major modifications reflect electronic filing procedures, change to filing dates as set forth in the following table, clarification that an application must be complete at time of filing with a full statement how the application meets the variance or special exception standards, and guidance provided. The filing deadline for supplemental information by the application has been extended from 14 days to 21 days; the filing deadline for the Transportation Consultant Report has been extended from 20 days to 45 days; and the filing deadline for Government Agency Reports has been extended from 7 days to 10 days. The increase in filing time is to allow the community and government agencies time to review and process additional information and to allow the Board time to review the recommendations of the ANC and government agencies prior to public hearings or action.
108	C	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Amend Subtitle C, Section 402 to permit multiple buildings for institutional campuses in residential zones as well as in nonresidential zones.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.
90	X	Thomas Smith ANC 3D02 Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Good beginning, but fall short. Inclusion of commercial property in residential neighborhoods shouldn't be optional. Shouldn't allow 2nd stage further processing at the same time as the Campus Plan review. Shouldn't allow 10% of total GFA to be used for commercial uses - univ. will see as MOR 10%.	Commercial adjunct uses are not inappropriate for campus plans and student life, but the applicant should make the case as part of the application.
91	X	ANC 3D Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Oppose 101.3(b) - 10% of total GFA to commercial in residential zones, 101.16 - public /charter school enrollment doesn't count toward student cap, and 101.18 - ZA ability to amend approved campus plan.	Commercial use within residentially zoned land covered by a campus plan must be approved specifically as part of campus plan and may not be inconsistent with Comp Plan; Public and Public Charter schools are matter-of-right uses and are not subject to special exception but they would be considered as part of the general conditions of the site.
91	X	ANC 3D Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Process concerns, thought campus plan revisions would be handled separately based on discussions with interested parties. Need more discipline - plans should reflect realistic development, impose deadline for resolution. Require inclusion of commercially-zoned property in campus plan, don't allow it to be optional. Require special exception for off campus housing in apt. or condo. bldgs. Enhance rules for further processing - no 2nd stage application until ZC has issued its order in the Campus Plan case.	Draft text proposes a special exception be required for university use of C-1 and C-2-A commercially zoned land. The ZC will discuss sequencing of Campus Plan approvals and further processing as part of deliberations on ZRR.
106	X	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Concern that the definition of University combined with the definition of Accessory Uses may unnecessarily limit the permitted number of accessory uses on a college or university campus.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.
106	X	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Remove limitation that interior private roads be excluded from FAR calculations or increase the maximum permitted FAR on campuses.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.
106	X	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Request inclusion of a provision that would allow for minor modifications to existing buildings or structures that have de minimus impact.	See proposed text at X 101.18, which allows for a small addition for compliance with life, safety or building codes that does not result in an increase in GFA of more than 1,500 square feet.
109	X	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	The Consortium recommends that the Commission acknowledge that any assessment of "all" programs that take place on a campus should be a broad overview of the various types of activities that take place as reflected in the buildings and uses approved through the campus plan process.	Sction 210.4 (d) of the existing regulations already require <i>"A description of <u>all</u> activities conducted or to be conducted on the campus, and of the capacity of all present and proposed campus development ."</i> OP does not recommend a change that dilutes the meaning of the word "all". The proposed regulations are aimed at requiring complete, clear and accurate information about the full scope of campus uses and impacts due to these uses in residential zones. The ZC can determine at the time of reviewing a campus plan how much detail they require to evaluate whether there are objectionable conditions.
109	X	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	The Consortium recommends that the Commission acknowledge that existing enrollment limitations will likely need to be increased in the future to accommodate the expanded definition of student. Existing campus plans should continue to proceed under their existing methodologies and enrollment limitations until their expiration.	An approved campus plan will continue to be vested under its existing order until expiration. The proposed regulations are aimed at requiring complete, clear and accurate information about the full scope of campus uses and impacts due to these uses in residential zones.
109	X	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	The Consortium recommends that the Commission delete Subtitle X, Section 102.	OP will review the language.
114	X	Independent Education Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	IE recommends that private school applications continue to be limited to a relatively narrow impacts-based analysis that focuses on whether the traffic, parking, or other impacts from the private school would become objectionable to neighboring residential property. IE recommends that any required review continue to be proportional to the requested relief; in other words, only major changes should require a full "campus plan" level of detail. IE also recommends that the Commission consider a "consent calendar" approval process for minor changes that have no impact, such as minor additions or upgrades required for building code reasons. IE recommends revisions to X § 104.1. IE also recommends that the Commission eliminate X §§ 104.2 and 104.3. IE concurs with the Consortium of Universities, DCBIA, and other stakeholders regarding their recommendations on theoretical lots. IE also concurs with recommendations regarding height measurement.	ZC has instructed OP to review the draft text so that it reflects current practice and parking.
118	X	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	campus plans	Subt. X, Sec. 101.8 (d) is vague as it applies to campus plans and private school special exceptions. The term capacity as it relates to all present and proposed campus development should be defined to require a listing of square footage and/or number of persons.	The ZC will discuss sequencing of Campus Plan approvals and further processing as part of deliberations on ZRR.
172	X	Sheridan School Comments	10/31/2013	campus plans	Concern that campus plan provisions would apply to small private schools.	It was not OP's intent to modify the plan provisions for small private schools. OP will clarify the language to ensure that the proposal is consistent with current practice.
182	X	Clayton Lewis Washington International School Comments	11/4/2013	campus plans	Concern that campus plan provisions would apply to small private schools.	It was not OP's intent to modify the plan provisions for small private schools. OP will clarify the language to ensure that the proposal is consistent with current practice.
456	X	Councilmember Mary Cheh Comments	12/12/2013	campus plans	Tailor amendment so that only commercial property that is owned by a university and used for academic or student purposes, or that is converted to such uses during the period of the Campus Plan, is included in the Campus Plan process.	OP will review the campus plan proposal.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
477	X	Patrick Kennedy ANC2A Chair Comments	1/24/2014	campus plans	ANC 2A joins our colleagues in Ward 3 to urge the Zoning Commission to amend the draft text of the Zoning Re-Write in order to add a provision which provides for the mandatory review of commercially-zoned property owned and acquired by universities, as part of the campus plan process. ANC 2A asks OP to prepare supplemental textual changes related to address missing subject areas related to campus plans, such as omnibus PUDs and length of campus plans. This resolution serves to supplement the ANC's prior comments regarding the Zoning Re-Write, contained in a resolution dated October 25, 2013.	OP will review the campus plan proposal.
495	X	ANC 2A Patrick Kennedy Testimony	1/30/2014	campus plans	ANC 2A joins with our colleagues on ANC 3D and with Councilmember Mary Cheh to encourage the Zoning Commission to adopt regulations mandating that ownership and planned acquisition of commercial properties be considered as a component of university campus plans. The Office of Planning is to be commended for many of the changes that it has proposed to Subtitle X, in the service of the following goals that it has identified regarding campus plans: To promote well-planned and designed educational campuses; To encourage long-term facilities planning for these uses; To minimize negative impacts of campuses on surrounding residential areas; and To provide consistency and transparency to the campus planning process. ANC 2A believes that expanding the scope of campus plans to include commercial property use dovetails with all four of these objectives. Indeed, OP has included in its draft regulations language in Chapters 102.5 and 1 02.6 which allows for the applicant to request that use of its commercial property under the new regulations be subject to campus plan regulations and that the Zoning Commission may determine that it is appropriate for the property to be considered as such, respectively. We believe that consideration of these matters under campus plans should not be optional, and that arbitrary determinations of what university-owned commercial property is best reviewed under campus plans should be avoided – by making the campus plan review process mandatory. It is also the opinion of our ANC that supplemental textual changes are needed to address matters that are not covered under the draft language. Specifically, members of our community are concerned at the lack of standardization in the campus plan process that resulted in GWU's latest campus plan being processed as an omnibus PUD for a 20-year time frame. The 20 year length of GWU's current plan offers little substantial opportunity for the community to impact the nature of campus development through second-stage further processing, and the nature of the omnibus PUD resulted in the delivery of what many feel are substandard community amenities with little relation to the actual preference of community members .. We feel that it is necessary for OP to address these matters in order to ensure that the campus plan process will be an equitable one for both universities and their surrounding neighborhoods in the future. In conclusion, I want to thank the Office of Planning, the Office of Zoning, and the Zoning Commission for their engagement and diligence on this most important civic matter.	Thank you for the supportive comment. OP will review the campus plan proposal.
537	X	David Fehrmann Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	I am happy to read many of the proposed rule changes. By combining most of the rules on school and university campus plans in one section, you make it easier for everyone to completely understand the process. Since schools and their neighbors are involved only once every ten years, making it easier to find and understand all of the rules and regulations will benefit everyone involved.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
537	X	David Fehrmann Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	I am opposed to the proposed subsection 101.16 which would allow a public or charter school to operate in college or university campus facility, without counting toward an approved enrollment/faculty cap of the host university. This section proposes that the number of hosted students using the facility will not be regulated if they are not affiliated with the university; and the zoning commission would love control of the impact this could have on the surrounding community by not counting all students using the facility.	Thank you for your comment.
537	X	David Fehrmann Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	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 that purchase nearby commercial property, then house campus offices and services in them, and more importantly hold student classes in them, and run shuttle busses to them, have an impact on the neighborhood. Not considering this impact is wrong and does not balance the desires for university growth with the impact on the neighborhood. These properties and uses should be considered by the zoning commission as part of a campus plan review.	OP will review the campus plan proposal.
537	X	David Fehrmann Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	The proposed rules in subsection 101.3 which would allow a university to maintain 10% of its gross floor area for retail purposes, is excessive. This subsection should not make it a matter of right; rather it should be rewritten so that the zoning commission will consider the impacts of retail property on the neighborhoods in each campus plan submission.	Commercial adjunct uses are not inappropriate for campus plans and student life, but the applicant should make the case as part of the application.
537	X	David Fehrmann Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	The rules for Further Processing in subsection 101.8 should be changed to prohibit submittal of a 2nd stage Further Processing application with the 1st stage Campus Plan submittal. Combining these processes strains the abilities of the zoning commission, the ANC, and the neighbors to fully understand the impact of the proposal. These two processes should be separate activities, 1st a Campus Plan application and ruling; followed by a Further Processing application.	The ZC will discuss sequencing of Campus Plan approvals and further processing as part of deliberations on ZRR.
544	X	Susan Farrell Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	I oppose 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.	Subtitle X Section 101.18 does not provide for unilateral approval of a campus plan by the Zoning Administration, but allows for small additions for compliance with life, safety or building codes that do not result in an increase in GFA of more than 1,500 square feet.
544	X	Susan Farrell Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	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.	OP will review the campus plan proposal.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
544	X	Susan Farrell Testimony	2/11/2014	campus plans	The rules for Further Processing in subsection 101.8 should be changed to prohibit combination of 2nd stage Further Processing with the 1st stage Campus Plan submittal. The experience of our yearlong process (AU) 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.	The ZC will discuss sequencing of Campus Plan approvals and further processing as part of deliberations on ZRR.
686	X	Westover Place Homes Corporation	4/2/2014	campus plans	The process takes too long. The campus plan should be extended. Support the goal to simplify. Opposed to proposed Section 101.16, 101.18 and 101.3B. Request additional work on proposed Subsections 102.5 and 102.6. Rules in Subsection 101.8 on Further Processing should be changed.	Thank you for your comments. OP will review the campus plan proposal and the ZC will discuss sequencing of Campus Plan approvals and further processing as part of deliberations on ZRR.
690	X	Letter from ANC 3D	4/8/2014	campus plans	ANC 3D approved a resolution on October 2, 2013 concerning changes in rules governing campus plans and testified before the Zoning Commission on the issue on November 4, 2013. That testimony suggested several changes in the proposed zoning rewrite based on our long-term experience of working on campus plan issues given that four university campuses and five private schools are located within the boundaries of ANC 3D.	Thank you for your comments. OP will review the campus plan proposal and the ZC will discuss sequencing of Campus Plan approvals and further processing as part of deliberations on ZRR.
58	Z	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	campus plans	WECA supports Z § 1200.7(e) for campus plans.	Thank you for your comment.
328	C	Elizabeth Miller Comments	11/14/2013	car share	There is a need for more car sharing spaces downtown.	Thank you for your comment.
528	C	Tom and Dorothy Belcher	2/7/2014	car share	This is an important parking provision for new development; however, existing development is exempt. More car-sharing spaces are needed downtown in existing built-up areas. Please consider a provision that requires or provides incentives for parking garage managers to reassign an allocated number of their 'pay-for' spaces to 'car-sharing' spaces, including the ability to access these spaces as set forth in the proposed regulations. It would be worthwhile to explore if it is possible to allow a tax rebate for car sharing spaces to compensate for lost revenue downtown, since most sites developed over the past 25 to 30 years.	Additional car share spaces in existing buildings would not be required by zoning, but could be required by DDOT, which has recently proposed additional bicycle parking requirements.
532	C	Karyn Posner-Mullen Comments	2/10/2014	car share	This is an important parking provision for new development; however, existing development is exempt. More car-sharing spaces are needed downtown in existing built-up areas. Please consider a provision that requires or provides incentives for parking garage managers to reassign an allocated number of their 'pay-for' spaces to 'car-sharing' spaces, including the ability to access these spaces as set forth in the proposed regulations. It would be worthwhile to explore if it is possible to allow a tax rebate for car sharing spaces to compensate for lost revenue downtown, since most sites developed over the past 25 to 30 years.	To encourage car sharing, OP is proposing that dedicated car-share parking spaces may be counted toward fulfillment of a minimum parking requirement.
559	C, I	Richard A. Drom Comments	2/12/2014	car share	Section 1908.2: This is an important parking provision for new development; however, existing development is exempt. More Car-Sharing spaces are needed downtown in existing built-up areas. Please consider a provision (similar to other existing uses) that requires or provides incentives for parking garage managers to reassign an allocated number of their 'pay-for' spaces to 'car-sharing' spaces, including the ability to access these spaces as set forth in downtown the proposed regulations. It would be worthwhile to explore if it is possible to allow a tax rebate for car sharing spaces to compensate for lost revenue downtown, since most sites developed over the past 25 to 30 years.	Additional car share spaces in existing buildings would not be required by zoning, but could be required by DDOT, which has recently proposed additional bicycle parking requirements.
329	I	Elizabeth Miller Comments	11/14/2013	car share	There is a need for more car sharing spaces downtown. Existing public parking garages should be required to reassign an allocated number of their pay spaces to car sharing spaces, including the ability to access these spaces. Need a provision in the downtown that requires loading zones/docks in mixed use buildings (in commercial zones) to be accessible to residents 24 hours a day. If not, must provide a designated loading space on the street in front of the building or provide a loading space in any public or private garage that is associated with the building. Residential uses in downtown commercial zones should be afforded some degree of protection from certain uses, noise, and light to maintain an acceptable quality of life.	The OP proposal requires the provision of car share spaces as a TDM measure. OP will review the loading and residential use/residential zone issues.
59	B	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	cellar	"Cellar" is defined as "that portion of a story, the ceiling of which is less than four feet (4 ft.) above the adjacent finished grade." This should be amended to read "...above the existing grade." "Existing" is easier to define than "finished," which can be altered. Such an edit would be consistent with C502 and the "Building Height" definitions which expressly provide that "berms or other forms of artificial landscaping shall not be included in measuring the high point of the adjacent finished grade." This edit to "existing" would prevent the manipulation that can take place by a builder simply constructing a berm around a building in order to re-label what is clearly a "floor" a "cellar," thus taking the "cellar" area out of the allowed FAR square footage. a. The Cafritz building at 5333 Conn. Ave. presents this anomalous situation, whereby what appears to be ground "floor" units might be re-case as "cellar" units because of an artificial berm that will ring the area. Whatever the outcome of the adjacent residents challenge to the Cafritz building in this regard, this anomaly should be cured by editing the definition of "cellar" as noted above.	OP will work with OAG to clarify the definition of cellar and align all definitions regarding finished grade.
97	C	Christopher Collins Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	chanceries	The new chancery parking requirement in Section 1901.5 is 0.5 per 1000 sq. ft. of space, in excess of 3000 sq. ft. This new parking requirement is the same for office use. The existing chancery requirement in the D, R-5-D and R-5-E zones is 1 for each 800 sq. ft., or 1200 sq. ft. or 1800 sq. ft., respectively, "or as determined by the Board." The flexibility given to the FMBZA in the original regulations has been removed in the new proposed regulations. The phrase "or as determined by the Board" should be retained in the parking schedule in Subtitle C, Section 1901.5 of the new regulations.	OP will continue to work with OAG on the chancery text.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
95	X	Christopher Collins Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	chanceries	X § 200.3(a)(2) permits "the first transfer" of a chancery use from one government to another, where the chancery use was established pre-BZA. This new section appears to exclude subsequent transfers. The word "first" should be stricken. The language of the FMA is clear. There is no prohibition in the FMA on successive transfers of a chancery property from one foreign mission to another. X § 200.3(a)(3) states that the FMBZA is empowered to "grant special exceptions and variance requests required for chanceries in all zones." This provision is new. The proposed language should be changed to say that "the Board may grant relief from the strict application of the zoning regulations as part of its review of a chancery application, applying the criteria of 22 USC Section 4306 of the FMA." X § 200.3(b) allows the FMBZA to review applications for improvements in the public space, "consistent with what is permitted under District law." This section needs to be clarified. The quotes phrase above should be revised to state that the FMBZA may grant permission to construct improvements in the public space when review of those improvements would otherwise be required by the Public Space Committee or other non-FMBZA reviewing agency. X § 201.2 states that the chancery applicant has the burden of proof, even if there is no opposition to the application. The FMBZA has the burden of proof to show why a chancery application should not be approved. This section, and Y § 410.3, should be stricken. Does not support the elimination of the D Overlay and introduction of the 50% test. X § 201.10 states the standards for historic preservation review by the FMBZA. There is case law establishing what is intended in the FMBZA's review of the historic preservation criterion of the FMA. This section should be modified, and similar language should be included as that suggested above for Section 200.3(a)(3). X § 204.3(a) notes that chancery orders expire. when it enacted the rule-making procedures for chancery review under the then-new FMA, the Zoning Commission determined in 1983 that chancery orders should not be subject to the same expiration language as non-chancery orders. Proposed § 204.3(a) should be stricken.	OP will continue to work with OAG on the chancery text.
364	X	State Department	11/18/2014	chanceries	Request to keep the record open in Subtitle X and other subtitles dealing with Chanceries until February 15th.	The Zoning Commission will hold the record open until September 15, 2014.
699	X	ANC 2D Resolution	4/24/2014	chanceries	ANC 2D supports increasing the square occupancy to 50% for the institutional threshold for consideration of any non-residential use including a chancery. ANC 2D recommends that the ZRR contain an explicit requirement that an accurate map of the squares with an accurate inventory of non residential properties be maintained. ANC 2D recommends that instructions that are allowed to exist in a residential neighborhood either by matter of right or by special exception not be counted toward the 50% threshold for square occupancy.	Thank you for your comment.
96	Y	Christopher Collins Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	chanceries	The FMBZA has the burden of proof to show why a chancery application should not be approved. Y § 410.3, should be stricken.	OP will continue to work with OAG on the chancery text.
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	Comprehensive Plan	OP has not provided information required in ZC 08-06-C: FNA filed comments in the 2001 NPRM, and in the Order, the ZC requested that OP explain how what they were proposing was consistent with the Comp Plan policies identified in our comments. OP has not provided any explanation and none is possible inasmuch as the draft text is inconsistent with those policies.	The OP reports provided to the Zoning Commission, at the time of setdown and for each public hearing, contained detailed information about the relevant Comprehensive Plan policies and how the OP proposal is not only consistent with, but furthers the Comprehensive Plan and other critical District policies and objectives. Copies of the OP reports can be found in the official case record (#08-06A) at dcoz.dc.gov .
548	D	Harry F. Gates Testimony	2/11/2014	Comprehensive Plan	ZRR does not reflect the guidance in the Comp Plan and affords little in the way of protections.	The OP reports provided to the Zoning Commission, at the time of setdown and for each public hearing, contained detailed information about the relevant Comprehensive Plan policies and how the OP proposal is not only consistent with, but furthers the Comprehensive Plan and other critical District policies and objectives. Copies of the OP reports can be found in the official case record (#08-06A) at dcoz.dc.gov .
546	A, X	Stephanie Guzman Testimony	2/11/2014	conservation districts	I propose to the Zoning Commission that the ability to designate areas as conservation districts - after being requested by its residents - be written in to the ZRR. The zoning regulations for a conservation district could include a formal designation application and process, public input regarding its design, and oversight from a governing body such as the Zoning Commission. The DC Zoning regulations are a key part to our community's wellbeing and must be reviewed with the changing nature of our neighborhoods in mind. Conservation districts are one proposition to consider in order to maintain affordable housing and grapple with the challenges of living in a dynamic city.	Thank you for your comment. OP through the Historic Preservation staff, is investigating conservation districts and how they could be administered. If zoning is determined to be needed, additional text will be brought forward.
700	B, D, E	Bill Crews Save DC Zoning Comments	4/24/2014	corner stores	While I do not support the expansion of corner stores, I am happy to see that all trash and waste is supposed to be on private property and not public space.	Thank you for your comment.
234	C	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	corner stores	Supports allowing modestly sized, convenience-style corner stores in rowhouse and multi-family residential zones, if specified criteria and conditions are met.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
297	C	Alexandra Dodds Testimony	11/12/2013	corner stores	Express strong support for the proposed changes to DC's zoning ordinance, including easing restrictions on corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
299	C	Neha Bhatt Testimony	11/12/2013	corner stores	Strongly support the new corner store zoning regulations as well. I think the City would do well to be even more encouraging and accommodating of corner stores east of the river -- where it is still such a food and shopping desert. If we lost our few and couldn't replace them, well, it would be a lot harder on our neighborhoods. Please think about daily life in these neighborhoods when you consider these regulations. Loss of corner stores would be tough for East of the River.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
395	C	Brian Cohen ANC 3B Testimony	11/19/2013	corner stores	Continue to support the rewrite. The updated draft makes reasonable allowances for local corner stores in rowhouse residential areas, including Glover Park. These stores will provide community residents with the ability to walk a short distance to local, neighborhood-friendly stores; they will enrich our neighborhood fabric and provide easy access to daily necessities.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
416	C	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	corner stores	Support of the proposed Zoning Re-Write as it pertains to corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
577	C	Mary Reuling Comments	2/24/2014	corner stores	Express support for the proposed allowance for an increase in corners stores. This proposal will help make our neighborhoods more walkable, decrease traffic congestion, and support the more environmentally sustainable traffic choices of the nearly 40% of DC household that, like us, do not own a car.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
602	C	Sylvia Ruiz Testimony	2/26/2014	general support	Support for the reforms to the zoning code that will reinforce walkability, diversity, and vibrancy.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
616	C, D	Jonathan Parker Comments	3/5/2014	corner stores	We should not only allow, but encourage more corner stores, and this code fulfills those goals.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
681	C, D	Alex Block Comments	3/15/2014	corner stores	I support the proposals to allow corner stores by right in residential zones. I would also support an even more permissive standards - including the R-5 zones, as well as consideration for the lower-density residential zones.	Thank you for your supportive comment. OP has proposed to retain the existing provision allowing for building-serving retail in apartment buildings. The corner store proposal is limited to the rowhouse zones, where this corner store use is more traditionally part of the neighborhood fabric and character.
695	C, D	Georgia Gann Comments	4/18/2014	corner stores	In addition, all residents should have access to fresh, quality, and affordable groceries. This includes residents who may not have cars. Corner markets, especially those offering fresh fruits and vegetables, provide some of that basic access. I support the corner store zoning proposals.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
695	C, D	Georgia Gann Comments	4/18/2014	general support	I support the proposed zoning updates that will more adequately reflect the dynamic needs of the population.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
425, 426	C, D	Henry McCaslin Comments	11/22/2013	accessory apartments	Express support for modifying our zoning code to allow for accessory apartments.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
425, 426	C, D	Henry McCaslin Comments	11/22/2013	corner stores	Express support for modifying our zoning code to allow for corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
427, 428	C, D	Elizabeth Carswell Comments	11/22/2013	corner stores	Please update the zoning codes regarding corner stores so that we can continue to feed the fantastic growth this city is experiencing.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
450, 451	C, D	ANC 3D Comments	12/9/2013	corner stores	Oppose the establishment of corner stores, including corner stores for which the use is a fresh food market or grocery store, by right in R-3 and R-4 zones and further proposes that corner stores should not be built within 1200 feet of an existing commercial zoned property in a neighborhood, such as Foxhall Village, that was built around a central commercial core that is walkable from all points in the neighborhood.	OP is not proposing that corner store uses, with the exception of a grocery use, be permitted as a matter of right. OP has proposed a 500-foot buffer from existing commercial zones, but understands the unique conditions of the construction of Foxhall Village and will look at ways to address this concern.
67	D	ANC 3C Comments	10/24/2013	corner stores	Corner food stores have potential to change neighborhood character in a positive or negative way so it is important that a neighborhood determine whether it wants to allow these new uses. Thus, the proposal to allow corner food stores in all R-3 row house zones should not be approved without neighborhood oversight and approval.	OP has already revised its original proposal, and is now proposing that all corner store uses, with the exception of a grocery use, be permitted only by special exception, including a public hearing and ANC notification.
158	D	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	corner stores	Corner stores are likely to increase trash, rodents, demand for parking, and other negative impacts. There is also the potential for blight when homes are converted into business uses, with grates, window coverings and other permanent architectural changes. Neighbors would have no voice in the appearance and design of the stores unless they are located in historic districts. And they draw retail stores away from Georgia Avenue and other main corridors that are finding it difficult to attract retail tenants.	Thank you for your comment. OP is proposing that only grocery stores be permitted by right, and they would be subject to numerous conditions regarding use, location, and design. Other corner store uses would be by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for the neighborhood to weigh in on the application, including suggesting conditions to address design issues. The OP proposal includes location criteria that limits the placement of corner stores in close proximity (500 feet) to existing commercially-zoned areas.
158	D	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	corner stores	Corner stores are proposed as one way to increase food and retail options in underserved residential neighborhoods. However, there is strong evidence that this proposal will not result in an increased offering of fresh food. Small-scale stores find it economically difficult to offer fresh food, as evidenced by the lack of fresh food offerings in existing convenience stores located on high-traffic streets. Alcohol sales would be permitted, something that is currently readily available in most neighborhoods.	In fall of 2011, DC Central Kitchen launched an affordable wholesale delivery service—featuring fresh local produce and healthy snacks— at participating corner stores in Wards 5, 7, and 8. See http://www.dccentralkitchen.org/healthycorners/ for more information on the Healthy Corners initiative. OP is proposing limits on the amount of space that could be devoted to sale of alcohol (15% of floor area), and the sale of alcohol for on-site consumption would not be permitted.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	corner stores	Within 4A, two areas are designated for corner stores. One is on the west side of 16th Street, NW, within ANC 4A08. We note that there is no commerce along 16th Street, NW in Ward 4. The area is historic and has been preserved (at least in Ward 4) for non-commercial purposes. Sixteenth Street is the Avenue of the President. This proposal would introduce commerce into residential areas, where commerce is not currently permitted. We oppose this because it would change the fundamental character of the area. It is significant that one of the proposed conditions is that there would be “no alcohol consumption on-site” and off-site alcohol sales would be limited to 15% of floor area. It is as if DC already knows what this new addition would mean and is trying to head it off. We have a better idea. Unless the ANC 4A asks for a corner store, do not impose one on the 4A neighborhoods.	Thank you for your comment. The maps that OP produced for the ANCs do not show areas designated for corner stores - they show areas where a corner store would be possible, given the proximity and zoning limitations proposed by OP. The ANC is correct that other factors, such as market demand, the character of the buildings in the area, and the restriction that any new corner store could only be located on a corner lot, at the intersection of two streets, would greatly limit the likelihood and location of a corner store further. The ANC is also correct that the extensive list of conditions proposed by OP are intended to address potential impacts so that neighbors can benefit from this use.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	corner stores	PRESERVE NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER. The proposal would permit the Board to “modify or waive” the requirements that apply to protect homeowners. Example is 1605.4. Such waivers should not be permitted. It defeats the purpose of this rewrite, if the Board can unilaterally waive the requirements. Our lot size may invite changes that are inconsistent with stable, established residential areas. This proposal seems to draw those non-conforming uses to areas like 4A.	The Board may not unilaterally waive all requirements. Section 1605.4 only permits the Board to waive the location restrictions in D 1605.3 (a) and (b) provided certain conditions are met, and as part of a public process which would include notification of the ANC.
235	D	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	corner stores	Supports allowing modestly sized, convenience-style corner stores in rowhouse and multi-family residential zones, if specified criteria and conditions are met.	Thank you for your supportive comment. OP is no longer proposing an expansion of the current provision regarding retail uses in multi-family zones.
245	D	Cliff Majersik Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	I ask that you accept the zoning proposals to: 1) To permit corner stores and fresh grocers by right.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
246	D	Donna Brockington (ANC 4D) Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	Opposed the corner store proposal. Will create issues with trash and garbage and rodents. Increase noise and traffic in residential areas. May impact on-street parking for residents. Enforcement is already an issue. Won't sell quality products. Should focus on improving existing commercial corridors. Principally concerned with the increase in noise which additional occupants in dwellings may cause the impact of the increased noise on residents living next door to or between accessory units.	OP is proposing that grocery stores be permitted by right subject to conditions. Other corner store uses would be by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for the neighborhood to weigh in on the application. OP is proposing a number of conditions for corner stores that should effectively address noise and trash concerns, including limits on hours, number of employees, square footage, and trash storage.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
246	D	Donna Brockington ANC 4D Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	Opposes the establishment of Corner Stores, including Corner Stores for which the use is a fresh food market or grocery stores, by-right in R-3 and R-4 zones of ANC 4D because there is no notice to residents and no opportunity for them to object. The location of Corner Stores in Petworth row house neighborhoods, particularly food stores, will be detrimental to the geographical area of ANC 4D because these business establishments will cause the following negative consequences: trash and garbage, rodents. ABRA is not able to timely investigate or hold accountable businesses that are in violation of DC rules and regulations concerning the sale of alcoholic beverages. The increase in businesses in fully residential row house blocks will bring an increase in noise and traffic. Contrary to an asserted purpose of the Corner Stores, they likely will not result in an increased offering of healthy foods. Furthermore, ANC 4D contains or is located very near commercial corridors along Georgia Avenue, Kennedy Street, and New Hampshire Avenue.	OP is not proposing that corner store uses, with the exception of a grocery use, be permitted as a matter of right. Non-grocery corner store uses will require a special exception and that process provides for notice to property owners within 200 feet of the subject property. OP has also proposed proximity limits - a corner store would not be permitted by-right within 500 feet of a commercial corridor.
246	D	Donna Brockington ANC 4D Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	Proposes that the DC government begin real on-the-ground implementation of the plans to establish and upgrade groceries and other businesses along Kennedy Street and the Petworth sections of Georgia Avenue in accordance with the Kennedy Street Revitalization Plan and the Georgia Avenue Great Streets Plan.	Status information on plan implementation can be found online on the DC Office of Planning website at http://planning.dc.gov/DC/Planning/In+Your+Neighborhood/Wards/ . Individuals may contact Ward Planners for additional information.
246	D	Donna Brockington ANC 4D Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	Proposes that the establishment of Corner Stores, including Corner Stores for which the use is a fresh food market or grocery stores, be allowed in R-3 and R-4 zones of ANC 4D only by special exception or only by variance.	Thank you for your comment.
249	D	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	Corner stores should be addressed through the customized zoning process -- only if a community wants it.	Thank you for your comment.
255	D	Gerald Fittipaldi Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	Supports corner stores. Convenience, reduce automobile trips, bolster a sense of community, increased safety, independence for children and seniors.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
256	D	Michael Farrell Testimony	11/6/2013	corner stores	Supports more corner stores. The proposed set of allowed uses is too narrow and include small restaurants (such as BYOBs like Philly), tiny coffee shops, boutiques and retail stores, and taverns. Hours should go later at least 10 PM.	Thank you for your comment.
417	D	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	corner stores	Support of the proposed Zoning Re-Write as it pertains to corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
418	D	Michelle Williams Comments	11/21/2013	corner stores	Lives at Fort Totten. Would like to live in a safe, walkable neighborhood with amenities, but can't seem to afford it. Long to have a walkable neighborhood where she can walk to the grocery store, dry cleaners, restaurants, and parks with a bike path. However, due to zoning, I cannot. I have to get back in the car to do all of these things. If new zoning will alleviate this problem, I would feel less apathetic and more hopeful of staying in the city.	OP's proposal regarding corner stores could help to address the issue of neighborhood walkability by providing opportunities for corner store uses to locate in neighborhoods.
431	D	Lane McFadden Comments	11/27/2013	corner stores	Please approve the amendment allowing corner grocery store development as of right, and approving a special exception process for other commercial activities in those properties. This matter has been debated for years and I look forward to the Zoning Commission finally approving this update to our zoning code so that we might have a 21st-century set of regulations to match our list-century lifestyles.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
431	D	Lane McFadden Comments	11/27/2013	parking	I look forward to the Zoning Commission finally approving this update to our zoning code so that we might have a 21st-century set of regulations to match our list-century lifestyles. I previously testified in person in favor of reducing parking minimums (Zoning Case 08-06A, Subtitle C), and I incorporate here by reference that portion of my testimony in which I urged the Commission to devise regulations that no longer privilege automobile owners and drivers so greatly above other residents of DC.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
480	D	Mike Gold Vice Chair ANC 3D Comments	1/29/2014	corner stores	Oppose the establishment of corner stores, including corner stores for which the use is a fresh food market or grocery store, by right in R-3 and R-4 zones and further proposes that corner stores should not be built within 1200 feet of an existing commercial zoned property in a neighborhood, such as Foxhall Village, that was built around a central commercial core that is walkable from all points in the neighborhood.	OP is not proposing that corner store uses, with the exception of a grocery use, be permitted as a matter of right. OP has proposed a 500-foot buffer from existing commercial zones, but understands the unique conditions of the construction of Foxhall Village and will look at ways to address this concern.
513	D	Christopher Winnike (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	corner stores	Supports the proposal to allow corner stores, but the it is also more restrictive than it needs to be.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
568	D	Maureen Gehrig Cook Comments	2/14/2014	corner stores	Opposes corners stores.	Thank you for your comments.
570	D	William H. Mosley Comments	2/18/2014	corner stores	Making it easier to create corner stores will contribute to density and walkability in our neighborhoods.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
575	D	Jim Feldman Comments	2/20/2014	corner stores	Strongly supports zoning changes that would allow for corners stores in the residential areas of our city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
692	D	Daniel Winston Comments	4/11/2014	corner stores	Strongly urge ZC to support a revision of the District's Zoning Code. Relaxing parking mandates and allowing the development of corner stores, in a thoughtful manner, will have a positive impact on our city's livability and affordability.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
421, 422	D	Louis Thomas Comments	11/21/2013	corner stores	In strong support of updating the outdated zoning code, particularly in regards to creating reasonable allowances for corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
472, 473	D	Colleen Hawkinson Comments	1/10/2014	corner stores	Urge ZC to update and simplify the zoning code and support accessory dwelling units, parking minimums and corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comments
187	D, E	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	corner stores	ANC 4D opposed the establishment of corner stores, including corner stores for which the use is a fresh food market or grocery stores, by-right in R-3 and R-4 zones of ANC 4D because there is no notice to residents and no opportunity for them to object.	OP is not proposing that corner store uses, with the exception of a grocery use, be permitted as a matter of right. Non-grocery corner store uses will require a special exception and that process provides for notice to property owners within 200 feet of the subject property.
484	D, E	ANC 3B Testimony	1/30/2014	corner stores	Urge Zoning Commission to approve the draft revisions to the zoning code. Supports corner store proposals. The proposed changes are not radical; they are long overdue modifications to an out-of-date, 1950's zoning vision.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
486	D, E	ANC 3B Brian Cohen Testimony	1/30/2014	corner stores	The updated draft makes reasonable allowances for local corner stores in rowhouse residential areas, including Glover Park. These stores will provide community residents with the ability to walk a short distance to local, neighborhood-friendly stores; they will enrich our neighborhood fabric and provide easy access to daily necessities. Neighborhoods like Capitol Hill and Georgetown that already have these corner stores are some of the most beloved and sought-after communities in our city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
490	D, E	ANC 6B Brian Flahaven Testimony	1/30/2014	process	ANC 6B strongly supports the Office of Planning's effort to update the city's zoning code and urges the Zoning Commission to approve the update as soon as possible.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
490	D, E	ANC 6B Brian Flahaven Testimony	1/30/2014	corner stores	ANC 6B strongly supports the Office of Planning's effort to update the city's zoning code and urges the Zoning Commission to approve the update as soon as possible. I'd also like to reiterate ANC 6B's unanimous support for OP's proposal on corner stores. Allowing limited commercial uses in residential zones is a good idea if we want to make our neighborhoods more walkable and accessible, particularly for those who wish to age in place. ANC 6B also unanimously supports giving the Board the authority to waive the requirement that a corner store may not be located within 500 feet of another commercial use in the same residential area which would potentially open up additional opportunities for corner stores on Capitol Hill.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
492	D, E	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	institutional	Institutional Uses – We do not want this introduction of non-residential uses in our neighborhoods by Special Exception or otherwise.	Thank you for your comment. Institutional uses are currently permitted in residential areas, under the current code.
492	D, E	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	corner stores	Corner Stores - If our rowhouse neighborhoods decide they need commercial, we would like to work with our residents to determine what that would mean and then approach you about permitting it. Please reject the proposed by right or by Special Exception corner store proposal.	OP is proposing that grocery stores be permitted by right subject to conditions. Other corner store uses would be by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for the neighborhood to weigh in on the application, which could include suggesting conditions to address design issues. The OP proposal includes location criteria that limits the placement of corner stores in close proximity (500 feet) to existing commercially-zoned areas.
493	D, E	ANC 6D07 David Garber Testimony	1/30/2014	general support	Express support for the Office of Planning's effort to rewrite the Zoning Regulations.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
496	D, E	ANC 3E Tom Quinn Testimony	1/30/2014	corner stores	Although the corner store proposal does not currently apply to any areas within the boundaries of ANC 3E we believe the proposal is a sound one. Currently retail in the District is largely confined to commercial corridors which can often be separated by significant distances. Limiting retail activity to these corridors precludes convenient and pedestrian accessible neighborhood serving retail for large swaths of the city, including Upper Northwest. Having said that we have a great example of the type of neighborhood serving retail we believe the comer store proposal ought to generate in the popular Broad Branch Market which serves a section of Chevy Chase that otherwise is lacking retail within walking distance. The Sheridan School Farmer's market has also thrived despite being located in a residential part of Ward 3 far from a major commercial corridor. We acknowledge that creating the opportunity for a comer store does not guarantee that it will be a successful one like Broad Branch Market however the opportunity for such businesses should not be precluded either. The one revision we would propose to the Comer Store proposal is that rather than limit alcohol sales based on floor area (15%), that such sales should be limited as a percentage of gross revenue. See Proposed Subtitle D, Section 1605.8. A critical fear of Comer Stores in some neighborhoods is that they will become essentially liquor stores. The floor area limitation does not protect against them being used essentially in that function whereas a reasonable requirement based on gross revenue would.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
508	D, E	Robert Ehrmann (Ward 6) Comments	2/4/2014	corner stores	Supports reforming the zoning code to allow for corner stores in residential areas.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
510	D, E	Carolyn Stoesen (Ward 1) Comments	2/5/2014	corner stores	I support the Subtitle D and E proposals on corner stores. Integrating small retail into our residential areas also makes sense. I'm lucky to have several corner stores close to my house, where I can pick up a bag of ice, buy an emergency roll of paper towels, or other items. There's no reason to prevent new stores from serving our neighborhoods and the proposals are modest and reasonable.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
512	D, E	Christian Alexander (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	corner stores	The neighborhood corner store provision allows for better access to local businesses.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
535	D, E	Kathleen Quinn Testimony	2/11/2014	corner stores	I support and urge you to support the proposed changes to corner stores as currently proposed by the Office of Planning.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
539	D, E	Larry Martin Testimony	2/11/2014	corner stores	Neighborhood stores are an asset to a community, . Not only are they just convenient, they create place - people meet there. And, once again, it helps reduce car use and traffic on our streets.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
560	D, E	Garrett Honea Testimony	2/12/2014	corner stores	Emphatically supports the proposed update to the DC zoning code - in particular the proposed reforms to corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
580	D, E	Jeff Speck Testimony	2/25/2014	corner stores	Supports corner stores rather than waiting for a bus to Wal-Mart.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
594	D, E	Jeremy Van Ess Testimony	2/26/2014	corner stores	Support for provisions regarding accessory apartments and corner stores - two things that along with parking updates will make our city more livable, accessible and friendly.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
607	D, E	Lyn Stoesen Testimony	2/26/2014	corner stores	Supports accessory dwellings and corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
504, 505	D, E	Malcolm M. Kenton Testimony	2/2/2014	corner stores	Supports allowing corner stores to open more easily in residential neighborhoods.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
63	E	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	corner stores	Conditional Commercial Uses in Residential Area (aka "Corner Stores") (1) ANC 6B supports the proposal to change the test for the conditional use of commercial space in residential areas from a variance in all situations to a more nuanced approach. ANC 6B supports the proposal that such conditional uses of commercial space in residential areas be matter-of-right for grocery stores at intersections, and grocery stores in mid-block buildings that were built before 1958 for non-residential use and only where it has been used for this purpose within the previous 3 years. All other permitted commercial uses would also be restricted to either intersections or mid-block buildings that were built before 1958 for non-residential use and would need a special exception. The 3-year requirement would essentially prohibit the re-conversion to commercial uses of any mid-block building that had been converted to residential use. (2) ANC 6B supports giving the Board the authority to waive the requirement that a corner store may not be located within 500 feet of another commercial use in the same residential area where the applicant meets certain conditions.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
63	E	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	corner stores	Conditional Commercial Uses in Residential Area (aka "Corner Stores") (continued) (3) At Subtitle E, Section 1106.5 list the prohibitions on Corner Stores. Section 1106.5(b) states that a Corner Store may not be "on a lot or within a building also containing an accessory apartment or another Corner Store." This can be read to prohibit there being a residential unit on the floor above a Corner Store. ANC 6B does not agree that residential units above a corner store should be prohibited. An "accessory apartment" is defined in Subtitle B, Definitions, Section 100.3 as "a dwelling unit that is secondary to the principal dwelling unit in terms of gross floor area, intensity of use, and physical character." ANC 6B supports encouraging the upper floors of a corner store building to be put to residential use. Indeed, having the owner of the store living above the establishment would seem an especially attractive approach. (4) Similarly, Section 1106.5(d) prohibits locating a corner store "within any building or on any lot containing more than one dwelling unit." This would bar a Corner Store from multi-use buildings with multi-family residential units. ANC 6B does not agree that a corner store in, for example, a small apartment building on a residentially zoned lot should be prohibited. ANC 6B opposes this limitation.	Thank you for your supportive comment. (3) OP agrees that this section needs clarification. It is not intended to prohibit residential use above a corner store. The reference to accessory apartment is not relevant in the RF zones and will be removed. (4) OP will review existing apartment buildings in the current R-4 zone to assess the impact of corner stores in these buildings. OP does not recommend corner store use in an apartment building in the R-3 zones because a corner store use would compound the non-conforming status of an apartment building in an R-3 zone.
79	E	Ben Klemens Comments	10/27/2013	corner stores	Proposes allowing corner stores anywhere in R-3, R-4, and R-5-B. Wants affordable grocery on U Street.	Thank you for the comment; because the R-5 zones already allow for commercial adjunct uses OP has not recommended corner stores in the R-5 zones.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	corner stores	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. Corner store provision is unclear. Proposed Sec. 1106 provides for special exception for numerous types of corner stores, but none of these uses are listed as authorized on the RF use tables. Non-residential uses can destabilize a neighborhood and remove housing from the neighborhood inventory. Moreover one of the main reasons for creating RF 4 and 5 is to protect row house housing by down zoning and removing inappropriate density and uses. The Council should amend the Comprehensive Plan to provide policy direction regarding corner stores and RF neighborhoods should request these uses and under what conditions they would support them. The allowance, including special exceptions, should be removed.	Subtitle E, Sections 1101, 1102, 1106, and 1107 clearly state the use permissions for the RF zones, particularly as they relate to corner stores. Corner stores are characteristic of many of the District's R-4 neighborhoods, including Capitol Hill. Therefore, OP does not believe that the corner store proposal is inappropriate. OP has amended the original proposal to require special exception (BZA and community) review of any new corner store other than a grocery store. The proposal is consistent with Zoning Commission direction, and with Comprehensive Plan and other District policy direction.
175	E	David Alpert Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	corner stores	Subtitle E, section 1106 (corner stores): We recommend adopting the new OP proposal including matter-of-right grocery stores and special exception for other stores, with one suggestion: In addition to "generally perpendicular streets" (1106.3(a)(1)), allow a store on streets which make a sharp acute angle. Consider specifying a maximum angle, such as 120 degrees, instead of the vague "generally perpendicular."	Thank you for your comment.
237	E	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	corner stores	Allowing modestly sized, convenience-style corner stores in rowhouse and multi-family residential zones, if specified criteria and conditions are met.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
263	E	Robert Robinson & Sherril Berger Comments	11/7/2013	corner stores	Corner stores could become nuisances.	OP is not proposing that corner store uses, with the exception of a grocery use, be permitted as a matter of right. Non-grocery corner store uses will require a special exception and that process provides for notice to property owners within 200 feet of the subject property.
409	E	ANC 6C Comments	11/21/2013	corner stores	Subtitle E, Sections 1101.1(e) and 1106, residential flat zones - the corner store provisions should be modified to require a special exception in all cases (as opposed to allowing a fresh food market/grocery store as a matter of right subject to several conditions).	Thank you for your comment. OP is proposing that grocery store uses be matter of right for corner grocery stores; however, the Zoning Commission could modify this proposal prior to adoption.
176	F	David Alpert Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	corner stores	Allow corner stores eligible in Subtitle E (RF zones) in similar structures in A zones.	Thank you for the comment; because the R-5 zones already allow for commercial adjunct uses OP has not recommended corner stores in the R-5 zones.
566	D, E	Chrissy Martin Comments	2/14/2014	corners stores	Supports the proposed update to the DC zoning codes, especially the revised parking minimums and the allowance of more corner stores, because I truly love my neighborhood.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
204	A	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	correction	The Comprehensive Plan is mentioned in several places in the draft proposed text, but it is not identified as an authority in the text along with other statutes. Chapter 4 - Other Authorities should have a section 404 - Comprehensive Plan added.	OP will include a section for the Comprehensive Plan in Chapter 4, Other Authorities.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	correction	§ 1004: This section should be revised to clarify that it addresses projections within required setbacks, not projections outside of the property lines. Section 1004.1 should be deleted.	OP will provide clarifying language.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	correction	§ 1201.4: This section should be renumbered to more clearly reflect that it applies to through lots in all zones.	Thank you for the comment.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	correction	§ 1400: This Chapter should be revised to clarify that it applies only to those zones in which plazas are identified in the accompanying development standards chart. It is our understanding that at this point, plazas are only required in the existing CR zones (M-10 and M-23).	Subtitle C contains general regulations - code users would determine applicability by reviewing the zone-specific requirements found in the Land Use Subtitles.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	correction	§ 1901.8(b)(2): This section refers to D 1603.16 and E 1102.11, but these sections do not exist.	OP will correct the references (D 1602.2(o) and E 1102.2(j)).
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	correction	Drafting Issues, lack of enforcement and monitoring mechanisms: Even the sections where OP is trying to implement a desirable policy, the implementation is faulty. In my earlier submission, I described the enforcement and monitoring issues in the text that OP proposed for shared parking and off-site parking, and provided suggested language changes. But I caution you that similar issues pervade this nearly 1,000 page document, and in this accelerated review process, it seems unlikely that you will be able to locate and correct all the poorly drafted sections.	Thank you for your comment.
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	correction	A purely formatting issue, section 1915.7(d) through (g) are subservient to (c) and should be indented and renumbered (1) through (4).	OP will correct the numbering in Section 1915.7.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	correction	D 1509.2 mistakenly cross references D 1607 when it clearly means to cross reference D 1606.	OP will correct the reference.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	correction	AMBIGUITIES – Reconcile Subtitle C and D regarding residential uses. One example is whether a new building is allowed in the side yards in R zones.	OP will review the proposed language and correct any inconsistencies; however, a side setback is not required along a side lot line in an R zone (D 1506.2).
440	D	Citizens Association of Georgetown Comments	12/4/2013	correction	Fourth, there is a typo in Section 1606.5 (d): the cross reference should be to Section 1606.4(b) and (c), the conditions which require owner occupation and limit the number of persons to six.	OP will correct the reference.
150	E	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	correction	§ 1003.1: This section's reference to "R" zone should be to "RF" zone.	OP will correct the reference.
151	G	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	correction	§ 201.1: This section lists the "M-1-A and M-2-A" zones, but those are not referenced elsewhere.	OP will correct the reference (M-1 and M-2).
151	G	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	correction	§ 508.2: This section references the CR zone. To which zone(s) is it intended to apply?	This reference should be to the M-10 zone. OP will be reviewing the document in its entirety and correcting all references.
282	H	Cleveland Park Historical Society Comments	11/12/2013	correction	In the General Provisions of the ZRR, we would ask that the first three words “in addition of” be replaced by “subject to”. (ZRR 100.2) That change will make it clear that the specific provisions in each neighborhood’s regulations will trump the more broadly worded general provisions.	Thank you for your comment.
205	W	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	correction	This subtitle is missing the Capitol Interest (CAP) Overlay.	OP will include mapping information for the CAP Overlay in Subtitle W.
206	X	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	correction	The table of comparative information on page 20 incorrectly shows the replace for R-4 to be R-16, R-17, and R-18. This should be RF.	OP will correct the reference.
13	D	Ron Lewis ANC 2E Comments	10/9/2013	custom zone	ANC 2E is pleased to express support for the revised residential zoning regulations proposed by the Office of Planning that would adopt a customized residential zoning plan for Georgetown. ANC 2E supports the components of the Georgetown customized zoning plan addressing building height, lot occupancy, front and side setbacks, use categories, accessory buildings, accessory dwelling units, and alley lot buildings. We believe that these provisions are compatible with the goals of the comprehensive revision of D.C. zoning regulations while maintaining the desirable elements of the historic character of Georgetown embodies in much of what is envisioned by the Office of Planning for neighborhoods throughout the city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
48	D	Citizens Association of Georgetown Comments	10/15/2013	custom zone	Pleased to be able to give our support for the portions of this Subtitle D applicable to Georgetown and in particular the Georgetown Customized Zone set forth in Chapter 11 of the draft regulations.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	custom zone	Two Georgetown zones were considered for customization. There is no language in the code that addresses how other neighborhoods might apply for this special zone treatment other than Subtitle X, section 400; now has OP been willing to discuss customization with other neighborhoods.	Chapter 4 of Subtitle X sets out the basic frame work for new zones. The Commission has asked OP to provide more detail on the process in the chapter.
440	D	Citizens Association of Georgetown Comments	12/4/2013	custom zone	First, we urge that the conditions in Section 1606.4 be separately numbered to avoid confusion as to the how many conditions can be waived by the Board. Accordingly Section 1606.4 (e) should become three separate conditions. We also have a question about the requirement in this provision that the accessory apartment not exceed 30% of the gross floor area of the house. The typical Georgetown apartment is the bottom floor of a three story house which typically includes a furnace room or utility closet to which the tenant may or may not have access. We would like confirmation that such an apartment does not exceed 30% of the house because such common areas are not included in the 30%. If that is unclear we propose that 30% be increased to 34%, at least in Georgetown, to ensure that this threshold condition can be met in the typical Georgetown house.	D 1606.4 specifies that the Board may waive not more than 2 of the requirements specified in paragraphs (a) through (f). If an apartment is contained on one floor of a three story house, it would not exceed the 30% limitation.
500	D	Virginia Daley (Lanier Heights) comments	1/29/2014	custom zone	Preserve single family homes: maintain density of single-family neighborhood lots. Let Lanier Heights residents decide what they want: allow facilitating downzoning (custom zoning) in a designated residential area as soon as possible. Preserve the character of neighborhood: stop out-of-scale heights and intrusive pop-ups.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept. OP has been in discussions with residents of Lanier Heights regarding changes to the zoning, or development of customized zoning, for some time and those discussions continue.
501	D	Bonnie Roberts-Burke Comments	1/29/2014	custom zone	Lanier Heights residents want the ability to adjust the zoning for our neighborhood through a zoning overlay or customized zoning. Appropriate zoning would allow no more than 2 units in existing single family homes; would not allow pop-up developments through addition of fourth floors; and would limit the amount of the lot on which housing can be developed.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept. OP has been in discussions with residents of Lanier Heights regarding changes to the zoning, or development of customized zoning, for some time and those discussions continue.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
502	D	David Burke (Lanier Heights) Comments	1/29/2014	custom zone	Lanier Heights residents want the ability to adjust the zoning for our neighborhood through a zoning overlay or customized zoning. Appropriate zoning would allow no more than 2 units in existing single family homes; would not allow pop-up developments through addition of fourth floors; and would limit the amount of the lot on which housing can be developed.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept. OP has been in discussions with residents of Lanier Heights regarding changes to the zoning, or development of customized zoning, for some time and those discussions continue.
503	D	Ronald Baker (Lanier Heights) Comments	1/30/2014	custom zone	I am extremely dismayed by the efforts of a small group to close the door on a new generation of Lanier Heights residents by limiting the development of affordable homes in our neighborhood. Under the slogan of "maintaining diversity" (of architecture, not people), this small group seeks a down-zoning of the Lanier Heights neighborhood to eliminate any new conversions of row houses to condominiums. If this small group succeeds, long time homeowners like myself will lose rights we have under current zoning to convert our row houses to multi-unit residences. I hope someday to convert my own row house so I may "age-in-place" in the neighborhood where I have lived the past 25 years. Other homeowners in Lanier Heights may have similar hopes. Do not close the door on the future of our neighborhood.	Thank you for your comment. OP has been in discussions with residents of Lanier Heights regarding changes to the zoning, or development of customized zoning, for some time and those discussions continue. Any changes to the zoning would include a public process before the Zoning Commission.
318	H	Sara Green ANC SMD 4B01 Testimony	11/13/2013	custom zone	Of note also is the process OP uses to engage communities and tailor zoning and economic development tools to each neighborhood. Georgetown was able to customize its new zoning regulations via a series of community meetings with the Office of Planning. Takoma should be accorded the same process.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. As for Georgetown, that was an entirely community led, grass-roots process within which OP had very little involvement. it resulted in very specific modifications to the current zones to address the unique physical form and historic character of this neighborhood, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and its national and local historic designations. OP believes that such community led planning processes should be respected.
567	X	ANC 7C Report	2/14/2014	custom zone	Request a delay in implementation of ZRR until OP is able to customize the new zoning rules for specific neighborhoods. Want to rezone property.	OP would be happy to work with ANC 7C to discuss the possibility and appropriateness of rezoning property, as OP did in 2007 & 2008 which led to the downzoning of large portions of Wards 7 and 8, including large areas of ANC 7C, from RSA to lower density residential zones. This would be a separate process from ZRR.
436, 437, 438	X	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	custom zone	2. Something might be added about the format of customized zone proposals, to whom they should be submitted, and the time frame for review and comment before the proposals are forwarded to the Commission for consideration. A customized zone may be essential to protect the character of a neighborhood, so there should be a clear and streamlined process for its consideration.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept.
436, 437, 438	X	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	custom zone	3. Section X 400.5 should be eliminated. All zoning involves some diminution of property rights, but if the proposed new zone has the support required by X 400.5, it should not be rejected simply because someone claims that the diminution is "undue".	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept.
436, 437, 438	X	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	custom zone	4. Section X 400.6(a) should be modified to: (a) More clearly establish the degree of support required from property owners in the proposed new zone. unanimous support of the property owners is too much to require or expect for any proposal, but opposition by a significant minority, perhaps 20%, of the property owners in the neighborhood probably should be sufficient to block approval of the new zone. (b) Eliminate the implied requirement for support from all relevant civic, community and business groups, the ANC and the single member district representative. The views of all such organizations and individual should be required to be included in the application, and the views of the ANC should be given great weight, but opposition by one or more of such organizations or individual should not prevent approval if the proposal has the support of the required super-majority of the affected property owners and their reasons for desiring such a customized zone are persuasive.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept.
436, 437, 438	X	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	custom zone	5. Section X 400.7 should be eliminated. The opposition of a property owner whose rights are being curtailed should be given no more weight than the support of a property owner whose rights also are being curtailed. The reasons for opposition offered by any affected property owner should certainly be considered during the approval process, but there is no more reason to give "great consideration", which appears to be an analogy to the "great weight" that by law is to be accorded to the views of an ANC, to the views of a dissenting property owner than there is to give such "great consideration" to the views of a property owner who advocates the imposition of the proposed new restrictions on his or her property and neighborhood.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept.
436, 437, 438	X	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	custom zone	While I strongly support the intent of X 400, I offer the following suggestions for improving its wording: 1. A preamble to section X 400 might be added which would encourage the creation of a new zone for any neighborhood which meets the requirements of this chapter. A customized neighborhood zone should be given preference over a city-wide zone whenever the requisite super-majority of the neighborhood supports the creation of a separate customized zone.	Should the Zoning Commission accept the custom zone concept, they will be available to other communities in a similar manner as overlays. OP may add clarifying language should it be necessary upon ZC adoption of the concept.
84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89	A, B, I, X, Y, Z	Anna McG. Chisman Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Concerns about detrimental effect on West End/Foggy Bottom.(1) I request that the Zoning Commission not approve the expansion of the Central Employment Area (CEA) into additional areas of Foggy Bottom/West End.	(1) The Central Employment Area (CEA) is not being expanded; the CEA is established by City Council or the Mayor through the Comprehensive Plan process or by consent, it is not established through zoning.
85	B	Anna McG. Chisman Comments	10/28/2013	DD	(3) I am also most concerned that apparently, no public hearings would be held on modifications to Zoning Orders, including the George Washington University's campus plan and other Planned Development Units (PUDs). I respectfully ask the Commission to reconsider the proposed changes to the Zoning Regulations.	(3) Sub X § 312.6 establishes that the ZC shall determine the level of a requested modification to a PUD and when a public hearing is warranted. There is no proposed similar flexibility for an approved campus plan.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
69, 70, 71, 72, 73	B, I, X, Y, Z	ANC 2A Comments	10/25/2013	DD	ANC 2A respectfully requests that the Zoning Commission to approve these proposed Comprehensive Text Amendments and address such community concerns. ANC-2A requests that the Zoning Commission: (a) not expand either the CEA or TDRs into more of Foggy Bottom-West End; (b) not allow for increases in currently allowable density, percent non-residential uses, and height in Foggy Bottom-West End; (c) define and state governing provisions for "omnibus" PUDs; (d) require public hearings for all "modifications of consequence" to zoning Orders, including for PUDs and Campus Plans; and (e) not change the requirements for parking spaces in Foggy Bottom-West End.	(1) The Central Employment Area (CEA) is not being expanded; the CEA is done by City Council or the Mayor through the Comprehensive Plan and is not established through zoning; (2) and (3) TDRs may be used consistent with the proposed boundaries of a D zone but they would be limited only to those areas that are designated High-density on the Comprehensive Plan and only for residential purposes; (3) There is a maximum FAR established for Campus Plans that reflects the maximum FAR of the current regulations; (4) There is no such thing as an omnibus Planned Unit Development (PUD). The PUD regulations apply equally to PUDs as specified. (5) The parking proposals recognize the transit rich environment of various parts of the city and the relationship between the cost of constructing more parking than the market dictates and the cost of housing.
55	I	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	DD	Concerns about expansion of the Central Employment Area (CEA) in Foggy Bottom-West End and expansion of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) in Foggy Bottom-West End.	The Central Employment Area (CEA) is not being expanded; the CEA is established by City Council or the Mayor through the Comprehensive Plan process or by consent, it is not established through zoning; TDRs may be used consistent with the proposed boundaries of the D zones.
85	I	Anna McG. Chisman Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Important that the Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) not be extended to include additional Squares in the West End/Foggy Bottom, and that the Zoning Commission not increase density, non-residential uses and height of buildings in my neighborhood. Some of these proposed zoning regulations would have, in my view, a negative impact on the residential character of West End/Foggy Bottom. These effects may well include taller buildings that will tower over existing houses and apartments, blocking light and casting shadows. This would adversely affect my property values, and have a detrimental effect on the entire neighborhood.	(2) TDRs may be used consistent with the proposed boundaries of the D zones which is only proposed for the areas identified as high-density commercial or high-density mixed use in the Comprehensive Plan;
104	I	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Generally supportive, including expansion of Downtown zone.	Thank you for your comment.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Chapter 7 is titled Design Review, but it appears to be site planning review. The title of this chapter should be changed since only Sec. 702.3 mentions architectural design. Even though the enduring criticism of downtown DC is the uninteresting architecture and the lack of quality materials, architectural excellence and quality materials do not seem to be the goal of the design review proposal. The Zoning Commission should raise the standards and consider delegating this role to a licensed committee of professionals.	Thank you for your comment.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Chapter 9 describes how the credit system would work. In most zones a developer can gain bonus density never before offered in the District in exchange for building housing or using existing TDRs. In addition, the developer is allowed to earn credits (aka TDRs) for that amount of housing that exceeds residential requirement, which in most zones is little or nothing. Then the developer can sell those credits to another developer who can use them, not to produce housing, but to avoid producing housing while gaining the bonus density. This is quite a scheme. It does not further the production of housing, and it surely won't result in the creation of affordable housing. The Zoning Commission should reject this scheme and replace it with a responsible assignment of bonus densities, including height, in exchange for furthering our land use policies, like increasing the inventory of affordable units. In addition, there appears to be no reason to continue the credit system, which in practice frustrates our land use goals while helping some developers to make additional profit selling credits and other developers to make maximum profit on office development.	Thank you for your comment. The Inclusionary Zoning provisions will apply to the new D zones.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 100.2(f) and (g) describe development of public open space and housing as among the purposes of Subt. I. In fact, this subtitle permits 100% lot coverage and does not meaningfully promote open space. Housing is partly encouraged, but the Zoning Commission should evaluate if the housing permitted by this subtitle should be limited to market rate housing or require affordable housing. The purpose statement should be evaluated at the end of the consideration of this subtitle to ensure that it accurately represents the subtitle.	Thank you for your comment. The Inclusionary Zoning provisions will apply to the new D zones.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 203 through 213 establishes the development standards for the expanded downtown zone. In most zones maximum heights allowed by the Height Act would be by right. Bonus density is achieved through FAR, which for the first time could exceed 10.0 by removing all limits on FAR. Is this the approach to endorse if the District wants to promote better design and massing? In addition, how would this approach further Comprehensive Plan land use policies? The Zoning Commission should fully explore with the Office of Planning what goal they are trying to achieve and whether that is our shared goal and what zoning measures move toward the shared goal.	Thank you for your comment. The Inclusionary Zoning provisions will apply to the new D zones.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 401.1(b) establishes credit trade areas. The District is experiencing a building boom. Why is it necessary or desirable to continue this practice, which originally was created to discourage all office space and encourage other uses? The reasons for this program appear to have been replaced with keen interest in downtown development. This program is essentially providing land use schemes to boost developer profits. Instead of requiring developers, in exchange for bonus density, to further a DC policy goal, this system rewards them for doing it voluntarily. This is uniquely offered to downtown developers. The Zoning Commission should evaluate whether this program is achieving Comprehensive Plan objectives.	Thank you for your comment. The Inclusionary Zoning provisions will apply to all new D zones. As the market sways between office and residential, the intention is make sure that housing is maintained as a constant land use in the downtown and high density D zones.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 401.7 through 401.9 limits the amount of affordable housing that can be provided in 3 of the 4 zones that have minimum residential FAR requirement. Is this reverse IZ? What is the rationale for not requiring IZ in these zones that would allow 130 foot buildings with unlimited FAR if all housing is provided, and then prohibiting the production of more than a minimal amount of voluntary affordable housing? The Zoning Commission should ask the OP for an analysis and then evaluate whether this would be consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies aimed at increasing the amount of affordable housing.	Thank you for your comment. The Inclusionary Zoning provisions will apply to the new D zones.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 403.4 limits the area of the ground floor that can be devoted to financial services. Isn't the goal to ensure interesting frontage? Wouldn't that be better achieved by limiting the frontage of this use?	Sec. 403.4 limits the area of the ground floor that can be devoted to financial services to make sure that there are other uses on the ground floor.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 802.5(a) provides credits (TDRs) for creating more IZ housing than required. Only four (4) of the downtown zones require IZ housing and these zones cover very little of the downtown area north of Pennsylvania Avenue. Three other zones limit how much FAR can be used for affordable housing, if a developer voluntarily wants to create it. Combined these proposals present a picture of a policy that is mostly smoke and mirrors and not intended to actually produce meaningful quantity of affordable housing. The Zoning Commission should consider requiring IZ throughout Subt. I and eliminate credits as the primary pathway to more affordable housing.	The overall policy and implementation of IZ will be considered as a separate case to the ZRR due to its complexities. Through the ZRR IZ will apply to the new D zones.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 804 outlines how credits (TDRs) can be generated for creating public open space. This appears to be a generous incentive, but at the task force meetings building industry representatives stated that developers would not use this offer when they could more profitably build square footage. Great cities are known for their grand and beautiful public spaces. City regulations continue to favor 100% build-out rather than inclusion of passive or active green space. With housing projected in an expanded downtown, it is time for zoning provisions that will result in community and quality features like public open and green space. The Zoning Commission should not approve this credit and should codify provisions that will achieve the goal.	Thank you for your comment. The Inclusionary Zoning provisions will apply to the new D zones.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 900.3 uses square footage to describe limits on floor area ratio (“FAR”). The limitation is on FAR and that term should be used.	Thank you for the comment. OP will review the language for consistency.
122	I	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Sec. 900.7 restates the maximum non-residential FAR listed in the development tables, but it is confusing because of the way it is introduced. It would be clearer if the introduction to the table stated that it represents the maximum non-residential FAR allowed before applying credits generated by residential FAR.	OP will be editing the Subtitle I for clarity and consistency with the overall format.
139	I	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Historic Buildings and Districts -- Lastly, why are we removing the current limitations in downtown around historic properties and contributing buildings in historic districts in the new downtown zoning? Currently zoning rules “Restrict permitted building bulk on critical historic frontages and lots with historic buildings so as to encourage preservation of historic buildings and assure a suitable scale of new construction in historic districts, especially in projects combining new development with preservation”. (section 1701.1(c)) The Mayor is then charged (through the Historic Preservation Review Board) with making a judgment about compatibility and the issuance of a permit. The new zoning rules don’t contain any protections for historic structures from abutting buildings and would automatically allow buildings or structures on a portion of a site occupied by a historic landmark or a contributing building within a historic district to go to 90 feet in zones D-1-A-2 through D-5-B-2 and the maximum height allowed under the Height Act in D-6-B-1 through D-8-B-2 zones. Historic buildings and historic districts are important elements in the character and shape of the city and especially in the downtown. The zoning rules need to be more sensitive to their preservation.	The proposed new D zones provide for the same protections of historic buildings and zones. There are new proposals that OP has heard could actually limit the development rights of buildings adjacent or additions to historic structures.
139	I	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	DD	I think I can understand the Office of Planning’s proposal to expand the area to be called downtown under the new zoning rules as a way to fulfill the desire for more high-density development. However, it’s pretty large—an area three times the size of the current downtown—and pretty spread out, and I do wonder about the use of the term “downtown” under those circumstances. I usually think of the “downtown area” of a city as being quite circumscribed and contiguous—an identifiable central business district. When does it become so spread out that it loses its identity as the CBD and what makes “downtown” downtown? Or are we talking now about multiple downtowns and what does that mean for commerce in our city? Is that the outcome we are seeking? The spread out nature and lack of contiguity also means that there are some in-between areas and the significant increase in downtown’s size creates many more “edge” or transition zones. What happens to those in-between and contiguous areas that aren’t being rezoned and that weren’t originally zoned with the anticipation that they would be next to or between sections of downtown? There needs to be a clear understanding of how the boundaries were determined—why some places were included and why some were left out—and there needs to be a sensitivity to the adjoining neighborhoods and their relationship to these new downtown areas. Notwithstanding all that, what I don’t understand is why the new zoning rules would eliminate aspects of the current downtown area that actually make it a better place to work, live, and visit. For example, in the new downtown zones, where are the squares, circles, and parks that provide open space and let the area breathe? Why won’t there be parking both for those working there during the day and for the people who want to go downtown in the evenings to dine or see a show or on weekends to visit shops and galleries? Why are we allowing high density FARs that won’t give the city any leverage to have developers provide the amenities we seek for downtown areas? Why are we undermining the protections for the many historic properties and districts that give our city its character by allowing new buildings that will overshadow them? I fear that this huge expansion of downtown and the resulting increase in allowable density without mechanisms to insure interesting, attractive, and livable environments ignores the lessons we have learned from our past experience and will fail to meet the potential for these areas.	The Historic preservation staff worked closely on reviewing any proposed expansion of the D zones and reviewed the draft language to make sure there were HP protections to identified and potential resources. OP will review the full subtitle for consistency.
139	I	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Open Space and Parks -- The new downtown zones show very little green space, even in areas where significant residential uses can be anticipated. It seems unlikely that the city would consider purchasing land for open space from developers, especially at the higher prices that would result from the proposed up-zoning. And yet, there will be no ability to negotiate for the creation of open space in trade for greater FAR because as a matter of right developers can fully build out their property for residential uses or use transferred development rights to increase commercial FAR. Yes, there are some ground floor retail and design requirements but is that all we want for our downtown streetscapes?	Thank you for your comment. OP will review it in light of open space planning being done for Mt Vernon area.
139	I	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Residential Development -- The new zoning rules for the new downtown zones strongly encourage residential development in these new downtown zones. But how do we turn residential development into a downtown neighborhood? We won’t really create viable residential neighborhoods unless we also provide the kinds of amenities that foster community. These include parks and open space, historic structures and districts that give character and sense of place, options for shopping and other activities, ways to participate in community decisions, etc. Our zoning rules need to recognize these needs and provide mechanisms to have developers meet the needs of local residents.	Thank you for the comment. The D zones do have several provisions for retail and preservation.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
142	I	Sue Hemberger Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Expansion of Downtown. OP is proposing a downtown that is about triple the size of our current downtown. The proposed expansion sprawls and skips, so downtown would no longer be compact and contiguous. Little or no attention seems to have been paid to the area adjoining (sometimes even sandwiched between different sections of) the new downtown. How will transitions and buffers be handled? What is (or will be) at stake in an area being classified as downtown? Currently, the obvious answer is that parking requirements would be eliminated. Increased heights appear to be another aspect of downtown zoning. Are such changes appropriate for all of the areas OP proposes to map as downtown?	Central Washington area is: Planning Area developed for use in the Comprehensive Plan; corresponds to the monumental core of the city and the adjoining central business district areas. Central Business District is: The major employment, shopping, and commercial activity center in the city. For the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan, generally refers to the area north of the National Mall and south of Massachusetts Avenue, between Foggy Bottom and Capitol Hill. The proposed new D zones reflect those areas within the existing Central Washington Area identified on the Future Land Use Map as high density commercial, high density residential or high density mixed use. Within these designated land uses properties may already reach 100 feet as a matter of right (with IZ) and up to 110 feet by PUD, or 130 feet by PUD with map amendment. Foggy Bottom and the West End neighborhoods are included within the Near Northwest Area Element (Chapter 21), not the Central Washington Area Element (Chapter 16).
152	I	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	DD	§ 210.1: The development table should be modified to provide for unlimited FAR for residential use and/or credits in the D-6-B-1 zones, similar to the D-5-B-1 and D-7-B-1 zones.	OP will look at this suggestion.
152	I	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	DD	§ 306.1: This section should be revised to remove the limitations on height for projects with contributing buildings in the D-5-B-1 and D-5-B-2 zones to be consistent with the current regulations.	OP will look at this suggestion.
154	I	Trevor Neve Comments	10/28/2013	DD	Proposed changes - expand either the CEA or TDRs into more of Foggy Bottom-West End; allow for increases in currently allowable density, percent non-residential uses, and height in the Foggy Bottom-West End neighborhoods; define and state governing provisions for "omnibus" PUDs; change the requirements for parking spaces in Foggy Bottom-West End; and no longer require public hearings for any "modification of consequence" to zoning orders (including for PUDs and Campus Plans) - would likely lead to a major reversal of growth in our neighborhood just at the time DC needs to accommodate a growing population. They would also devalue property that we have spent years improving. For the sake of a blossoming neighborhood, I therefore respectfully ask that you reconsider the changes you are proposing.	The D zones are limited to the Central Washington Planning Element as set out in the Comp Plan. There are no proposals to extend a D zone into Foggy Bottom or West End. The Central Employment Area is not the same as the Central Washington Planning Element. Changes to PUD are set out in Subtitle X, however, there is no such thing as an omnibus PUD. A PUD by definition may include multiple properties.
333	I	Barbara Kahlow West End Citizen's Association Testimony	11/14/2013	DD	As the WECA stated in writing and orally, the WECA repeatedly and successfully fought to contain the boundaries of the Central Employment Area (CEA) in Foggy Bottom-West End and contends that a change in law is required before OP's redefinition (including its expanded Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) receiving zones) can be legally included in ZRR. As stated in the WECA's October 28th submission, the current zoning rules for TDRs (which increase allowable density and allowable height, including for PUDs) at 11 DCMR § 1709.16 state, "The New Downtown receiving zone consists of the C-3-C zoned portions of Squares numbered 72 through 73, 74, 76, 78, 85, 86, 99, 100, and 116 through 118" in the West End. The WECA requests that the Zoning Commission not expand the CEA or the Central Area into more of Foggy Bottom-West End, especially into Squares which include current residents. The WECA requests that the Zoning Commission not expand TDRs into more of Foggy Bottom-West End	Central Employment Area (CEA) is defined in the Comprehensive Plan as: A legal definition used primarily by the federal government in the location of projects, leasing of space, determination of parking standards, etc. and synonymous with the major concentration of federal and commercial land uses in the core of the District of Columbia. (page 5, Glossary of Terms & Index, 2006 Comprehensive Plan). The Zoning regulations do not propose a change to this definition. Central Washington area is: Planning Area developed for use in the Comprehensive Plan; corresponds to the monumental core of the city and the adjoining central business district areas. Central Business District is: The major employment, shopping, and commercial activity center in the city. For the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan, generally refers to the area north of the National Mall and south of Massachusetts Avenue, <u>between</u> Foggy Bottom and Capitol Hill. Foggy Bottom and the West End neighborhood are included within the Near Northwest Area Element (Chapter 21), not the Central Washington Area Element (Chapter 16). The new D zones reflect those areas within the existing Central Washington Area identified on the Future Land Use Map as high density commercial, high density residential or high density mixed use.
337	I	Sue Hemberger Testimony	11/14/2013	DD	Upzoning, loosening restrictions on redevelopment of historic properties, eliminate parking requirements, redefine boundaries of downtown, being asked to replace the PUD process and limits on FAR with a developer-controlled market for density credits. And to carve out more exceptions to IZ requirements. Asked to lay the groundwork for even more upzoning if/when the Height Act changes.	Thank you for your comments. The IZ will apply to the new D zones.
343	I	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/14/2013	DD	Urge the Commission to closely examine the appropriateness of the expansion of the downtown. Concerned that the FAR limit would disappear and be replaced with unlimited FAR - missed opportunity to leverage maximum density for more affordable or mixed income housing. Concerns about viewshed - by right height of 130 feet on 16th ST and land that borders Lafayette Square. Examine the modeling studies to evaluate potential damage to historic views from by right increased heights. OP should demonstrate how the proposed heights would transition in scale to residential areas on the edges of the proposed expansion area. Wait to change heights until Height Act is resolved. Absence of any planned parks or open space in the expanded downtown.	The zone along 16th St is limited to 90 feet as the SP-2 zone is in the existing regs. IZ will apply to the new D zones.
344	I	Jo-Ann Neuhaus Penn Quarter Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/14/2013	DD	Request that you zone the FBI site the equivalent of C-5, or D-7-B-1, should you adopt the proposed Zoning regulations.	The site has a current zoning of C-4. Because the site is in federal ownership and federal use it is not subject to zoning. The proposed new zone would reflect that of the C-4 zone.
365	I	Robert Brauncler Comments	11/19/2013	DD	Writing to request that property that was the subject of ZC Case No. 08-34 be included in the D-6-B-1 zone versus the D-4-B-1 zone.	The property will be subject to the conditions and covenants of the PUD; any base zone will reflect the equivalent of the current C-3-C.
411	I	ANC 6C Comments	11/21/2013	DD	Subtitle I, section 601.1, downtown zone to include NoMa - the (ANC) commissioners voted to expand the downtown zone to include the proposed areas of NoMa and to eliminate minimum parking requirements in the portion of NoMa.	Thank you for your supportive comments.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
423	I	Mark Carroll SKANSKA USA Comments	11/22/2013	DD	Section 317 should specifically state that no rear yard is required for a through or a corner lot fronting on three streets, even is there are rear lot lines as newly defined within the lot. This modification would clarify that Section 1201.4 from Subtitle C, which states that no rear setback is required for a through lot, specifically applies to the Downtown Zone and would clarify that corner lots fronting three streets are also exempt, since such a lot would not fall within the newly proposed definition of a through lot (see Section 100.3 of Subtitle B).	OP will review this section.
423	I	Mark Carroll SKANSKA USA Comments	11/22/2013	DD	Section 500.3 of Subtitle I requires access through an improved and accessible alley, if one exists. This provision should be eliminated to provide greater flexibility of design and access, especially for larger projects that have multiple uses and multiple street frontages.	OP will review this section.
423	I	Mark Carroll SKANSKA USA Comments	11/22/2013	DD	Skanska is concerned with the First Street retail requirement applying to elements of the project that are not fronting on First Street. For this large development, the First Street frontage is fully developed and includes retail. Based on the current language of the proposed regulation, additional requirements will be generated for mid-block additions to the project, which start more than 125 feet from First Street. Requiring retail along side streets in a midblock addition does not further the goal of creating retail concentration along First Street. Accordingly, Skanska requests that the metric to determine the retail requirement along First Street be directly related to the frontage on First Street.	OP will review this section.
423	I	Mark Carroll SKANSKA USA Comments	11/22/2013	DD	Skanska is pleased with many of the changes that have been proposed for the Downtown Zone, including the height and density proposed for this area.	Thank you for your comment.
423	I	Mark Carroll SKANSKA USA Comments	11/22/2013	DD	Skanska requests the Commission to consider the vesting and grandfathering provisions that should be incorporated in these regulations. Skanska recommends that projects for which a foundation-to-grade permit has been filed should be exempt from compliance with the new regulations given the level of design and expense that has already gone into the project. Similarly, Skanska would like to see language addressing how the regulations will be applied if only a portion of the multi-phased development is vested and the remaining portions are to be developed under the new regulations.	OP will review this proposal with OAG.
488	I	ANC 6C Mark Eckenwiler Testimony	1/30/2014	DD	Support the expansion of the downtown zone to include the proposed areas of NoMa. ANC 6C recognizes and fully supports the fact that this change will result in elimination of minimum parking requirements in that portion of NoMa.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
489	I	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	DD	Reducing parking minimums-as the proposal calls for-is a step in the right direction, but it fails to go far enough. Subtitle I, Chapter 11 removes parking minimums for downtown. This again fails to go far enough. Parking minimums induce a demand for more cars, more congestion, and more dangers for pedestrians. Parking maximums ensure that we prioritize pedestrians and help make our neighborhoods more walkable. Likewise the reduction of parking minimums in transit zones should be changed to remove the minimums all together.	Thank you for your comments.
701	I	ANC 6D Comments	4/24/2014	DD	Request that the ZC retain the existing C-3-C zoning for parcels 646, 648, and 649 rather than to rezone these parcels to D-5-B-1. This will alter the maximum height from 90 to 130. We contend that all large developments should go through the planned unit development process. This process best ensures a development that exhibits a high-quality design that responds to the surrounding context and mitigates many adverse impacts.	OP will review this section.
152	I	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	DD credits	§ 807.6: This section should be deleted in its entirety. Buildings that were constructed during the appropriate time period that would have generated credits (previously TDRs or CLDs) should not lose their rights.	OP is proposing to maintain the relative value of CLDs and TDRs.
340	I	Dennis Hughes Holland & Knight Testimony	11/14/2013	DD credits	Evaluate whether credits should expire once they land on a site and are used to achieve additional non-residential density. At a minimum, credits created by the conversion of CLDs and TDRs should be included with plaza credits as credits that do not expire. Should not limit credits generated by arts uses to only satisfy the arts requirements of properties within the limited Downtown Arts Sub-area. Such a limited market will undermine the policy goals. CLDs related to other preferred uses (not just residential), especially preferred arts uses, should qualify for conversion. Should not restrict requests to convert CLDs to credits to "owners" of a residential development - should also allow those cases where CLD "rights" have been reserved as part of a property sale and subsequent development. Further review the proposed 3 year time limit on converting CLD and TDRs to credits. At a minimum, the time limit should be tied to the administrative issuance of standardized documentation for the credit allocations and that any conversions that are initiated by that deadline should qualify.	OP continues to review the D zones, and is committed to making sure that there is no lost value to the TDRs and CLDs.
142	I	Sue Hemberger Comments	10/28/2013	DD FAR	Significant Upzoning. Maximum height in current C-3-C zones moves from 90 feet to 130 feet (or more). Limits on FAR would be eliminated in 7 of the 11 downtown zones.	Thank you for your comments.
152	I	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	DD FAR	§ 308.3: This section should be revised to include a composite FAR as is currently provided for in Section 1707.4 of the Zoning Regulations: ".... provided, that in a multi-lot development or combined lot development within a single square, the permitted 6.0 FAR may be averaged with the permitted FARs of other lots that are part of the development, including any lots not subject to the 6.0 FAR maximum, so as to achieve a composite FAR for the entire development."	OP will review this section.
152	I	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	DD grandfather	§ 603.4: This section should be deleted in its entirety.	OP will review this section.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
142	I	Sue Hemberger Comments	10/28/2013	DD height	Incentives/requirements/leverage. Significant increases in height and density shouldn't just be given away – but that is what OP is doing in this subtitle. Maximum heights allowable under the Height Act and unlimited FAR will be achievable as matter-of-right in most zones. PUD 06-14 is a interesting read if you want to get a sense both of what can be achieved by making additional height contingent upon infrastructural improvements and of how limits on FAR create important incentives for the provision of public space. It's being built now in NOMA so it's direct comparison – how would that project look different if it were developed under the proposed downtown rules rather than the existing ones? In Height Act discussions, Director Tregoning has repeatedly mentioned that possibility that FAR could be auctioned off. But the only auctions that will happen if this subtitle is passed as currently drafted would involve one developer selling credits to another. DC government loses both money and control when it leaves development capacity up to the market rather than regulates it. The existing regulations were the product of a time when it was difficult to attract investment downtown. That situation has changed dramatically. And therefore it's time to reconsider whether bonuses (especially bonuses for things that the market already incentivizes). With respect to pre-existing development rights (CLDs, TDRs), while they can't be eliminated, there's no reason to increase their value. Those who possess these entitlements got what they bargained for – to the extent that it hasn't proven useful to them, no obligation arises to offer them something more or better.	OP is reviewing the DD provisions as they apply. The cited case addresses a property that was not within the Downtown East (NoMA) receiving zone and OP appreciates the positive comments about our work in negotiating that successful project.
142	I	Sue Hemberger Comments	10/28/2013	DD historic preservation	Existing protections for historic structures and fabric downtown seem to have been weakened. A more detailed discussion, focused on regulation 306.1, follows.	The historic preservation provisions were written in close collaboration with the Historic Preservation staff. The HP staff reviewed the area for potential historic issues and work with staff to write the draft.
559	C, I	Richard A. Drom Comments	2/12/2014	DD parking	Subtitle C, Section 19001. Parking Requirement - (Section 1902.3 (b)): Vehicle parking shall not be required in the Downtown Zones. If a minimum number of below grade parking spaces are not required in the future, residents, property owners, cultural venues, retailers, restaurants, and the city's tax receipts could all be affected negatively. Several downtown property managers estimate that over 50 percent of the residents with cars do not use them to commute; they use transit, bike, or walk to work, theaters, and restaurants during the week. However, garage storage is needed for those who reverse commute; use their car on weekends/ vacations, or off-hours for errands and family visits. This is particularly true downtown because street parking is unavailable to Downtown residents —unlike other residential neighborhoods. Today, historic preservation requirements and narrow lot sizes result in residential development without parking or with only a few parking spaces, requiring residents with cars to find monthly parking elsewhere. There is also a need for parking requirements on commercial sites which can also rent to residents when parking spaces are not available on residential sites. Parking is a use that can't easily be retrofitted, and, further, the Downtown streets are all metered leaving garage parking as the only alternative to residents living here. In the future, there is likely to be an imbalance between those owning cars wishing to live Downtown and the available number of spaces. A lack of parking will cause a percentage of potential Downtown residents to live elsewhere and will cause property value to decline. Further, lack of parking will also affect restaurants and cultural venues, especially theaters, causing a steep decline in ticket sales. Apartment rentals, condominium sales, restaurant business, cultural venue attendance, commercial rental rates are all at stake. The market for condominiums without dedicated parking will likely be hurt because it will restrict who will purchase the property. Car sharing will likely be impacted because the cost of parking will be prohibitive. Therefore, the zoning code should include a minimum parking requirement, especially for residential buildings to accommodate travel for the disabled, or when public transit is not a reasonable option, and to provide spaces for car sharing, regardless of the proximity to Metro stations.	Thank you for your comment. The Zoning Commission will determine whether it is appropriate to modify OP's proposal for required parking.
709	I	Richard Houghton Testimony	4/24/2014	DD process	Urge the Zoning Commission: Do not accept the zoning rewrite in its entirety as presented by OP; Use those pieces of the ZRR that can be properly vetted and justified to AMEND the existing code for clarity and consistency and bring it into the 21st century; Adopt a transparent mechanism for citizen input in the amendment process; and Utilize an independent, third party to undertake that vetting process.	
707	B, C, D, E, F, H, I	Charles Robertson Testimony	4/24/2014	DD process overlays	Cites a number of problems: 1. Uneven treatment of neighborhoods. 2. No surveying to justify the changes. 3. Permissible destruction of housing units. 4. The changing of the zone appellations. 5. The repeatedly misleading characterization of the zoning regulations. 6. The top down approach by the planning office. 7. The Zoning Administrator given too much discretion. 8. The extension of downtown by 30% westward. 9. The elimination or obscuring of neighborhood overlays.	OP recommendations were based on years of public work, starting with topic-focused public work groups and leading to a series of public hearings before the ZC where the ZC gave OP guidance on most of the proposals. These public hearings were fully noticed by the Office of Zoning to every ANC. The draft text proposes several changes to protect housing - no longer allowing galleries or private clubs in the R-4 and CBIF in low density residential zones; No additional discretion has been given the Zoning Administrator and the neighborhood overlays are proposed to be well focused with new emphasis by being assembled in a single location.
139	I	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	DD PUD	FAR and Amenities -- Regarding FAR, the Zoning Commission certainly has enough experience with PUDs to know that you need to be able to trade something in order to get amenities. Residential development, which allows full FAR, is not an amenity, though affordable housing within residential developments would be but what could we trade for it. We need to use increased FAR to improve our city, not just as a bonus of up zoning to current landowners.	All new D zones are subject to IZ.
118	X	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD PUD	Sec. 303.4 includes proposed PUD height in C2C that is less than the proposed by right height in Subt. I for the C2C zone; the proposed PUD height for C3C, C4, and C5 is the same as the by right proposed height for these zones in Subt. I. If the intention is to only use PUDs in downtown zones for bonus FAR beyond what could be achieved with credits, this should be stated in Subt. X. It is questionable policy to require a developer to buy credits before being eligible for a regulatory process when that criterion is not required for any other applicant. Careful consideration should be given to how PUDs would be used in downtown zones and the potential benefits attained from by right height and FAR (after purchasing credits) versus what can be gained through a PUD process.	OP will review this section.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
118	X	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	DD PUD	Sec. 306.4(c) exempts downtown PUDs from housing linkage requirement, which means that if downtown area is expanded, as proposed, a significant area could realize the development benefits of a PUD without providing any affordable housing. The PUD rules as they will affect downtown should be evaluated with the review of Subt. I.	All new D zones are subject to IZ.
559	B, C, I	Richard A. Drom Comments	2/12/2014	DD use	Request that the ZC revise the following proposed zoning regulations in Subtitles I and C to protect the quality of life of downtown residents. Subsection I - Downtown Uses – Chapter 6, Section 402.2. Residential Uses in downtown commercial zones should be afforded some degree of protection from certain uses, noise, and artificial light to maintain an acceptable quality of life. To create and maintain a viable living downtown, the proposed zoning regulations should be modified to treat ‘Residential Uses’ in the Downtown Zone similar to ‘Residential Districts’ elsewhere. Use Categories that include activities that are incompatible with residential uses (such as night clubs, pornography stores, or nude dancing clubs) should include conditions that prohibit, place restrictions on, or include distance requirements. The proposed use restrictions in ‘Residential Districts’ should also apply to all ‘residential uses’ in the Downtown Zone. In addition, any reference to ‘Residential District’ or ‘Residential Zone’ should be revised to refer to ‘Residential Use(s)’. Using the term ‘Residential Use’ instead of ‘Residential District’ or ‘Residential Zone’ will help facilitate the ability of other agencies to establish or change regulations to help protect the quality of life of downtown residents. For example, regulations that restrict hours of operation or maintain distance requirements between uses can address nuisance noise from commercial loading operations, amplified sound, or nearby construction, as well as direct or indirect light that penetrates or bounces off nearby walls into the living quarters of residential homes.	OP will review this section. The ZC has asked OP to consider revisions to address the issue of residential uses vs. residentially zoned properties.
152	I	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	DD use	§ 615.3: This section should be revised to limit the use requirements based on a calculation more accurately reflecting the goal of locating preferred uses on Primary Designated Street Segment.	OP will review this section.
528	I	Tom and Dorothy Belcher	2/7/2014	DD use	Residential uses in downtown commercial zones should be afforded some degree of protection from certain uses, noise, and artificial light to maintain an acceptable quality of life. To create and maintain a viable living downtown, the proposed zoning regulations should be modified to treat "Residential Uses" in the Downtown zone similar to "Residential Districts" elsewhere. Use Categories that include activities that are incompatible with residential uses (such as night clubs, pornography stores, or nude dancing clubs) should include conditions that prohibit, place restrictions on, or include distance requirements. The proposed use restrictions in "Residential Districts" should also apply to all "residential uses" in the Downtown Zone. In addition, any reference to "Residential District" or "Residential Zone" should be revised to refer to "Residential Use(s)."	OP will consider revisions to address the issue of residential uses vs. residentially zoned properties.
532	I	Karyn Posner-Mullen Comments	2/10/2014	DD use	Residential uses in downtown commercial zones should be afforded some degree of protection from certain uses, noise, and artificial light to maintain an acceptable quality of life. To create and maintain a viable living downtown, the proposed zoning regulations should be modified to treat "Residential Uses" in the Downtown zone similar to "Residential Districts" elsewhere. Use Categories that include activities that are incompatible with residential uses (such as night clubs, pornography stores, or nude dancing clubs) should include conditions that prohibit, place restrictions on, or include distance requirements. The proposed use restrictions in "Residential Districts" should also apply to all "residential uses" in the Downtown Zone. In addition, any reference to "Residential District" or "Residential Zone" should be revised to refer to "Residential Use(s)."	OP will consider revisions to address the issue of residential uses vs. residentially zoned properties.
344	I	Jo-Ann Neuhaus Penn Quarter Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/14/2013	DD use definition	Concern about sexually-based businesses - prohibits them from being within 600 feet of a residential district, but there are no residential districts in Penn Quarter. I hope you will consider language that treats all residents equally and not just those who have chosen to live in residentially zoned neighborhoods.	OP will consider revisions to address the issue of residential uses vs. residentially zoned properties.
78	B	David Briggs Holland & Knight Comments	10/25/2013	definition	Revise fast food definition to delete the reference to payment for the meal prior to consuming it.	OP will review the proposed definition for Fast Food Establishment.
81	B	Parking Development Solutions Comments	10/28/2013	definition	Delete definition for mechanical parking garage. Don't delete definition of garage, private. If a definition for parking garage is included, don't distinguish between parking and automated parking. Assume public garage replaces parking garage, which they support, but want public garage to permit incidental services. Covered parking and ramps shouldn't be included in GFA - appears that all covered parking counts toward GFA, regardless of how far below ground level. Refine language regarding ramps to reflect possibility of automated parking system. GFA should address how automated parking is treated - systems are like elevators and should only count toward GFA at ground level. Comment that vehicle storage areas often have structural headroom of 6 feet - should factor in GFA calculation. Propose modifying definition of basement and cellar to 6-foot standard in lieu of current 4-foot headroom standard.	OP has no objection to changing mechanical parking to automated parking and will clarify when covered parking counts toward gfa.
83	B	Lindsley Williams Comments	10/28/2013	definition	Side by side comparison of current and proposed definitions.	Thank you for the comment.
124	B	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	definition	Apartment buildings are defined as structures with 5 or more units - how do you define 2, 3, or 4 unit buildings?	2, 3, and 4 unit buildings are Residential Flats, as regulated in proposed Subtitle E.
124	B	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	definition	Comments on Section 300 (Home Occupation), which no longer exists in Subtitle B. Need provision to require that the home occupation practitioner is a full-time resident where the home occupation is established. Concern that home occupation can be established in an accessory structure without a special exception. Should not allow requirement that the practitioner must reside where the home occupation is established.	Home occupations are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202) and the draft text proposes basically the same provisions and conditions as outlined in the use permission in the Land Use subtitles; the uses have been updated to reflect general changes in how people work and technology.
124	B	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	definition	Definitions of affordable housing and Inclusionary Zoning include different income definitions - should standardize to IZ income requirements.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
124	B	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	definition	Household definitions seems to allow 6 persons under one roof versus 6 persons on a single lot.	OP will provide clarifying language, as necessary.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
148	B	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	definition	§ 100.3 Fast Food Establishment: This definition should eliminate the reference to payment for the meal prior to consuming it. This change would parallel and coordinate with the definition of "Restaurant" in the proposed text, which makes no reference to payment for food after it has been served and consumed as a condition for recognition of a food establishment as a "Restaurant".	OP will review the proposed definition for Fast Food Establishment.
156	B	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	definition	The definition of "low income households," at DCMR 11-2601.1, be changed from 50% of MAI and redefined as "equal to or less than 30% of the District's median income or DMI."	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
156	B	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	definition	The definition of "moderate income households," at DCMR 11-2601.1 be changed from 51% to 80% of AMI and redefined as "between 31% and 50% of the District's median income or DMI."	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
229	B	Chris Otten Adams Morgan for Reasonable Development Testimony	11/5/2013	definition	The new regulations should define the rear yard and rear lot line as they currently do now - primarily based on the principal building's rear line and projecting back. That way, no matter how irregular the lot, there is a rear yard buffer to meet the intentions and purpose of the Zoning Code as described by DC Code § 6-641.02.	OP is proposing to define rear lot line and to measure rear setbacks in a manner consistent with the Zoning Administrator's interpretation.
244	B	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	definition	Apartment building - The current definition describes buildings with 3 or more units. The proposed definition describes buildings with 5 or more units. This may be to distinguish apartment buildings from 4-unit row houses, but there are existing apartment buildings that will be included in the new Apartment Zone that have fewer than 5 units. The new definition implies that apartment building density has a base of 5 units and that buildings with 4 units are some undefined housing option.	With the creation of the new Residential Flat (RF) zones, which would apply to 2, 3, or 4-unit buildings, it was appropriate to revise the definition of apartment building.
244	B	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	definition	Household - the definition is confusing. OP seems to intend to have this explain how and when numbers of people living together is limited. But OP is only including two types of households and is not including other types of households where the proposed regs would limit the number of people living together. Included in the definition is a family household where everyone is related and the total number of occupants is unlimited, and the other is a group household of no more than 6 unrelated persons living under one roof with common living features, like kitchen and bathrooms. OP has not included accessory dwelling units even though they create a separate household and OP has included a limit on the number of people living on a lot in Subtitle D. To be comprehensive and clear the household definition should include all types of households with accompanying limits on number of occupants.	The conditions found in the Land Use Subtitles are intended to be more restrictive than the general provisions found in the remaining Subtitles.
244	B	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	definition	One issue is the legal authority of the definitions - do they establish requirements or are they only descriptions of terms? Chapter 1 states that the zoning definitions are not intended to change legal meanings used in other regulations, but it is not stated whether the zoning definitions are actually enforceable provisions of the code or are simply helpful bits of information to orient the code user. For example, the definition of home occupation describes a resident/practitioner relationship, but the Subtitle D provisions that establish the rules for home occupations is not clear that the resident must be the business practitioner. So is the definition an additional enforceable provision or not?	OP will consult with OAG regarding the enforceability of the definitions.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	definition	§ 601.1: This section changes the approach on regulating the number of residents in a dwelling from the current definition of a "family" to a "maximum number of occupants" in a dwelling (unlimited if related by blood, marriage or adoption; up to 15 for a religious group residence; 6 in all other instances). If the residents of the dwelling had out-of town guests, or had a party, resulting in more than 6 people inside the dwelling ("occupying" the dwelling) during that time, would that violate the zoning regulations?	OP is proposing a change (household vs. family), but the intent is not that out of town guests or other visitors would constitute a violation of the zoning regulations.
390	C	Patricia Penny ONE DC Testimony	11/19/2013	definition	Without a changed definition of affordability, most low-income black residents will be priced out of the city. Your commission has a chance to change the tide - over 35,000 black Washingtonians have been moved or priced out of the city within the last decade. Let's not let another 35,000 leave in this decade. It's time for change now -- change the definition of affordability so it actually reflects the needs of current DC residents.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	definition	We hope the Zoning Commission will rethink its plan to excise the word "family" and concept from the definitions.	Thank you for your comment.
59	B	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	definitions	The definition of cellar should be amended to reference existing grade because existing is easier to define than finished.	Finished grade is used in the existing code and OP is not proposing to make a change.
220	B	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/5/2013	definitions	Proposes changes to historic preservation related definitions. Historic District: An area listed as an historic district in the D.C. Inventory, or which the State Historic Preservation Officer has nominated or issued a written determination to nominate to the National Register of Historic Places after a public hearing before the Historic Preservation Review Board. Historic Landmark: A building, structure, object or feature, and its site, or a site (a) Listed in the D.C. Inventory or National Register of Historic Places, or Historic Resource: A building, structure, object or feature, and its site, or a site listed in the District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Sites or the National Register of Historic Places or a building, structure, feature, and its site, or a site certified in writing by the Historic Preservation Office as contributing to the character of the historic district in which it is located.	OP will amend the historic preservation related definitions to ensure consistency with other DC regulations.
461	B	Alma Gates Comments	12/28/2013	definitions	The term "abut" is used frequently throughout the current zoning regulations. It is a term that is not included in the definition; however, its intent has been to express a particular relationship between two properties, objects or property owners. The term "abut" requires attention. What definitions will be provided in ZRR and how will the term be applied. Without answers, there is no clarity and little protection for residential zone districts when they share a common line of demarcation with a commercial zone district.	OP will work with OAG and the Zoning Administrator to clarify the intent and current practice and include a definition, as appropriate.
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	definitions	Former ANC commissioner David Bardin has suggested definitions that should be included. I support his suggestions.	Thank you for your comment. OP will work with DDOE to define urban tree canopy and sustainability.
100	A	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	effective date	Anxiety regarding lack of effective date for proposed regulations. ZC should establish timelines for transition to the new regulations. Revise A § 100.4 to account for land use processes that have been established since the drafting of the transitory language in 1958 and to provide additional clarity.	OAG will work with DCRA and OZ on establishing the effective date of the new regulations; the date in A § 100.4 will be corrected to reflect the new effective date.
147	A	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	effective date	Additional questions and concerns about vesting and timing.	OAG will work with DCRA and OZ on establishing the effective date of the new regulations; the date in A § 100.4 will be corrected to reflect the new effective date.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
173	Y	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	e-mail testimony	Allow individuals to file testimony by email without needing a signed and scanned PDF. Remove “or by email” from 206.3 (requiring PDF format) and delete 206.5(c) (“contain the signature of the originator”).	Thank you for your comment.
211	Y, Z	Cheryl Cort Coalition for Smarter Growth Testimony	11/4/2013	e-mail testimony	Request that Y § 206.5 be deleted to allow e-mail communications for testimony before the BZA and Zoning Commission.	Thank you for your comment.
179	Z	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	e-mail testimony	Subtitles Y and Z, chapter 206 (filing documents electronically): Allow individuals to file testimony by email without needing a signed and scanned PDF. Remove “or by email” from 206.3 (requiring PDF format) and delete 206.5(c) (“contain the signature of the originator”).	Thank you for your comment.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	FAR	§ 901.2 (Rules of Measurement for FAR): This section should more specifically clarify private rights-of-way that serve as principal circulation versus those that access loading, service, and parking functions.	The intent is that private rights of way, other than access ways to loading, servide, and parking, would not count towards total lot area for the purposes of calculating FAR. OP will review the language to ensure this is clear.
94	G	Citizens Association of Georgetown Comments	10/28/2013	FAR	Increase FAR from 2.5 to 3.0 for M-4 (C-2-A in Georgetown).	OP will review this proposal.
319	G, H	Faith Wheeler ANC 4B Testimony	11/13/2013	FAR	New buildings on main corridors should have minimum FAR requirements to encourage multi-story buildings.	Thank you for your interesting comment - OP will review whether and how this could be enforced.
93	J	Christopher Collins Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	FAR	Uses that are permitted by right and not subject to conditions should be able to achieve the full FAR for permitted uses in each category. Other uses permitted subject to conditions or permitted by special exception should also be able to use the full FAR. Consider including green technology and tech incubator space as appropriate uses for the full FAR in P zones.	Uses are limited by FAR to ensure that there is a place for industrial uses consistent with the Comp Plan.
109	X	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	FAR	The significant departure from existing practice would deprive universities of existing density rights and disrupt their established investment-backed expectations for campus development. Therefore, the Consortium strongly urges the Commission to delete the provision that would require interior private roads on a campus that serve as access to buildings or circulation to be excluded from FAR calculations. The Consortium recommends that the Commission either delete Subtitle X, Section 101.7 or alternatively increase maximum permitted FAR on campuses under Section 101.5 to account for the loss of longstanding permitted density.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.
117	A	Committee of 100 Comments	10/29/2013	ZA Authority	Sec. 304 does not require the Zoning Administrator to notify the Advisory Neighborhood Commission of a request for and approval of modifications to development requirements, which means that ANC would be at disadvantage to know of his action in time to appeal his ruling on these matters. The Zoning Administrator should be required to notify the relevant ANC when a building permit requiring a zoning deviation or modification approval is being considered and if it is approved in order to preserve the ANC’s right to file a timely appeal of his decision.	Zoning Administrator notification of ANCs for requests for minor modifications is not currently required under the existing zoning and OP is not proposing to establish a new requirement.
117	A	Committee of 100 Comments	10/29/2013	format	The proposed designation of R5 zones as Apartment Zones does not emphasize that these are residential zones with many different types of housing and levels of density. The proposed apartment zone should be titled RA to indicate it is primarily a residential zone, like R and RF zones, with varied housing and range of density permission.	Permitted uses in a zone are not based on the zone name, but rather on the list of permitted uses within the regulations. However, OP will add Residential to the Apartment Zone names.
117	A	Committee of 100 Comments	10/29/2013	format	The proposed renaming of overlay zones is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Zoning changes should not require amendments to the Comprehensive Plan; it is zoning that should follow the designations that relate to land use policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Overlay policies are included throughout the Comprehensive Plan and there are directives to create more of them and no policies to combine them with underlying zoning.	A zoning change which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan does not require a Comprehensive Plan amendment; a zonign change must be deemed by the Commission to be not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. OP will review the proposed zone naming. However, the new proposed nomenclature is consistent with Commission guidance. The combining of the overlay zoning and the base zoning provisions, including any policy statments, is also consistent with Commission guidance, and consistent with direction to update the code to make it easier and more effective to use.
117	A	Committee of 100 Comments	10/29/2013	format	The use of existing residential zone names in Subt. A for proposed new zones is unwarranted and confusing. The R-1-A & B, R2, R3 zone titles should be maintained for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and clarity. It is more than confusing to have R-1-B become R2 and R2 become R3.	OP agrees, and will review the proposed zone naming conventions.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	format	Subtitle C has many sections that apply to both residential and commercial areas. In many respects, there is ambiguity between Subtitles C and D regarding residential requirements. In seems that many of the residential-only related requirements contained with Subtitle C would be better placed with Subtitle D. Certain obvious examples are noted above, such as C502 related to height limits in residential areas.	OP will review the format to make it clear and concise within and between subtitles.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	format	Express strong support for simplifying the overall code.	Thank you for your comment. Dwelling unit density regulations also, "(a) Conserve the District’s inventory of housing for larger households, through the preservation of single dwelling unit houses; (b) Permit the provision of quantities of dwelling units consistent with designations provided in the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan; and (c) Provide housing options that are affordable through the ability to share common facilities, such as bathrooms and kitchens, while maintaining limits on the total number of occupants that may occur on a lot to prevent overconcentration." All of which are stated in the introduction to Subtitle C Chapter 6.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	format	New individual zone designations have divided the low density residential zones into 10 groups and 20 zones. Should the current familiar zone classification system be maintained for the low density residential zones?	Thank you for the comment. The new proposed nomenclature is consistent with Commission guidance and has been public for several years. However, OP will review the proposed zone naming.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	format	Subtitle D is generally more cumbersome than the sections of the current code that address regulations dealing with low density residential zones and where all provisions dealing with each individual residential overlay are found in one section.	Thank you for the comment; OP will review the subtitle for additional clarity and ease of use.

<i>ZC Exhibit #</i>	<i>Subtitle</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Comment/Testimony</i>	<i>OP Response</i>
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	format	Subtitle D is one of the larger sections of the ZRR and suitable to use as an example of what has not been accomplished in the zoning revision. There is as much or more flipping between subtitle in the ZRR than in the current code. Some of the cross references are missing. OP has carried forward policies that have been met with resistance from neighborhoods as well as members of the task force. Prime examples of unwanted change are the introduction of external accessory dwelling units, matter of right internal apartments, expanded home occupations, and removal or reduction in required parking (which is not in Subtitle D).	Thank you for the comment. OP issued the draft at the request of the Zoning Commission following requests from members of the public that a draft of the entire document be issued. At the time, OP noted that it is a working draft. All of the issues noted are equally strongly supported by many other members of the Task Force and the residents of the District.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	format	The General Rules that pertain to residential zones are found in Subtitle C. The necessity to flip between chapters in the zoning regulations was one of the most frequently cited reasons for a revision. It is clear there continue to be a necessity to flip back and forth between several subtitles.	Thank you for your comments.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	format	With regard to Subtitle D-Residential Houses, we recognize that this document is the result of an ongoing process; and I believe that this latest draft is a vast improvement over prior efforts, but we oppose the proposed revision, as currently written.	Thank you for your comment.
508	D, E	Robert Ehrmann (Ward 6) Comments	2/4/2014	format	Supports simplifying the zoning code so that property owners and residents are all comfortable with the understanding of the law.	Thank you for your comments.
539	D, E	Larry Martin Testimony	2/11/2014	format	To the extent that the update simplifies organization of the code, that is a good thing too.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	format	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. Purpose statement, Subt. E, Sec. 100.3(a) is too all-inclusive and it removes the important purpose statement that R4 zones are partly intended to stabilize remaining single family homes. The policy statements regarding walkable neighborhoods, housing affordability, aging in place, improvements to the overall environment are land use policies that are self-evident for all zones, but are not mentioned in other residential zones. The existing purpose statement includes protection of single family homes from conversion to multi-family housing and that goal should be in the purpose statement.	The draft regulations have not eliminated or reduced the achievements and protections of the overlays. The overlays have been translated into their own zones, which include the same provisions, intent, restrictions and provisions. The new zones also can include more specific Comprehensive Plan language. However, OP will review the overlay provisions to make sure none have been eliminated.
263	E	Robert Robinson & Sherril Berger Comments	11/7/2013	format	Proposed regulations are infinitely more confusing and ambiguous and their organization deceptive. They do tremendous violence to our neighborhood. They included no crosswalk to the original regulations; no accurate information on what improvements or remedies each proposed change was designed to achieve; no information about who proposed these specific changes and what their stated object was.	OP has prepared section-by-section crosswalks detailing where provisions in the existing code can be found in the proposed code.
264	E	Sharon Conway Comments	11/7/2013	format	Frustrated by complexity, internal contradictions, and ultimately, its potential to destroy Mt. Pleasant neighborhood. Should not be a matter of right to convert single or two-family home to multifamily dwellings in the R-4 zone.	As in the existing code, conversions in the R-4 zone are limited in that the lot of record must have a minimum of 900 square feet of land area for every dwelling unit in the building. OP has agreed to work with the historic Mt. Pleasant neighborhood to address the issue of conversions, and to examine this provision. OP has and will continue to support the R-4 zone as a predominantly rowhouse flat zone, not an apartment zone.
121	F	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	format	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. R5A zones are not exclusively apartment zones. This zone should be moved from the A zone to the R zone. The R5A development standards and appropriate use authorizations are more aligned with R zone districts.	All zones permit lower density uses. R-5-A is in the existing code with the other R-5 zones and is identified as "General Residence Districts" which which permit "all types of urban residential development". The R-5-A is the first zone which permits apartments, albeit subject to BZA review by special exception. As such, this zone is most appropriately located with the other apartment zones.
121	F	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	format	The purpose statement in Subt. F, Se. 100.3 does not mention affordability even though the A zones provide the most housing density. If affordability is an appropriate purpose of RF zones, it should be an appropriate purpose in A zones.	Thank you for your comment. Affordability is not included in the purpose statements of apartment zones in existing code, but OP will examine this proposal.
290	H	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/13/2013	format	We concur with the recommendations for simplification submitted on behalf of the Committee of 100 by Nancy MacWood.	Thank you for your comment. OP will be refining the draft proposed text based on feedback received.
344	I	Jo-Ann Neuhaus Penn Quarter Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/14/2013	format	Proposed Zoning regulations are overwhelming.	True - reviewing an entire zoning is not an easy task, be it the current code or the proposed one, which is why this process has taken many years. OP has prepared section-by-section crosswalks detailing where provisions in the existing code can be found in the proposed code, ANC level summaries of major proposals, and other documents to assist in making the review easier.
509		AIA-DC (Ward 1) Comments	2/5/2014	format	The complexity of updating the code required making some difficult choices about format. We understand that instead of simplifying the document zone-by-zone you have tailored it to the specific circumstances of neighborhoods. While this may make it harder to read from a city-wide perspective, this format may make it easier to use on case-by-case basis. This may remove some complexity for an individual user. This format choice is consistent with other cities similar to Washington with complex codes such as San Francisco and Boston. Boston's code, in fact may be more complex, containing three volume and 73 articles. Its code, however, has a searchable database by address and includes clear graphics, which we recommend for reference and application in DC.	Thank you for your comment. OP will be refining the draft proposed text based on feedback received.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
690		Letter from ANC 3D	4/8/2014	format	Proposals to spread the current overlay districts across multiple Subtitles instead of maintaining them in a separate Subtitle will have the subtle effect of making it difficult for an ANC to ensure that the protections afforded by those overlays are maintained. It is precisely these types of proposed structural or “organizational-type” changes that raise concerns, especially given the complexity of the issues under discussion and the limited resources available to ANCs to keep up with the evolving changes being recommended, let alone assess their potential impact. This became evident again recently after reviewing ANC-specific impact assessments of the ZRR provided by OP for ANC 3D. Although these assessments were intended to assist the ANC in reviewing the ZRR, the assessment for ANC 3D was – at best – incomplete – for example, not even including any information on proposed changes in campus plans and school plans – one of the most critical issues for ANC 3D. This underscored the value of the additional time that you have provided ANCs to participate fully in this case. The issues in this case are too important and deserve time and attention to ensure the Zoning Commission gets this right. OP’s zeal to simplify the zoning code, or to streamline or decrease the number of cases before the BZA, should not be used to limit the role of ANCs. DC Statute 1-309.10 specifies the advisory role that ANCs are to play “with respect to proposed matters of District government policy including, but not limited to, decisions regarding planning ...” As the Zoning Commission reviews final proposals for the zoning rewrite, ANC 3D strongly encourages the Commission to ensure that changes in zoning do not limit the role that ANCs have played in the city on zoning issues or try to use the ZRR to rewrite provisions of the DC Code, as they apply to the role of the ANCs. Any provisions that would change the role of the ANC – whether directly, as with some special exception cases, or more subtly, as is the case with the zoning overlays or other structural “organizational” changes in the code, should be rejected.	The current code also separates the relevant zoning for an area covered by an overlay into multiple chapters and locations, but OP will review the proposed zone naming conventions and the organization of the zones. However, the new proposed nomenclature is consistent with Commission guidance. Please refer to page 28 of the ANC 3D summary, which includes a summary of the proposals related to campus plans and school plans. While there are regulations that currently require BZA and neighborhood (including ANC) review that would become by-right under the proposal (an example would be an accessory apartment internal to the principal dwelling, subject to satisfying conditions and requirements), other things that are currently by-right would under the proposal require ANC review (such as the establishment of a nightclub in industrial zones). Of course, any request to waive a brand new requirement - such as front yard setback - would also require such review.
702		Sue Hemberger Comments	4/25/2014	format	The ZRR is not user-friendly.	Thank you for your comment.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	front setback	The front setback regulation is a welcome concept - to maintain a relatively uniform front setback line on any given block, but we suggest some definition to the phrase "within the range." Specifically, D 205.1 should cross reference C 1002.1, which provides further specific guidance in this respect.	Thank you for your supportive and detailed comments.
110	C	Maisie Hughes Casey Trees Comments	10/28/2013	GAR	Applaud efforts but GAR has a critical flaw - credit system values trees based on size at planting and not at maturity.	The Office of Planning will look at revising the credit system to reflect tree size at maturity versus at planting.
126	C	Delores Bushong Comments	10/28/2013	GAR	1702.8 and 1703.5 Vegetated Walls – I am confused as to whether credit is given for the vertical growth area or the horizontal area of the plants. I have quoted the two sections that apply to vegetated walls. They seem to conflict. 1702.8 “Landscape elements of the GAR shall be measured in the following ways: (b) For vegetated walls, use the vertical square footage of the portion of the wall covered by the vegetation” 1703.5 “(c) “The area calculated is the ground coverage area, not the total plant growth area.” Solution: Clarification of language to indicate clearly what earns the GAR, either the vertical area covered by the plants or the horizontal space in which they are planted.	OP will work to clarify the language.
126	C	Delores Bushong Comments	10/28/2013	GAR	An additional issue that I would like to bring to your attention is the wording in 1703.4: “Trees shall meet the following conditions: a) All trees shall be at least two and a half inches (2.5 in.) in diameter measured at a height of four feet, six inches (4ft.6in.) above grade when planted and shall be replaced if damaged or killed by any cause.” I have underlined the words that concern me. I am unsure what the word “kills” means in this context. It implies that someone did something to it. Is it synonymous with “died.” Does this mean that if a tree dies for any reason that a developer must replace it? How would this regulation be enforced? Is there a time limit on this requirement? If someone doesn’t replace a tree that is damaged or dies, what happens? Do they pay into a tree fund? Change the wording to “die from any cause.” Provide more specific expectations in terms of time replacement is expected and what happens if a tree isn’t replaced, such as contributing to a tree fund to plant trees in schools, parks, or for street tree boxes.	OP will review the proposed text and include clarifying language, as necessary.
126	C	Delores Bushong Comments	10/28/2013	GAR	One of two things: Increase the multiplier for existing trees of 24 inch diameter or more and for trees which will provide a canopy of 2000 per square foot per tree at maturity or lower the multiplier for the green roof to encourage developers to consider planting trees.	The Office of Planning will look at revising the credit system to reflect tree size at maturity versus at planting.
126	C	Delores Bushong Comments	10/28/2013	GAR	Provide a higher ratio for trees based on their size at maturity, not at time of planting. At maturity these larger trees provide much greater value in managing storm water runoff, improving air quality, and mitigating the urban heat island effect, which is what GAR is all about.	The Office of Planning will look at revising the credit system to reflect tree size at maturity versus at planting.
402	C	Maisie Hughes Casey Trees Testimony	11/19/2013	GAR	GAR has a critical flaw. The credit system values trees based on their size at planting, rather than their size at maturity. This fails to incentivize the planting of trees that will provide the most environmental benefits - those that will grow to have large canopies. GAR should score trees based on their size at maturity (as it does for shrubs). Line B3 of the score card reads "Tree canopy for all new trees 2.5" to 6" in diameter or equivalent- calculated at 50 square feet per tree". We propose replacing this language with: "Tree canopy for ~ new trees 40' or less at maturity- calculated at 50 square feet per tree". Line B4 of the score card reads "Tree canopy for new trees 6" in diameter or larger or equivalent -calculated at 250 square feet per tree". We propose replacing this language with: "Tree canopy for all new trees greater than 40' at maturity- calculated at 250 square feet per tree".	The Office of Planning will look at revising the credit system to reflect tree size at maturity versus at planting.
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	GAR	Section 1915 is excellent. Paragraph 1915.7 might be better as a reference to section 1703. These sections should at least be harmonious. Maisie Hughes of Casey Trees and Laszlo Bockh have both submitted testimony for strengthening Chapter 17, and I fully support their suggestions.	OP believes that it is appropriate to include the parking lot landscaping requirements in the parking chapter in lieu of in the GAR chapter.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
496	C	ANC 3E Tom Quinn Testimony	1/30/2014	GAR	We applaud the provisions in the Proposed Code focused on Pervious Surfaces (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 16), Green Area Ratios (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 17) and Tree Protection (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 18). The proposed rewrite aspires to bring our Zoning Code into the 21st Century and express 21st Century values. A critical such value is the protection of our environment. Already the Proposed Code calls for using mitigation measures when variances, exceptions and PUDs must be approved to bolster the goals of Chapters 16, 17 and 18. If the Zoning Commission asks the Department of Planning to propose further revisions to the Code, we would urge that the Office of Planning should look for additional ways to use mitigation generally to advance these important goals. We believe that while the rewrite addresses Green Area Ratios, Tree Protection, and Pervious surfaces requirements, the concept of such equitable environmental mitigation should be extended to new residential construction, and additions to existing residential structures that result in lot occupancy in excess of current defined maximums.	The pervious surface requirements apply to the residential zone districts in Subtitles D and E as follows: (a) The construction of a new principal structure; (b) An addition to a principal or accessory structure, other than a historic resource, that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by ten percent (10%) or more; (c) The construction of a new accessory structure that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by ten percent (10%) or more; or (d) An addition to a historic resource that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by twenty-five percent (25%) or more.
506	C	Vincent Verweig (Ward 1) Comments	2/3/2014	GAR	1702.7, Equivalent square feet of tree canopy and large shrubs. Please change “Plants” to “woody plants”, as to not confuse woody plants with herbaceous plants. Define “Tree canopy” in this section as “Tree canopy preserved”, unless you expect people to plant trees of more than 24 inches in diameter. 1702.9(c), Eligible Landscape elements. Define "soil depth" as "uncompacted soil with significant organic content, free of debris and pollution", otherwise you risk construction fill or other “soil” being used for this credit. Trees should be given multipliers by their relative canopy, not the caliper at planting, as the current language does not encourage the restoration of Washington, DC’s urban forest. The Urban Forestry Administration and the residents of Washington have set a target of 40% in the city, and with a current inventory of 35%, we still have a long way to go. Solution: I suggest qualifying trees as "small", "medium", and "large". A fairly comprehensive list is present in Arlington's Tree canopy list, available at http://arlingtonva.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/21/2013/12/20-Year-Tree-Canopy-Worksheet-10-2011.pdf . This list used the Virginia Nursery and Landscape Association measurements of future canopy, and the latter could also be used as a primary source. Clarify the use of native plant species. If a development uses one native plant, does it get the bonus, or does it need to use all native species? Solution: Set a ratio for this bonus. It may be unrealistic to expect 100% native species planting, but perhaps a composition of 75% native plantings provides the bonus. This could be an argument for a higher bonus, which I would support (perhaps 0.2). 1703, Landscape element conditions for green area ratio. Please move section 1703.9(c) to the general 1703 area, as it should apply to all plantings, not merely native plantings (which are unlikely to contain species from the exotic plant invaders list). Consider a more comprehensive invasive plant list, such as Alexandria’s Invasive Exotic Pests list (found at alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/recreation/parks/InvasiveExoticPlantsThatThreatenParksinAlexandria.pdf), which is supported by years of research on threats to our ecosystem from urban plants. 1703.8, Enhanced Tree Growth Systems. Under (a), use “supported pavement” instead of merely “pavement”, to prevent subsidence issues with the uncompacted soils defined under (b). 1800, Tree Protection. I am concerned counting existing trees for the Green Area Ratio may face abuse if proper protection measures are not put in place. I fear projects which do not provide enough of the existing roots to survive construction, while still getting credit. Construction can cause serious damage to trees, and many developers do not know about the effects of disturbance on tree roots and survival. I suggest the following: Provide clearer tree protection guidelines, or refer to existing tree protection guidelines. Define a minimum clearance zone or critical root zone in which no disturbance should occur, otherwise the tree cannot be counted for the Green Area Ratio. Require an arborist report on trees to be saved, to ascertain the viability of the trees from an overall health perspective, as well as their likelihood of survival. Require review at the end of the project, or a set time after the project, to inspect survival of the trees that were to be protected. If the trees show more than 30% dieback, they should be rejected and replaced by similar canopy.	OP will review the proposed text and include clarifying language, as necessary.
507	C	Marsha Lea (Ward 6) Comments	2/4/2014	GAR	Supports GAR and parking.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
558	C	Jerry Malmo Comments	2/12/2014	GAR	With regard to the GAR scorecard and new trees, all trees should be 2.5" caliper at the time of planting, with incentives for trees that will grow larger and incentives for preserving existing trees. Line B3 of the score card should be revised to read "Tree canopy for all new trees 40' or less at maturity - calculated at 50 square feet per tree." Line B4 of the score card should be revised to read "Tree canopy for all new trees greater than 40' at maturity - calculated at 250 square feet per tree." The scorecard assigns a multiplier of 0.8 for preserving existing trees 24 inches in diameter or larger. This multiplier is too low and should be revised to 1.0. A new multiplier of -1.2 also should be implemented for the removal of existing trees 24 inches in diameter or larger.	The Office of Planning will look at revising the credit system to reflect tree size at maturity versus at planting.
561	C	Irv Sheffey Testimony	2/12/2014	GAR	Line B3 of the score card should be revised to read "Tree canopy for all new trees 40' or less at maturity - calculated at 50 square feet per tree." Line B4 of the score card should be revised to read "Tree canopy for all new trees greater than 40' at maturity - calculated at 250 square feet per tree."	The Office of Planning will look at revising the credit system to reflect tree size at maturity versus at planting.
493	D, E	ANC 6D07 David Garber Testimony	1/30/2014	General support	Regarding the substance of the zoning rewrite, I am particularly excited about the changes and modifications that will encourage local living and the building and growing of more livable communities inside our city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
512	D, E	Christian Alexander (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	general support	This update includes modest proposals that are important to enhancing livability, affordability, and sustainability. Supports provisions that provide increased options -- options for where to live, where to go, and how to get there -- that in turn provide mobile and economic freedom to DC residents.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
535	D, E	Kathleen Quinn Testimony	2/11/2014	general support	During the span of time my family has lived in the District we have gone from a city where corner stores were common, where more people and generations lived in each housing unit and a city where many buildings and homes were built without off street parking and there is no reason to believe that a city that is becoming more transit and pedestrian oriented can't thrive with a zoning code that is rooted in both the past and the future while leaving behind the mistakes of the 1950s so I support and urge you to support the proposed changes to corner stores, accessory apartments and parking minimums as currently proposed by the Office of Planning.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
560	D, E	Garrett Honea Testimony	2/12/2014	general support	Emphatically supports the proposed update to the DC zoning code. Hope the Commission adopts these zoning reforms to encourage development to be smarter, sustainable, and more affordable.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
580	D, E	Jeff Speck Testimony	2/25/2014	general support	Aware of the positive changes being made in cities all across this country – my clients include Memphis, Oklahoma City, Des Moines, Albuquerque, and others – and I can assure you that the proposals set forth by OP represent the very best of the best practices that are proliferating nationwide. These proposals are not radical, are well tested, and have been shown to achieve the desired outcomes that have been well stated by District leadership. Failure to support these measures would threaten to put the District well behind other cities that it would hope to surpass in quality-of-life and sustainability measures. Most significantly, these proposals have been introduced with the goal of making life in the District more affordable, the biggest challenge the city currently faces. It is easy for someone with two cars and a nice house to clamor for the status quo. People like this have the time and resources to have their voices heard. But what about those who have no voice, who can't take time off from their two jobs to attend this hearing, and are just too stressed with paying the bills to participate in civic life? If the zoning commission does not look out for their needs, who will? Hopeful that the Commission votes not for those who complain the loudest, but for those who need the commission's help the most. These include people without cars, people who are looking for a small accessory apartment to live in, and people who want to shop at a corner store rather than waiting for a bus to Wal-Mart.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
594	D, E	Jeremy Van Ess Testimony	2/26/2014	general support	Express strong support for the updates to the DC zoning code. Urge the Zoning Commission to push ahead without delay.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	GFA	§ 903.1(a): This provision changes the perimeter wall method metric from 4 feet to 6 feet; however, the definition of basement and cellar have not changed. In addition, the last portion of this section states ". . . between the finished grade and the ground floor of the story above." What about when there is more than one level of a building that is partially below grade? Are they all "ground" floors in that instance? There are numerous examples of apartment buildings along major corridors, with stream valleys behind, that have this condition. The word "ground" should be deleted.	OP will review the proposed text and include clarifying language, as necessary.
440	D	Citizens Association of Georgetown Comments	12/4/2013	GFA	Third, we also support retaining the proposed minimum 2000 sq. ft. gross floor area requirement in Georgetown. Adjustments should be made on a case by case basis through the special exception procedure.	Thank you for your comment.
59	B	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	height	Comments regarding the redundant and unnecessary definitions of "Building Height, Residential Zones" and "Building Height, Non-Residential Zones."	OP will work with OAG to reconcile these definitions and remove any redundancy.
74	B	Allen Seeber Comments	10/25/2013	height	Concerns about 40-foot height limit and height measurement.	The 40 foot height limit in lower density residential zones is brought forward from the current code. The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
161	B	John Forrer Comments	10/29/2013	height	BHMP - should be 2013 dirt level at the midpoint of the front of the house.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
540	B, C, D	Gary Malasky Testimony	2/11/2014	height	I live in Wesley Heights which like much of the city is hilly. Every house on my side of the street is higher in the front than the back, and each has a walk out basement which is below grade in the front. For some of the houses, that walk out level would constitute a 4th story. It seems to me that measuring points are very important for the proposed R-14 and R-15 zones. New houses should be able to be built with walk-outs not limited by the height and number of stories standard. That would be very much in keeping with the existing housing stock in the neighborhood. The new regulations should also not create any non-conforming uses.	The Zoning Commission adopted new regulations for measuring height, which state that the building height measuring point (BHMP) shall be established at the existing grade at the mid-point of the building façade of the principal building that is closest to a street lot line, which would allow for a walk out basement at the rear of a property. The regulations also state that a conforming structure in existence on June 14, 2013 that would have been rendered nonconforming as a result of the adoption of amendments to this section made in Z.C. Order No. 12-11 shall be deemed conforming; provided that the height of the structure may neither be increased or extended.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	height	Comments on C502 and C505 are addressed above.	OP will review the text and propose changes to clarify.
75	C	Allen Seeber Comments	10/25/2013	height	Modify the confusing averaging method for determining height.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
108	C	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	height	Amend Subtitle B, definition of "Building Height, Residential Zones" and Subtitle C, Section 502.3, 502.7, and 503.6 to permit measurement from midpoint of whatever building façade that permits the greater height for buildings on campuses that are set back 1:1 from all lot lines -- not limited to the facade that faces a "public street."	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
108	C	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	height	Confirm that height is measured from "finished grade" for buildings within campuses that do not front directly on an adjacent street and from "existing grade" for buildings that front on a street, as set forth in Subtitle C, Section 502.3. (Subtitle B, definitions, and Subtitle C, Section 503.6 uses the term "natural grade.")	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language. OP will ensure there are no discrepancies between subtitles.
108	C	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	height	The Consortium recommends that the Commission return to the longstanding practice of permitting the property owner to select the most appropriate front for measuring building height.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
300	C	Randy Speck ANC 3G Testimony	11/12/2013	height	First, with respect to which side of the building is used for measurement, proposed section C502.8 adopts the "mix-and-match" formula for corner lots, allowing a builder to select one street frontage to generate the height limit, but then to apply that height limit to a different frontage that is "selected as the front of the building," thus permitting a height limit that would exceed what would be permitted from either frontage. Particularly as the District considers revisions to the Height Act, we urge the Commission to adopt a reasonable rule that whatever side is selected to determine the height limit must be the same side where that height limit is applied.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
300	C	Randy Speck ANC 3G Testimony	11/12/2013	height	Our first comments relate to section C502 and the rules for measuring building height in Residential Zones. As an initial organizational matter, it may be that these rules relating only to residential zones would be more appropriately included in Subtitle D, in keeping with OP's efforts to consolidate rules that affect particular types of zones. Substantively, our comments are informed by our recent experience with the as-of-right permit application for a 260-unit apartment building at the corner of Connecticut and Military Road, which raised a number of questions about the correct measurement of the building's height.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
300	C	Randy Speck ANC 3G Testimony	11/12/2013	height	Second, with respect to where on a side of a building the height will be measured, we are concerned that the proposed rule C502.3 permits a builder to use the middle of the "building facade of the principal building that is closest to a street lot line" to determine the building's height so that the design placement of the building facades themselves may alter the permissible height. We urge the Commission to adopt a more objective, fixed measurement point based on the middle of the lot.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
300	C	Randy Speck ANC 3G Testimony	11/12/2013	height	Third, we favor an absolute height limit in section C502.5 for residential buildings - not the confusing "average level" requirements for many roof types, which could yield a true height of well over 40 feet and even more than 50 feet.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	height	There are several problems with the height proposals. In almost every subtitle height measurement methodology varies, often on the same lot. To avoid manipulating heights and building taller than the established scale, heights for all structures in R, RF, and A zones should be from existing grade, not finished grade. In addition, the purpose statement on why we regulate heights should include the intention to preserve the scale and character of a neighborhood. This is important because almost all the special exception rules require evaluating whether the request is consistent with the stated purpose for the regulation. If the purpose, for example, of height or roof structure regulations is incomplete the review could miss important considerations.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language. OP will ensure there are no discrepancies between subtitles.
434, 435	C	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	height	One of the biggest concerns of many single family detached neighborhoods in which all of the houses have historically had moderate front roof slopes is the intrusion of houses with 3 story rectangular vertical front facades. Even with the advantage in height measurement afforded by (rest of document is cut off).	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
434, 435	C	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	height	Rather than eliminate C502.5 and have the height of all houses measured to their highest point as recommend by ANC 3/4G, I suggest that the application of C502.5 be limited to houses whose front roof is either a hip (slope from front to rear) or a single gable (slopes from sides to peak), or both, with a minimum slope or slopes of 6:12 and a maximum slope or slopes of 14:12. Houses with moderate roof slopes both admit more light to the street and appear less tall when viewed from the street, so it is appropriate to measure their height to the midpoint between highest eave and peak. Houses with steeper roof slopes, including so-called mansard style roofs which are almost but not quite vertical in front and then flat or nearly flat on top, block just as much light and appear just as tall as houses with vertical fronts and flat roofs, so their height should be measured to the peak.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
434, 435	C	John O. Forrer Comments	12/2/2013	height	When determining the BHMP, do not substitute the mid-point of the front lot line for the midpoint of the front facade of the house as suggested by ANC 3/4G. This might be a workable alternative for flat lots, but it would be unworkable for lots in hilly neighborhoods and thus it should not be the general definition of BHMP.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	height	Need to reconcile height provisions in Subtitles C and D. Concerns about BHMP and mix and match rule. Task Force favors an absolute height limit for residential buildings, with language such as that used for flat roofs in C 502.4 and would address confusion that could arise with averaging. Task Force believes that whatever side is selected to determine the height limit must be the same side where that height limit is applied.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	height	Recommend that in any R zone, there be an absolute 10-foot extra height limit for any structure or other embellishment that sits above the roof on which it is located. As drafted, certain rooftop items like a spire technically have no height limit. C 505 contains a series of overlapping height requirements for the same series of roof structures. Certain structures in 505.1(a) to (c) fall through the cracks and technically have no height limit. This should be remedied by adoption of an overall 10-foot excess height limit, at least for residential areas. Should be made express that any structures on the roof, such as a penthouse, be non-inhabitable.	Thank you for your comment. OP is proposing to carry forward the existing provision that, "A spire, tower, dome, pinnacle, minaret serving as an architectural embellishment, or antenna may be erected to a height in excess of that which this section otherwise authorizes in the district in which it is located."
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	height	Task Force is pleased to see that for R-1 to R-4 zones, the draft regulations retained the 40-foot height maximum, an absolute 3-story limit, and the various lot occupancy maximums and pervious surface minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
77	D	Allen Seeber Comments	10/25/2013	height	Provisions of Subtitle D appropriate to measurement of principal residential building height should be modified to provide for a maximum of 40 feet measured from the mid-point of the building restriction line (BHMP) to the highest point of the roof or parapet. By the same token, accessory buildings should be limited to a maximum of 20 feet (which, due to "averaging," is equivalent to the current 16-foot regulatory limit).	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
123	D	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	height	Height measurements on same lot should be consistent and in residential zones should be from existing grade.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	height	Roof structures, like pergolas and enclosed entertainment areas, will be permitted in addition to antennae, solar panels and wind turbines. These structures are limited to 10 feet above the allowable 40 feet height limit.	Thank you for your comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
141	D	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	height	Height and Size - Neighborhood height and size limits are important because the predominant character of many older neighborhoods, including mine, is one or two stories and less than 40 feet. The 40-foot height limit is leading to tear downs in older neighborhoods and new houses significantly taller and larger than their neighbors. Two recent “remodelings” near me—one in front of our house and one behind—have more than doubled the size of the houses. They now look like behemoths and are out of scale in the neighborhood context. I’m sure all the Palisades bungalows are doomed which is a shame because it’s the most affordable housing in our area. The proposed zoning rules have same height limit as the current zoning rules—40 feet and 3 stories—with some slight changes to how the measuring is done. (Subtitle C) Obviously, this has not been working. One of the action items in the Comprehensive Plan (Action LU-2.1.D) is called “Avoiding Mansionization”: Consider adjustments to the District’s zoning regulations to address the construction of excessively large homes that are out of context with the surrounding neighborhood (“mansionization”). These adjustments might include the use of a sliding scale for maximum lot occupancy (based on lot size), and the application of floor area ratios in single family zone districts to reduce excessive building mass. They could also include creation of a new zoning classification with a larger minimum lot size than the existing R-1-A zone, with standards that more effectively control building expansion and lot division. However, neither the current nor the proposed height limits will help neighborhoods like mine maintain low height housing that gives our neighborhood its character. The height limit should be set at what is predominant in the area and the FAR should be limited in relation to lot size to avoid teardowns and mansionization. In addition, no roof structures should be allowed in single family or townhouse neighborhoods above the height limit.	The draft text includes some measures that could help, including how building height is measured and reducing the permitted height for roof structures to 10 feet. OP will look at other tools, including limiting number of stories, height of buildings, and design review.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	height	There needs to be an absolute height limit for residential buildings and we suggest there be a standard description. The one that is used to measure flat roofs should be considered as a measurement tool.	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
249	D	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	height	Among the positive recommendations are measurement of height from the existing grade, (although this should be extended to accessory structures).	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	height	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. Height measurement of accessory structures from finished grade. Height measurements on same lot should be consistent and in RF zones should be from existing grade.	OP is proposing an alternate method of height measurement for accessory buildings, as they may differ from the principal building, particularly in relation to an alley on which an accessory building might front.
94	G	Citizens Association of Georgetown Comments	10/28/2013	height	Propose 25-foot height limit for M-4 (C-2-A in Georgetown) within 30 feet of a property line that abuts a residential lot.	OP will review this proposal.
142	I	Sue Hemberger Comments	10/28/2013	height	Relationship of the Zoning Code to the Height Act. As currently written, the new code would automatically allow for increased heights in most downtown zones if the Height Act restrictions are loosened. This approach is in direct contradiction to Director Tregoning’s representations to the Council and to NCPC that changes to the Height Act would have no effect unless implemented through Comp Plan changes and a rezoning process.	The Office of Planning announced the release of the District of Columbia’s final recommendations for the congressionally-requested Height Master Plan on November 20, 2013. The District is recommending reasonable and modest modifications to the Height Act would give the District more autonomy to set different height maximums through a collaborative future Comprehensive Plan process while respecting the significant federal interest within the L’Enfant City.
106	X	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	height	Clarify discrepancy in language between definitions in Subtitle A and regulations in Subtitle C for Building Height Measurement. Do not limit measurement to a façade that faces a "public street."	The method of determining height was just adopted by the Zoning Commission in Case ZC 12-11; the language in the ZRR reflects the adopted language. OP will ensure there are no discrepancies between subtitles.
597	D, E	David H. Marlin Testimony	2/26/2014	historic preservation	Down-zone Kalorama Triangle Historic District so that issues of density, noise and parking are controlled and the character of the neighborhood is once again protected in accordance with the intent of historic guidelines. The change in zoning can be accomplished by requiring a developer seeking to renovate a historic property to seek a variance before the BZA with concurrent approval of the HPRB.	OP is not proposing to down zone properties through the Zoning Regulations Review process. If a neighborhood is interested in pursuing a modification to its zoning, residents and the ANC should work together and bring a proposal forward to the Zoning Commission for consideration.
598	D, E	Mary McReynolds Testimony	2/26/2014	historic preservation	Destruction of historic preservation in Washington, DC - ZC and HPRB need to coordinate law making and review functions. Property owners are not receiving adequate notice. Recommend legislative action to protect historic properties - mandatory actual advance notice to historic district and neighborhood; primacy of historic preservation over zoning and land use; immediate automatic historic property downzoning; ensure focused staff support to HPRB; mandatory preservation of gardens, trees, and green space; and increase in density strictly limited and inadequate parking prohibited.	OP is not proposing to modify the notification requirements contained in DCMR Title 10.
586	X	Mary McReynolds Testimony	2/26/2014	historic preservation	Recommend the adoption of legislation to strengthen historic preservation in Washington, DC. There are at least two areas of weakness in the existing statutory and regulatory structures. 1. ZC and HPRB must coordinate their law making and review functions in order to preserve and protect properties and structures located in DC historic districts and properties and structures listed on the DC or National Register of Historic Places. 2. Owners of Historic Properties do not receive adequate advance notice of proposed construction affecting such properties. Recommend legislation action to protect Historic Properties. 1. Mandatory actual advance notice to Historic District and Neighborhood. 2. Primacy of Historic Preservation over Zoning and Land Use. 3. Immediate automatic Historic Property downzoning. 4. Ensure focused staff support to Historic Preservation Review Board. 5. Mandatory Preservation of Gardens, Trees, and Green Space. 6. Increase in density strictly limited and inadequate parking prohibited.	OP is not proposing modifications to DCMR Title 10 at this time.
588	X	Bart Reynolds Testimony	2/26/2014	historic preservation	Mandatory notice for construction affecting historic property.	OP is not proposing to modify the notification requirements contained in DCMR Title 10.
593	Y, Z	Bart Leonard Testimony	2/26/2014	historic preservation	Mandatory notice for construction affecting historic property.	OP is not proposing to modify the notification requirements contained in DCMR Title 10.
543	B, C	Bernard Ries Testimony	2/11/2014	home occupation	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.	This Home Occupation provision is taken from the existing code that permits tutoring of not more than five (5) students at any one time as a home occupation.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
244	B	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	IZ	Affordable housing - The definition is no more than 30% of household income spent on housing. I don't think that definition is applied to any zoning provisions, but the term is used in the Planned Unit Development provisions. It may also be mentioned in other parts of the code. The confusion arises because IZ rules apply to a proffer that affordable housing, beyond what is required, will be a benefit of a PUD. IZ has income requirements based on area median income levels and not on the percentage of income spent on housing. It would seem that a clearer definition of affordable housing would relate to the IZ income criteria, which is based on percentage of AMI. There should be a review to determine if the term affordable housing is ever used in the code without referencing IZ regulations. If it always is associated with IZ, a better definition would use the IZ income rules and would cross reference Affordable Housing with definitions for low and moderate income or 30% or 50% of AMU, whichever is clearer reference to IZ.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
49	C	One DC Comments	10/17/2013	IZ	We propose updating the current zoning definitions of affordability that are based on the AMI. As mandated by HUD, the AMI income standard averages DC's incomes with at least two of the wealthiest counties in the nation: Fairfax, VA and Montgomery, MD. The AMI is an unstable measure, as it fluctuates yearly, and because it is based on incomes earned in neighboring jurisdictions, it does not accurately represent DC's particular affordability needs. As the IZ regulations are currently configured, the City and Zoning Commission are simply not making a dent in DC's infamous affordability crisis despite best intentions. We urge the DC Zoning Commission to enact the following recommendations to improve the Inclusionary Zoning program governed by the Zoning Commission's regulations: 1) Redefine the eligibility for IZ units; 2) Require more IZ units to be constructed in new developments.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
98	C	Empower DC Comments	10/28/2013	IZ	Use DCMFI not AMI to define eligibility for IZ units. AMI is skewed by MoCo and FFX Co. Require more IZ units to be constructed in new developments (18 to 20%).	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
131	C	Southwest Neighborhood Assembly Comments	10/28/2013	IZ	Redefine the eligibility for IZ units - The Zoning Commission can amend DC Municipal Regulation 11-2601.1, which defines affordability eligibility for low and moderate income households, and dispose with an unpredictable and unreal AMI metric, replacing it with a metric more solidly based on a percentage of the federal minimum wage ("FMW"). Units must be defined as affordable to someone who makes \$15,080 annually, using the accepted 30% of gross income as the standard measure. This would be the base definition of affordable, and affordability for those who make 120% of the minimum wage or 200% of the minimum wage would be defined as such.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
131	C	Southwest Neighborhood Assembly Comments	10/28/2013	IZ	Require more IZ units to be constructed in new developments - Currently DCMR 11-2603.1 & 11-2603.2 set the percentages of the square footage of any new development that must be dedicated to IZ units. Given the bonus density granted to the developer and given the aforementioned affordability crisis, the required IZ percentages must be doubled: IZ currently requires 8-10% of residential density in a new development, while we "The current federal minimum wage is \$7.25 per hour. If a minimum wage worker is employed full-time (forty hours per week for 52 weeks), that worker would earn \$15,080 annually" http://poverty.ucdavis.edu/faq/what-are-annualearnings- full-time-minimum-wage-worker urge that you amend this to 25% in order for the District to meet its housing goals.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
156	C	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	IZ	Recommend that additional emphasis be placed on providing houses for low-income and moderate-income families in place of existing policies and zoning regulations that offer incentives to developers who provide housing to families with incomes of 100 percent or more of AMI.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
156	C	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	IZ	Recommend that Inclusionary Zoning regulations mandate that two and three-bedroom units make up at least 20 percent of the affordable units that are eligible for subsidies and other incentives.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
156	C	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	IZ	The set-aside for IZ affordable units in residential developments be increased from 10% and 8%, respectively, to 20% and 18%, respectively, in order for developers to qualify for bonus development density.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
162	C	Tadina Ross Comments	10/30/2013	IZ	Concern about 20 year resale restriction for affordable and IZ units.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
185	C	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	IZ	ANC 4D recommends the enactment of the following amendments to the District of Columbia's regulations regarding IZ in order to mode toward true affordability in housing in ANC 4D and around the District. 1. That the definition of "low income households," at DCMR 11-2601.1, be changed from 50% of AMI and redefined as "equal to or less than 30% of the District's median income or DMI. 2. That the definition of "moderate income households," at DCMR 11-2601.1, be changed from 51% to 80% of AMI and redefined as "between 31% and 50% of the District's median income or DMI. 3. That the set-aside for IZ affordable units in residential developments be increased from 10% and 8%, respectively, to 20% and 18%, respectively, in order for developers to qualify for bonus development density.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
308	C	Jim Schulman Testimony	11/12/2013	IZ	I believe inclusionary Zoning is among the most important improvements to our Zoning Code in recent times, even if it has not yet had the opportunity to be proven in a thriving economy. On page C-1011 see that inclusionary Zoning is not applied to all zoning districts. Perhaps there are functional reasons for these exclusions. In any case, I would like the reasons for such exclusions to be clearly stated in the text of the Zoning code- or otherwise be eliminated.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
312	C	Carolyn Dungee Nicholas Advocates for Elder Justice Comments	11/13/2013	IZ	The definition of low income households should be changed from 50% of AMI and redefined as equal to or less than to or less than 30% of the District Median Income or DMI. The definition of moderate income households should be changed from 51 % to 80 % of AMI and redefined as between 31 % and 50 % of the District's Median Income of DMI. The set aside for IZ affordable units in residential developments should be increased from 10 % and 8 % respectively to 20 % and 18 %, respectively, in order for developers to qualify for bonus development density.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
369	C	Brenda Batts Comments	11/19/2013	IZ	Here to testify about resale-restricted ownership units, ADUs, and Inclusionary Zoning Units, incorporated into market-rate condo buildings. Unfair and unreasonable dictates of the covenants that govern these properties. These unjust practices should be further reviewed and corrected by the Commission and DHCD to help level the playing field of homeownership in the District of Columbia.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
371	C	ANC 5B Comments	11/19/2013	IZ	Amend Inclusionary Zoning to redefine affordability in DC. Given the bonus density granted to the developer and given the aforementioned affordability crisis, the required IZ percentages must be doubled; IZ currently required 8-10% of residential density in a new development - we recommend this be amended to 16-20% in order for the city to meet its housing goals.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
372	C	Chase Point Resident Comments	11/19/2013	IZ	1) There needs to be a court, conflict resolution or arbitration unit to watch over Affordable Home Unit Owners. The ADU unit owners are afraid to speak to the Board or Testify. 2) There definitely needs to be oversight by a governmental unit, which reviews the activities of condominium board association officers. I want to keep my home, the board could care less. 3) A record needs to be kept of the condominium bylaws and annual financial reports. 4) There needs to be stricter oversight and regulation of condominium unit boards, just as there are for landlord and tenant issues. 5) There needs to be a graduated cap on ADU homeowners condo fees. I want to keep my home. 6) I have concerns of conflict of interest in what vendors are chosen for building services and other activities such as real estate transactions with a person holds a board member post.	DHCD monitors and enforces compliance with the requirements for ADUs in DC.
378	C	Jim Dickerson Manna, Inc. Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Concerns about detrimental issues with affordable dwelling units, 20 year resale-restricted covenants, financial hardship and ruin as a result of not being fully and clearly informed of the bad consequences visited upon them when they bought their units and testimony about their concern about issues that future IZ and ADU owners will face like them. Please work with the Department of Housing and Community Development to change these and other covenants, allow these buyers to be made whole and start over and create a different and workable program for lower income owners.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
379	C	Andrea Rosen Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Redefine low-income and moderate-income - use AMI for the District along (DMI) as the basis for defining moderate- and low-income households. Reduce the percentages applied to area median income to equal to or less than 30% of DMI. Increase the set-asides for IZ units in residential developments from 10 and 8% to 20 and 18%, respectively, in order for developers to qualify for bonus development. The city must stop tinkering at the edges of the problem and strengthen inclusionary zoning to realize its salutary goals for citizens of the District of Columbia.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
380	C	Dave Paprocki Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Speak about re-sale restricted ownership units, both Affordable Dwelling Units and Inclusionary Zoning Units integrated into market-rate condo buildings. The restrictions have been a straight jacket. Please consider current ADU owners' experiences and at least make the renting rules more flexible so owners can still hold on to their investments even with normal change of life circumstances that arise. Without some flexibility we could be stuck as renters the rest of our lives nullifying the investment and hard earned money we've already put into our homes.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
385	C	Leslie Steen Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Commend the Zoning Commission for creating the Inclusionary Zoning program.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
386	C	Samone Hoston Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Speak about resale-restricted ownership units, both Affordable Dwelling Units and Inclusionary Zoning Units integrated into market-rate condo buildings. As an owner of an ADU with 20 year resale restrictions, I think it's important for the Zoning Commission to understand what I've experienced living in this type of unit. Along with other ADU owners, I have been working with the Department of Housing and Community Development to come up with solutions for our situations and want to ensure future affordable owners do not face the same issues. Resale restrictions, no access to equity, escalating condo fees. What we need is a housing strategy that meets the needs of all District residents.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
391	C	Sarah Scruggs Manna, Inc. Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Manna supports including affordable rental units into market-rate buildings and believes rental units can and should target even lower income levels. The ownership side could serve more residents and lower income families, but only after certain regulatory and administrative issues are addressed. If we want to continue to integrate affordable units into market-rate buildings, then the District needs to cap or somehow reduce the potential increases of condominium fees, and include this information in all condo documents. If the District wants to provide longer term ownership opportunities for families or individuals/couples planning to have children, then it should consider available avenues to build larger units. The economics and administration of long-term or permanently restricted ownership units need to be evaluated. In order to make the ownership side of Inclusionary Zoning thrive and benefit lower income folks in the District, we need to not ignore issues and we need to be creative. We need to create a system that supports affordable housing in the future and allows lower-income families to grow.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
392	C	Renee Bowser ANC 4D Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Urge the Zoning Commission to adopt regulations to allow DC's real low and moderate income population the rent and own units in new or substantially rehabilitated multi-unit housing under the inclusionary zoning law. In addition, I'm testifying in support of ANC 4D's resolution urging retention of parking minimums for multi-unit housing bordering fully residential blocks in our neighborhoods. ANC 4D urges the Zoning Commission to adopt realistic definitions of low and moderate income households that are based solely on the median income of DC residents. The definition of "low income household" should be 0 - 30% of DC's median income and that of "moderate income household" should be 30 - 50% of DC's median income. ANC 4D also urges that developers be required to build double the current percentage of affordable units in their buildings which would be 16 - 20% of affordable units in their buildings in return for greater density and other benefits they receive. ANC 4D opposed a reduction in parking minimums for developers that construct multi-unit housing in buildings that border fully residential blocks. Instead, ANC 4D urges the Zoning Commission to maintain the existing number of parking spaces that developers of multi-unit housing are required to construct. Urge the Commission to consider these practical impacts of this proposed zoning change and not merely the attractive slogan about a walkable city.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
397	C	Cheryl Cort Coalition for Smarter Growth Testimony	11/19/2013	IZ	Want to express our thanks to the Zoning Commission for creating the Inclusionary Zoning regulations. Major concern with IZ is that its production of 50% AMI units is far below what we had hoped for when we first proposed this program. About 15% of the pipeline with be 50% AMI units, with the rest at 80% AMI. In the near future, we ask that the ZC assess this key issue to explore how it can strengthen this promising program to deliver more affordability.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	IZ	Finally, please get the IZ regulations right. There is good reason that this program is ridiculed around the city. The proposed purpose statement is partly incorrect and the special exception standards are weak and undefined. Any applicant who couldn't meet the proposed review standard should probably not be in the development field. Critically important is a skeptical consideration of how IZ is proposed in the new downtown zones in Subt. I. We have to reconsider exempting such a large area of the city from IZ. This is a terrible policy because it ignores our number one problem and gives unexpected profit through density bonuses to developers without requiring them to help us produce affordable housing. The target income population should be adjusted to more accurately help those residents in critical need of housing assistance.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
483	C	ANC 1C Comments	1/30/2014	IZ	Wish that ZRR might become a vehicle to broaden the reach of the District's Inclusionary Zoning program. To that end, I want to pass along two proposals on this front: (1) that eligibility for IZ be set to a reference point other than the Area Median Income, as AMI is skewed higher by the inclusion of high-income areas immediately outside of the District; (2) that the square foot requirement for IZ for new developments be increased upwards from current requirements.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
517	C	Colin Hughes Testimony	2/8/2014	IZ	Urges the Commission to increase affordability of inclusionary zoning.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
563	C	Eugene Puryear Testimony	2/12/2014	IZ	The ZC should consider the existing standard for determining eligibility for IZ units, which is AMI. ZC could amend edibility requirements in 1 of 2 ways - use DC Median Family Income or define low-to-moderate income households in relation to the Federal Minimum Wage.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
691	C	ANC 1C Report	4/11/2014	IZ	Resolved that ANC1C calls on the District to strengthen its inclusionary zoning regulations by (i) establishing formulas for determining the amount of a building that must be set aside for inclusionary zoning that would make the District a leader in the nation, and (ii) lowering the thresholds of Area-Median-Income to which inclusionary zoning units must be accessible so as to take account of the fact that the Area-Median-Income figures for the District are unusually high due to the atypical concentration of high-income-earning residents who live in the surrounding metropolitan area.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
499, 529	C	ANC 6805 Brian Pate Testimony	1/30/2014	IZ	It is important to ensure that affordable units built now remain affordable units in the future, even beyond the 30-40 year window, after which certain units can revert to market rate, typically associated with current affordable housing projects. Subtitle C, Section 2204.1 appears to achieve this, but only for units created after implementation of the new regulations. It's important that the Zoning Commission carefully review this section of the ZRR to ensure that it achieves the objective of creating long term affordable units, not just for future developments, but for existing ones as well. In reviewing this section, I also noted that the Subtitle C, Section 2201.4 (a) exempts areas in Georgetown and near the Naval Observatory from IZ requirements. Perhaps there is a justification for this, but on the surface, it seems elitist, pretentious and exclusionary that these well off areas of the District would not contribute to solving one of the largest problems facing our City. I would note also that this section is a recent amendment to the ZRR, which further reinforces my sense of moral indignation towards the exception.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
487	C, D, E, X, Y, Z	ANC 5B Shirley Rivers Smith Testimony	1/30/2014	IZ	Last October ANC 5B submitted three resolutions, including: 1. Approved: the DC Zoning Rewrite Process Amending the Inclusionary Zoning: Redefining Affordability in DC. Because we have a very significant population of residents which are seniors, families with children and individuals on fixed, limited and/or restricted income	OP is current reviewing the very important Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) provisions, proposed by OP and made effective in 2007. Because of the complexity of this issue and because this review was not part of the workshop discussions held in 2008 - 2011, OP will undertake this review independently of the ZRR process.
142	I	Sue Hemberger Comments	10/28/2013	IZ	Inclusionary Zoning. No viable strategy for the production of affordable housing downtown has been developed, even as the creation of new downtown neighborhoods in being encouraged. It appears that the following squares, which are currently subject to inclusionary zoning requirements, have been exempted from them under this new mapping of downtown: 325, 326, 351, 352, 383, 384, 385, 409, 410, 433, 434 462, 646, 648, 649. See attached maps for the details.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361	B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K	David Aron Comments	11/16/2013	loading	Deliveries requiring trucks to back up should be banned during the hours that garbage pickup is banned (10 PM to 7 AM) if the trucks make loud beeping noises while backing up and the delivery site is within 2 blocks of a residential buildings. Fines for violations should match those for violating the garbage pickup times (\$1,000 per violation). Also, weekend/holiday permitted delivery hours should not begin at 7 AM - they should be more like 10 AM or 9 AM at the earliest.	Thank you for your comment.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	loading	Section 2101.9 - This section is identical to the current provision in the Zoning Regulations. The current interpretation of this provision is that multiple sets of two berths may be stacked in the event that three or more loading berths and/or service/delivery spaces are required. For example, if four berths are required, a property owner may provide two sets of stacked berths to satisfy the requirement. Because the intent is not clear, this section should be clarified to specifically state the current interpretation.	OP will review the language and clarify as necessary.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	loading	Section 2103.4 - This section should be eliminated or revised. Specifically, given constraints with the ground floor design of buildings, access to the loading berth cannot always be provided to all uses through an internal corridor. If this provision is to be maintained, we recommend that it be revised to state as follows: "All uses that require loading berths shall be capable of accessing the loading facilities." As an example, see attached the recently approved project at 1001 4th Street, SW which utilizes an exterior corridor for service access (see "Attachment C".)	OP will review the language and clarify as necessary, but in general, the design of new buildings should provide direct connections between loading ways and the uses they serve so OP would not propose elimination of this section.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	loading	Section 2107 - A designated trash room is not typically provided within an office development. Instead, the janitorial staff deposits trash directly in a dumpster, typically fitted with a compactor. As an example, please see the attached ground floor plan 1100 4th Street, SW (see "Attachment D"). Accordingly, we recommend that this section be deleted or be revised to state as follows: "Buildings requiring loading must have a designated trash area either within the building or within a loading berth or within an accessory building or structure immediately adjacent to the loading area."	OP will review the language and clarify as necessary.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
528	C	Tom and Dorothy Belcher	2/7/2014	loading	The new loading regulations are good; however, to ensure downtown residents have the ability to load and unload passengers and goods (groceries, luggage, purchases, etc.) provisions are needed to require mixed-use developments - where residential uses share loading facilities with commercial uses to: a) designate a 24-hour loading zone outside the building or access to loading docks; or b) designate a short-term parking space for loading either in a garage, off of an alley or driveway, or elsewhere on private property adjacent to an entry door. If 24-hour access can not be accommodated, then the regulations should require that the property owner obtain a space at the curb by the residential entrance so residents exclusively may load and unload passenger's belongings 24 hours a day.	OP will forward these comments to DDOT. DDOT is the agency responsible for on-street parking and may be able to identify an on-street solution. In the alternative, tenants could work with building management to identify a solution.
532	C	Karyn Posner-Mullen Comments	2/10/2014	loading	The new loading regulations are good; however, to ensure downtown residents have the ability to load and unload passengers and goods (groceries, luggage, purchases, etc.) provisions are needed to require mixed-use developments - where residential uses share loading facilities with commercial uses to: a) designate a 24-hour loading zone outside the building or access to loading docks; or b) designate a short-term parking space for loading either in a garage, off of an alley or driveway, or elsewhere on private property adjacent to an entry door. If 24-hour access can not be accommodated, then the regulations should require that the property owner obtain a space at the curb by the residential entrance so residents exclusively may load and unload passenger's belongings 24 hours a day.	OP will forward these comments to DDOT. DDOT is the agency responsible for on-street parking and may be able to identify an on-street solution. In the alternative, tenants could work with building management to identify a solution.
559	C, I	Richard A. Drom Comments	2/12/2014	loading	Sections 2101.8 and 2103.3. The new loading regulations are good; however, to ensure downtown residents have the ability to load and unload passengers and goods (groceries, luggage, purchases, etc...) provisions are needed to require mixed-use developments— where residential uses share loading facilities with commercial uses to: A. designate a twenty four hour loading zone outside the building or access to loading docks; or B. designates a short-term parking space for loading either in a garage, off of an alley or driveway, or elsewhere on private property adjacent to an entry door. Such loading zone, short-term parking space, or loading dock needs to be available for residents to use at no charge 24-hours a day so residents are able to conveniently load and unload passengers and belongings for easy transport to and from residential units. If 24 hour access can not be accommodated, then the regulations should require that the property owner obtain a space at the curb by the residential entrance so residents exclusively may load and unload passenger's belongings 24 hours a day. This is not a loading space for move in/moves out purposes but for residents who cannot park on site or who car share to be able to place belongings into and out of a vehicle.	OP will forward these comments to DDOT. DDOT is the agency responsible for on-street parking and may be able to identify an on-street solution. In the alternative, tenants could work with building management to identify a solution.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	loading	FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONES, KEEP ALL TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS OPEN, INCLUDING CARS AND TRUCK LOADING DOCKS Loading Dock Size - The proposal would change loading requirements. This could impact us as homeowners and consumers or those who work or drive in areas where loading is done. The proposal would remove 55 foot truck bay requirements and allow the sharing of facilities. That has ramifications for the stores that we use. If the businesses that serve us, what will be the impact on us?	OP found that relief was frequently requested and granted from the 55-foot truck loading bay requirement and is proposing that a smaller bay size would be appropriate. While OP is proposing to allow for sharing of loading spaces, it is not proposing to eliminate the requirement for the provision of loading spaces.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	lot occupancy	§ 701.4: This section governing building area omits the current exclusion for portions of the building that do not extend above the main floor of the main building. Is there a reason for this change?	Section 701.3 states that building area shall be, "the maximum horizontal projected area of a principal building and its accessory buildings, measured at the ground level of the principal building and measured from the exterior faces of exterior walls and from the center line of walls separating 2 buildings."
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	lot occupancy	§ 701.6: This section states that when adding a vertical addition to an existing building, each added story must comply with the prescribed lot occupancy limitations. Why must a vertical addition to a non-conforming building conform to the lot occupancy limitation when the existing building does not? Putting an addition on top of an existing nonconforming building that exceeds the lot occupancy limit, to the full limit of the building's footprint, will not increase the lot occupancy of the building.	This acknowledges current practice and interpretation that vertical additions can increase impact of the non-conformity. Subtitle C, Chapter 3 addresses nonconforming structures and outlines the proposed restrictions regarding enlargement, expansion, or extension of nonconforming structures and uses.
689	C, D	29th Street Neighbors Comments	4/4/2014	lot occupancy	Note the new standard that will eliminate the current incentive to "fill in" narrow courts. Applaud the direction of this proposed change, but do not believe it adequately protects the immediate neighbors of any such rear additions to row houses in this neighborhood. Request the Zoning Commission consider allowing such additions only by special exception or variance.	Provided that setback and lot occupancy requirements are met, OP is not proposing to require a special exception for an addition that would "fill in" a narrow court.
63	E	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	lot occupancy	Lot occupancy requirement for semi-detached dwellings - The Zoning Regulations Review proposal does not change the current limit of 40% lot occupancy for semi-detached dwellings in RF Zones. ANC 6B's docket often includes requests for zoning relief to allow semi-detached dwellings to go to 60% of lot occupancy in conjunction with the building of rear additions. In most cases, ANC 6B agrees fairly routinely to such requests on the theory that there is usually not a persuasive reason for treating a semi-detached dwelling any different than a detached building on the matter of lot occupancy. Thus, ANC 6B urges the Zoning Commission to change the lot occupancy requirement for semi-detached dwellings in RF zones to 60%.	OP agrees and is proposing a consistent lot occupancy standard of 60% for all building types.
270	E	Fay Armstrong Historic Mount Pleasant Testimony	11/7/2013	lot occupancy	Remove Subtitle E, Chapter 6. Maintain current lot occupancy maximums for different kinds of housing. Set lot occupancy maximums by building type and not number of units.	The draft text proposes to bring forward the 900 square foot rule for conversion to apartments in the existing R-4 areas. OP is examining new text that address this issue, including for the Mt. Pleasant historic district.
275	E	Claudia Schlosberg and Wayne Kahn	11/9/2013	lot occupancy	Conversions - support Historic Mount Pleasant proposal to eliminate Subtitle E, Chapter 6 and to maintain lot occupancy maximums; and set those maximums by building type and not the number of units. Oppose the 20% lot occupancy conversion bonus.	The draft text proposes to bring forward the 900 square foot rule for conversion to apartments in the existing R-4 areas. OP is examining new text that address this issue, including for the Mt. Pleasant historic district.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
488	E	ANC 6C Mark Eckenwiler Testimony	1/30/2014	lot occupancy	Opposes the maximum lot occupancy figures set out in proposed section 901.2 for two reasons. First, in zones where the maximum occupancy of non-alley lots is 60%, we believe it anomalous and inappropriate to allow extra-large alley lots (i.e., those over 1800 sf) to occupy 80% or even 90% of the alley lot. However, we do support by-right lot occupancy above 60% in the case of lots with substandard area (i.e., less than 1800 sf). Second, the schedule of allowable lot occupancy figures in section 901.2 creates an undesirable "stair step" effect in which lots of slightly different sizes receive very different treatment. For example, under the current proposal an alley lot of exactly 2000 sf could be developed up to 90%, resulting in an occupied area of 1800 sf. By contrast, a larger 2100 sf lot could only be built up to 80% occupancy (1680sf). Urge the Commission to mitigate the extreme effects of the current proposal (and to reduce the lot occupancy permitted on larger alley lots) by adopting a more flexible schedule as follows: for lots of 900 sf or less, 100% lot occupancy; for lots larger to 900 sf but less than 1800sf, a reduction (below 100%) by 2% for every 45 sf above 900 sf; and for lots of 1800 sf and larger, a 60% maximum occupancy. Thus, a 1450 sf lot would have a maximum occupancy of 80%, while a smaller 1270 sf lot would enjoy a higher maximum of 84%. This more fine-grained system would avoid the sharp drops/increases associated with the two breakpoints in the proposed regulations. Finally, we note that the 10% minimum pervious surface requirement imposed in section 901.2 is incompatible with 100% lot occupancy. ANC 6C recommends waiving that requirement in the case of lots at or below 900 sf in area.	Thank you for your comments. OP will review the proposed lot occupancy provisions.
708	G	Rick Bush Dupont Circle Citizens Association Testimony	4/24/2014	lot occupancy	In C-2-A, C-3-B and C-2-B do not expand the lot occupancy to 100%.	OP proposed removing lot occupancy requirements for residential stories; the current and proposed lot occupancy for non-residential is 100%. Existing regulations, included as a part of existing zoning and building codes, would fulfill main objectives of air and light access to occupants of buildings in lieu of existing residential lot occupancy requirements for mixed use zones.
318	H	Sara Green ANC SMD 4B01 Testimony	11/13/2013	LTR	Revise the existing Large Tract Review process to make it work. The existing LTR process does not give the community or the ANCs any meaningful role in commenting on new development that has a significant impact on the surrounding homes and businesses. In fact, the Office of Planning refused to give ANC 4B "great weight" with respect to the LTR process for the new Walmart at Georgia and Military Roads. The AG had to step in to require that OP give ANC 4B its "great weight" for this and other LTR cases. I strongly support ANC 4B's proposal that the LTR process be replaced with a special exception.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail, but the LTR process is not regulated or administed as part of the zoning regulations.
127, 128, 129, 130	K, I, G, H	G. Macy Nelson, LLC Comments	10/28/2013	LTR	Large Tract Review - Proposed that OP use LTR as a vehicle through which it would make a recommendation to the BZA regarding whether the BZA should approve or deny a special exception.	Thank you for your comment. ZC has asked OP to look at a process for assessing land use impacts of large format retail, but the LTR process is not regulated or administed as part of the zoning regulations.
147	A	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	mapping	A § 210 should specify the process for correcting mapping errors and whether doing so will require a hearing.	The process for petitioning for a map amendment can be found in Subtitle Z, Chapter 10, Map Amendments.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	measurement	§ 405 Measurement rule for lot width: This section reflects an approach that is different from the three existing rules of lot width calculation. Why were they rejected in favor of this new method?	Following discussions with the Zoning Administrator, OP is proposing a lot width measurement that is in line with the current Zoning Administrator interpretation and practice.
332	G	Ramsey Meiser Forest City Washington Testimony	11/14/2013	mixed use zones	Express strong support for the zoning text amendments regarding proposed Subtitle G (Chapters 3 and 14).	Thank you for your supportive comment.
487	C, D, E, X, Y, Z	ANC 5B Shirley Rivers Smith Testimony	1/30/2014	neighborhood character	I realized that what is being proposed by the Office of Planning (OP) promotes the destabilization of existing neighborhoods; recommending a new maximum building footprint in lieu of lot occupancy; proposes matter of right construction on substandard lots; will remove required uniform side yards; eliminates light and air considerations; proposes rear yard accessory residential space; and, trades the customization of zones for the unique overlays that currently provide protections for established residential neighborhoods.	OP is not proposing to eliminate lot occupancy requirements. OP is proposing that the minimum lot area remain applicable for the creation of new lots. For existing lots, in order to address the very real issue of blighted and derelict lots that impact neighborhood character and safety, OP has proposed that they be allowed to be developed by right provided the new house is compliant with setbacks and lot occupancy, so in character with the neighborhood. OP is not proposing to remove minimum side setback requirements. OP IS proposing a new front yard setback standard, that will help to ensure that new house development is consistent with streetscape character. OP is proposing that an accessory apartment could be located in an existing accessory building, as a matter-of-right, subject to conditions, but a new accessory building for an accessory apartment would require BZA and neighborhood review. OP is not proposing to remove overlay provisions, but rather to combine overlay provisions with the equally relevant provisions of the underlying zones for ease of use and effectiveness.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
595	A, C, F, G, W, X, Y	Peter Lyden Treasurer Reed Cooke Neighborhood Association Testimony	2/26/2014	neighborhood commercial overlays	2. The impetus for the ZRR is to update the current regulations in accordance with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. One Comprehensive Plan element speaks specifically and very positively about Reed Cooke. "Policy MC-2.4.5: Reed-Cooke Area Protect existing housing within the Reed Cooke neighborhood, maintaining heights and densities at appropriate levels and encouraging small-scale business development that does not adversely affect the residential community." However, the ZRR as currently drafted undoes and attacks many of the safeguards that are in place to protect the residential character of our neighborhood. Why OP has moved our residential housing that is presently under R-5-B zone, and places it into "Apartment (a) zones" is unknown to us. "Apartment zones" allow commercial and other non-residential uses to intrude into residential neighborhoods. We feel our residential housing should at least be under the "Residential Flat (RF) Zones". with appropriate protections we have today. We clearly have a solid residential area and urge that zoning designations be reexamined with an eye to preventing the intrusion of non-residential uses and deleting the provisions allowing conversion of houses to apartments and pop-ups. It was noted in our work that a number of "Special Exceptions" are permitted, and that interpretations by the Zoning Administrator are allowed. We believe that the ZRR should be more explicit in what is permitted and prohibited, and not rely on the discretion of the Zoning Administrator or Board of Zoning Adjustment to adjudicate poorly written and fuzzy text. Using the word "prohibited" in the text is necessary for clarity.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones. The current R-5-B is an apartment zone; a downzoning to an RF (flat) zone would require a zoning map amendment, although OP has proposed additional RF zones that a neighborhood may want to consider as part of a rezoning request.
595	A, C, F, G, W, X, Y	Peter Lyden Treasurer Reed Cooke Neighborhood Association Testimony	2/26/2014	neighborhood commercial overlays	3. OP representatives have assured us that they would not change a thing about the RCOD, with perhaps some very minor changes to bring it up to date. OP has disassembled the RCOD, DCMR, Chapter 14, and applied parts of it to "Mixed use zones", M33-M34 zones, and "Apartment Zones A-8". Its reorganization scheme has created confusion, redundancy, dropped substantive phrases and made additions that are not currently authorized in the current Reed-Cooke Overlay or worse that do not exist under the current code. To us the term "overlay" makes sense. It takes the underlying code and lays on top of it certain restrictions. It is simple to understand. There is a cross walk from the RCOD tot he ZRR, however we noted that parts of the overlay have been deleted, terms have been changed, and it no longer reads with the force that was intended. These changes have degraded the intent and application from what we have today. In the past 4 years we have had two explicit applications of the RCOD. They are the Adams Morgan Church, and a proposal to build an 85-foot building at 1711 Florida Avenue. In both cases, clear provisions of RCOD were applied. This demonstrated that the RCOD in its present form is as relevant today as when the Zoning Commission enacted it.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones. However, OP continues to look at ways that the code can be formatted and organized to ensure clarity and ease of use.
595	A, C, F, G, W, X, Y	Peter Lyden Treasurer Reed Cooke Neighborhood Association Testimony	2/26/2014	neighborhood commercial overlays	An example of this "streamlining" is the Reed Cooke Overlay District (RCOD): It has gone from a cohesive, understandable, clear, consecutive 6 pages to over 37 pages in 7 different subtitles with language that required the intervention of a person who majored in English to understand. Last week at our monthly meeting I tried to present how the ZRR is organized, and the issues we face. I was able to talk in terms of major sub topic headings, but trying to go deeper and explain how the RCOD was treated, was lengthy, and not all together clear to my audience. From my and their frustrations, they do understand that the ZRR is a confusing document. A map of the proposed changes would have ensured that we were discussing the same area where the new zones would be applied. I had an OP representative tell me that a map of the new zoning will follow, but it would have been a nice visual aid when trying to explain the proposed changes. We have heard talks about transit zones; where are they in relation to Reed Cooke, and what impacts these will have on us? Again, having a map would have quickly conveyed much understanding.	Thank you for your comment. However, it is important to remember that the current zoning for the RC area is NOT just the overly - the various base zones are also critical, so it is not accurate to say that the zoning for RC has gone from 6 to 37 pages. OP is not proposing any changes to the areas where the zones would apply, so the current zone map reflects the proposed zone map for RC. The ANC level summaries provide additional maps showing where various proposals would be applicable within each ward.
595	A, C, F, G, W, X, Y	Peter Lyden Treasurer Reed Cooke Neighborhood Association Testimony	2/26/2014	neighborhood commercial overlays	Please maintain the integrity of The Reed Cooke Overlay District and the city's other overlays by keeping the name and the current language. We ask that you do this to allow the general users to understand what they can and cannot do -- please make the text of the code more explicit as to what is "prohibited", there by making it easier to understand and apply.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
242	D	Woodley Park Community Association Comments	11/6/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	We also want to stress that we feel that the zoning for row houses should be uniform across all of Woodley Park. In the past different sides of Connecticut Avenue were treated differently.	OP is not proposing to re-zone any property as part of the ZRR process. The R-3 to the west of Connecticut Avenue will remain R-3 (R-4) and the R-4 to the east of Connecticut Avenue will remain R-4 (RF-1).
691	G	ANC 1C Report	4/11/2014	neighborhood commercial overlays	Requests the Zoning Commission, as regard at least zones M-4, M-5, M-33 and M-34, the mixed use zones applicable to Adams Morgan, to: restore the 60% and 80% lot occupancy maximums; provide for rear setback from the rear lot line for all portions of a building; and eliminate any increase in permissible non-residential FAR.	OP is not proposing to eliminate the 60% and 80% lot occupancy maximums for residential uses in the M-4 and M-5 zones. OP is proposing to maintain the 15-foot rear setback. OP is proposing to allow an existing building on a lot with an area ten thousand (10,000) square feet or less, may have a maximum floor area ratio of 2.0 for non-residential uses, provided the uses are located in the ground story and the story directly above the ground story to encourage the commercial use of existing buildings on small lots.
691	G	ANC 1C Report	4/11/2014	neighborhood commercial overlays	Resolved that ANC1C recognizes that the Reed-Cooke Overlay District came into existence as the result of laborious grass-roots efforts by local resident volunteers. Resolved that ANC1C recognizes that other Overlay Districts within the city share a comparable history, and accordingly feels that the special status of Overlay Districts should be reflected in the organizational structure of the Zoning Regulations. Resolved that ANC1C calls on the Zoning Commission to preserve the existing Zoning Overlay Districts in a separate Subtitle within the Zoning Regulations Rewrite. Within such Subtitle, there could be one Chapter for each of the current Overlays. Overlays that contain multiple zoning districts, could then have Sub-Chapters for each of those zones. In that manner, readers would still be able to refer to just a single Chapter (or Sub-Chapter) for all of the information pertaining to the lot they are interested in. But at the same time, it would remain clear that the characteristics of their lot is tied to the characteristics of other nearby lots based on their common history as part of an Overlay.	Thank you for your comment. OP will review the format of the Subtitles and revise the draft text to more closely follow the organization of the overlays in the existing code.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
115, 116	G, H	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	(1) Purpose statements beginning with Sec. 300.3 are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Framework Element that describes the Future Land Use Map density levels and ascribes zones to each density level. M-4 (C2A) should permit low and moderate density that correspondingly serve surrounding neighborhood to a broader market area; M-5 (C2B) should permit moderate and medium density that range from neighborhood serving to broader market area to citywide serving; M-7 (C3A) should permit moderate to medium density. The density description for all the new M zones should reflect the range that exists today and not prescribe only the most intense density and purpose when the Comprehensive Plan Framework Element uses a range. The District’s hierarchy of commercial types should be accurately described. Underlying identifies what terms are missing.	OP is not proposing modifications to permitted density. The proposed language is consistent with the existing code.
115, 116	G, H	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	(2) The Neighborhood Commercial Overlay Districts (“NCOD”) have been combined with the underlying zone into a single new zone with combined purposes, requirements, and special exception standards. This is in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and dilutes the effect of the overlays. The NCODs should be maintained as free standing districts whose provisions contrast with the underlying zone provisions.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones. This will improve the ease of use and the effectiveness of the zoning. However, OP continues to examine formatting and organizational changes to the text that will further ease of use.
65	H	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Eighth Street Southeast Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone (N-6) - Four Squares (906, 907, 929, and 930) below the Southeast Freeway on either side of 8th Street SE, currently the "Eighth Street Southeast Neighborhood Mixed Use District," would become the Eighth Street Southeast Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone (N-6) under the revised code. (1) ANC 6B supports this conversion of the Eighth Street District to a special N-6 Zone provided that the terms of this special zone include the same limitation on eating establishments as in the current district, namely that food and drinking establishment use be limited to 50 percent by lot frontage linear foot and fast food be further limited to half of the 50 percent of linear feet for eating establishments. The ZRR appears to create a conflict between a general policy and a specific N-6 policy as regards the limitation on fast food. To accomplish ANC 6B's objective, ANC 6B requests that the text of Subtitle H should exempt the N-6 zone from 1101.3(b)(1) or amend it to read: "These uses shall occupy no more than 25% of the linear street frontage within a particular N zone (50% in the N-6 zone), as measured along the lots that face designated roadways in the particular district: and" (2) ANC 6B reviewed the list of Uses [section 1102] that would apply to the N-6 zones. Uses are either permitted by-right, with conditions or by special exception. One use permitted by right -- Parking -- stands out. The "Parking" use definition is in Subtitle B: Definitions, Section 201.26. Currently, within the four Squares (906, 907, 929, and 930), there are three commercial surface parking lots and one temporary private surface parking lot. In order to prevent the addition of more surface lots in this small area, ANC 6B requests that surface lots require a special exception in the N-6 zone.	OP will review the text to make sure it reflects the current standards, limitations and uses.
68	H	ANC 3C Comments	10/24/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Neighborhood commercial overlays and residential overlays are bottom-up zoning that should be honored. Therefore, the proposals from the Office of Planning to combine the underlying zone with an overlay into a single zone district should not be approved.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
159	H	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	FAR, height, lot occupancy, and side and rear yard requirements should not deviate from those detailed in the 2002 Takoma Central District Plan.	Agreed, OP is not proposing to modify the requirements of the 2002 Takoma Central District Plan.
159	H	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	FAR, height, lot occupancy, and side and rear yard requirements should not deviate from those detailed in the 2008 Upper Georgia Avenue Great Streets Redevelopment Plan and in the subsequent Takoma Overlay Zone. Rear and side yard requirements should not be reduced.	Agreed, OP is not proposing to modify the requirements of the 2008 Upper Georgia Avenue Great Streets Redevelopment Plan and the subsequent Takoma Overlay Zone.
159	H	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Section 300.1(f) should be amended to read: "Limit the height of new buildings and encourage a scale of development and a mixture of building uses that is compatible in scale with existing buildings and consistent with the Takoma Historic District.	Thank you for your comment.
159	H	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	The provisions describing the "Purpose and Intent" of the Takoma Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone (N-2) should be amended so that the purpose and intent of the N-2 Zone is to encourage compatibility of development with the Takoma Historic District.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
282	H	Cleveland Park Historical Society Comments	11/12/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	In the provisions specific to Cleveland Park, a new provision appears expressing the “intent to permit mixed use development at a moderate density.” (ZRR 400.2). We are concerned that the addition of this provision could be interpreted as authority for changes in the existing uses and density of development in this overlay district. We would like to have that section deleted. It may be a provision in M mixed use zone and we would suggest that it would be much less confusing to restrict the N zone to the overlay provisions.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
282	H	Cleveland Park Historical Society Comments	11/12/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	The draft should preserve the explicit use of the term “overlay.” The draft ZRR renames the NCO (ZRR 400.) as a “neighborhood mixed use zone”. By contrast, the Comprehensive Plan uses the term “overlay” (RCW Element, pg.23---1, pg. 23---16) and the current zoning refers to the Neighborhood Commercial Overlay. (Title 11, Chapter 13) The reference to “neighborhood mixed use zone” distances the ZRR from the Comprehensive Plan and the current zoning and sends a signal that its purpose has somehow changed. Likewise, in the ZRR “General Provisions” there is no reference to the Comprehensive Plan in the N zone language. In the current zoning the Preamble [(Sec.1300.3 (c))] specifically refers to its purposes “as generally required by the Comprehensive Plan.” We are concerned that with the name change and the omitted reference, consistency with protections in the current zoning code and in the comprehensive plan is lost.	Language clarifying the connection between the subtitles will be reviewed. The proposed organization of the draft text is more user friendly. Once established and mapped the overlay/new zone is regulated by use standards and conditions which continue to be those of the existing overlays.
282	H	Cleveland Park Historical Society Comments	11/12/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	The ZRR has added new, vaguely worded purposes to the current zoning code’s original purpose of the overlay. That is “preserving And enhancing neighborhood shopping areas”. (Sec. 1300.1) The ZRR now recites the intent to foster “residential, employment,.... and other related uses....”in its General Provisions. [ZRR 100.2 (a)] In contrast, the Comprehensive Plan makes no reference to employment. Element RCW---1.1.3: Conserving Neighborhood Commercial Center reads, “Support and sustain local retail uses and small businesses in the area’s neighborhood commercial centers.” The ZRR’s reference to employment again dilutes the link both to the Comprehensive Plan and the current zoning requirements. There is no “employment” aim for this neighborhood in the current zoning code. The intent of the overlay is to ensure neighborhood---serving retail and services at the street level, not to create an employment center.	OP is not proposing modifications to the purposes for the zones. The proposed language is consistent with the existing code.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
282	H	Cleveland Park Historical Society Comments	11/12/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	We do not want the overlay that we worked very hard to create changed.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
290	H	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	A glaring omission is content from the Overlay District Preamble. The current Section 1300.2, which says, “The NC Overlay District includes a number of individual overlay zone districts that may be established from time to time, consistent with the general provisions of this chapter” has been dropped. This emphasizes the connection between the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the code. Please put it back in.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
290	H	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Additionally, the ZRR adds some provisions and deletes others. As previously mentioned, it drops the existing code’s reference to the Comprehensive Plan (Section 1300.2). Please put it back in. It also adds section 400.2, “The N-3 zone (C-2-A/CP) is intended to permit mixed use development at a <i>moderate density</i> rate”. This is not in the existing code. The term is vague. Please take it out. The ZRR has changed the purpose of “preserving and enhancing neighborhood shopping areas” (current zoning 1300.1) to include new (possibly retail-displacing) “residential and employment” as additional purposes of these new "Zones." (100.2 (a)). The code would now encourage new (possibly retail displacing) “residential” and “employment” as additional intents of these new “Zones.” This is a significant change. Please take it out.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
290	H	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	First, words matter. The impetus for the ZRR is the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. The Plan speaks specifically and very positively about NCODs and references them in various sections. It lays out the benefits and usefulness of Neighborhood Commercial Overlays as important zoning tools (pg.23-1, pg 23-16). It goes so far as to recommend, “the creation of additional neighborhood commercial overlay zones atneighborhood commercial centers and “main streets” throughout the area”. So why does the re-write drop the term “neighborhood commercial overlay” entirely? OP has renamed these areas “Neighborhood Mixed Use Zones”. The term "overlay" makes sense. It takes the underlying code and lays on top of it certain restrictions. It is simple to understand. In the current Zoning Regulations, the Preamble {{NC current zoning 1300.3 (c)}} specifically refers to its purposes “as generally required by the Comprehensive Plan”. In the ZRR “General Provisions” there is no reference to the Comprehensive Plan in the “N” zone language. With the switch to “Neighborhood mixed Use Zones”, and the omitted reference, the essential link to the Comprehensive Plan is lost. Keep the language used in the Plan the same in the code. Use “Neighborhood Commercial Overlay”. The Plan is the touch point against which all proposed code revisions are measured. It is like a giant mission statement complete with goals and objectives. The connection between the Plan and the code must be clear and easily recognizable. And it must be maintained.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
290	H	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	In conclusion, the Cleveland Park Commercial Overlay area is very small but it is wonderfully vibrant and varied. Our retail is mostly comprised of small business owners. The community worked hard to codify an overlay structure that would create a welcome mix of neighborhood serving retail and services, while allowing for some destination places of entertainment. We want to help Cleveland Park remain a walkable community. And that is what the CP/NCOD does. Residents and Metro users can visit the commercial area and get almost anything they need, catch a movie, eat and drink, or check a book out of the library. Please maintain the integrity of the Cleveland Park Neighborhood Commercial Overlay District and the city's other overlays by keeping the name and the current language. And please -- for the benefit of the next generation of developers, attorneys, residents, business owners, public servants, and community activists trying to understand what they can and cannot do -- please make the code easier to use and apply.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
290	H	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Second, the draft re-write is maddeningly confusing. OP’s mission statement calls for “Streamlin[ing] Zoning Regulations to enhance efficiency and transparency of zoning processes,” which is also cited as a primary purpose of the re-write. So please explain to me how this (the two page table of contents for Subtitle H) simplifies this (the 1/3 page table of contents for the current Chapter 13)? When I was first elected as a CPCA officer, I had to learn about the overlay. It took me about 45 minutes to read through Chapter 13, and a bit more time and some conversations to grasp its mechanics. Aside from some outdated terms, the chapter was simple and easy to understand. Fast forward to the re-write. I have spent hours and hours poring over Subtitle H. I’ve had meetings with local zoning experts, Historical Society leadership, and even Jennifer Steingasser and staff from the Historic Preservation Office. I still can’t understand this re-write! For example, two of Cleveland Park’s most important components are the Uptown Theater and the Library. But I can’t find them in any of the designated uses for “N-3(C-2-A/CP)”. Numerous subsections in the “General Use Permissions for N Zones” (1100) are repeated in “Neighborhood Mixed (N) Zones” (100) and again in “Cleveland Park Mixed Use Zones” (400). This confusion is unnecessary. It would be so much simpler, dare I say elegant, if the re-write followed the logic behind the purpose: Specify the rules for underlying zoning in a subtitle; then specify the refinement of these rules vis-à-vis the overlay zoning in a second subtitle. Simplify the code by keeping the distinction between the	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones. OP has prepared section-by-section crosswalks detailing where provisions in the existing code can be found in the proposed code.
290	H	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Third, OP representatives have assured us that they would not change a thing about NCODs, save perhaps to update the list of allowed retail uses. In fact, they have made an incredible number of changes, both in form and content. Not only are there changes, the subtitle is sometimes wrong. For example, “Lodging” is permitted according to the table in 1102.3, but prohibited in 1105.2(g) the “N- 4” zones. There is no reference in 1105.2(g) to “N-3” zones so is it prohibited or permitted there? Today, lodging is not an allowable use in the Cleveland Park Commercial Overlay District.	OP will review the use permissions for the N-3 zone.
317	H	Cary Kadleccek DCBIA Testimony	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Under Section 808, we proposed that more specificity be added to when these design requirements are applicable, i.e., whether these design standards apply to existing buildings, to new buildings, or to additions. We propose a simple bright line that all of these design requirements apply only to new buildings or new additions. This bright line standard will simplify these regulations for property owners, and, more important, it will help the Zoning Administrator avoid a case by case assessment of whether a certain criterion could apply to a particular existing building.	OP will review the language and clarify as necessary.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
317	H	Cary Kadleccek DCBIA Testimony	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	We recommend a change to the special exception standard language in section 1200.1. Under this section, a special exception is provided for relief from the development standards in subtitle H. However, subsection (c) - or what is intended to be subsection (c) since there is a typo and (a) is repeated twice - requires that exceptional circumstances exist for the relief to be granted. This standard effectively turns the special exception into a variance and all but eliminates the point of a special exception. With a special exception in general, there is a presumption that the provided nonconforming standard is appropriate, provided that certain conditions relating to impacts are met. However, this "exceptional circumstances" criterion eliminates the presumption by forcing the applicant to demonstrate something unusual about the property or neighborhood. This is much different than the conditions on impacts, as opposed to property characteristics, that are the basis for special exceptions. In addition, , this "exceptional circumstances" criterion is inconsistent with the Zoning Enabling Act, which separately sets forth special exceptions and variances as falling within the jurisdiction of the BZA. The intent of a special exception for development standards is to minimize any adverse impacts from nonconformities. However, the proposed regulation goes well beyond that by forcing an examination of the property characteristics, so we recommend that subsection (c) should be eliminated to maintain the focus of the special exception on impacts.	The language reflects that in the existing regulations in Chapter 13, Section 1304.1 (b). OP will review the special exception standard language and revise, as appropriate.
318	H	Sara Green ANC SMD 4B01 Testimony	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Another key concern is the language in the proposed Takoma Mixed-Use Zone that calls for new development that is "generally compatible" with the existing community. The word "generally" need to be cut. It signals that OP would like the ability to support increased densities and heights that would be incompatible with the surrounding homes and apartments. Whatever you adopt should make it clear that all new development must be "compatible" with its neighbors.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
318	H	Sara Green ANC SMD 4B01 Testimony	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Not sure if the proposed Takoma Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone would permit an increase in the height or FAR of new commercial or residential development over the existing provisions in the Takoma Central District Plan.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
318	H	Sara Green ANC SMD 4B01 Testimony	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	One of my concerns is the list of Squares in the OP proposal. It seems that some of those parcels of land have existing uses which are divided between residential and commercial. What is the impact of including these specific pieces of land in a zoning revision? Again, it's not clear to me.	OP is not proposing to rezone any properties. The squares listed with respect to overlay applicability have been carried forward from the existing code without modification.
318	H	Sara Green ANC SMD 4B01 Testimony	11/13/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Should emphasize that the ZRR should retain the provisions and the supporting language in the Takoma Central District Plan. I think the best way to approach the Takoma Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone in the ZRR is to simply include the language from the Takoma Central District Plan in whatever is adopted (See testimony for language). The new language in the ZRR could include the Takoma Overlay Zone, which was approved shortly after the adoption of the Central District Plan. The overlay permits a maximum height of 55 feet int he C-2-A zone for mixed-use buildings to accommodate 14-foot ceilings on the first floor. This gives retailers and developers the tools they need to come to Takoma, provide good products and services, and earn a profit. Takoma is experiencing a building boom, with new housing and retail now under construction or soon to be constructed. The height, FAR, and side and rear yard provisions of the Takoma Central District Plan do not need to be changed to encourage more development. It's happening now.	OP is proposing to bring forward the requirements of the Takoma overlay without modification.
325	H	Committee of 100 Comments	11/14/2013	neighborhood commercial overlays	Recommendation to revise proposed Subtitle H to restore the Overlay Zones and provide clarity and ease of use. Neighborhood Commercial Overlays ("NCOD") are an easy to understand, stand alone chapter in the current zoning regulations. They provide restrictions, allowances, and/or requirements not included in the underlying commercial zone. The Office of Planning committed to not changing the NCODs, but their reorganization scheme has resulted in great confusion, redundancy, dropped substantive phrases, and additions not currently authorized in NCODs. Perhaps the most offensive change is the elimination of the title overlay, which announces that there are modifications to an underlying zone. In an effort to respond to the Zoning Commission's request for guidance to unravel the proposal, the following new organization is offered. It would remove large sections of the proposed Subtitle H that are simply repeated provisions from Subtitle G. Their inclusion in Subtitle H only serves to confuse and obscure the modifications in the overlay. Presumably the reorganization was to avoid referring back to Subtitle G, but that has caused Subtitle H to become unintelligible, potentially change the enforcement and interpretation of the overlay, and require a lot of flipping of pages to try to make sense of it. A simple reference at the beginning of each overlay district to the underlying M zone will direct the user that the main development and use standards are in Subtitle G and the purpose of Subtitle H is only to list the provisions that modify some of the standards in Subtitle G. This will add clarity and simplicity and avoid redundancy. See comments for detailed edits.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361	B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K	David Aron Comments	11/16/2013	noise	Hotel concierges should be banned from using whistles (either a physical whistle or just whistling with their mouths/fingers, etc.) to get cabs.	Thank you for your comment.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	nonconforming structures	Task Force approves the provisions that allow for a matter of right extension or addition to a pre-58 home that follows existing non-conformities for rear and side setbacks. These sections should cross-reference similar provisions at C 302.	Thank you for your comment. OP will include a cross-reference.
214	A	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/4/2013	overlays	Consolidation of overlays with underlying zones is ill-considered. Apartment zones should be identified as residential zones. The Zoning Administrator should be required to notify the relevant ANC that he is considering taking action and again when he takes action.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
132	C	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	overlays	Subtitle C, Chapter 1801 General Tree Protection Regulations addresses when tree protections apply although the overlays they are meant to protect are in Subtitle D.	OP will add language to make the connection between these provisions clearer.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	overlays	I urge you to look carefully at all purpose statements. They might seem benign but they can skew the Zoning Administrator's interpretations and regulatory proceedings. I mentioned side setbacks, tree protection, roof structures, IZ, and height as obvious ones that should be reviewed.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
450	C	ANC 3D Comments	12/9/2013	overlays	Maintain the existing overlays for Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace (<i>Chapter 3</i>) and Wesley Heights (<i>Chapter 8</i>) and oppose OP's recommendation for combining the underlying zones with an overlay into a single zone district.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
123	D	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	overlays	Overlays should be preserved in current form.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	overlays	Boundaries, lot and square numbers for many of the overlays have been removed from the main overlay section in Subtitle D and placed in the mapping section (Subtitle W). For example, the CBUT Overlay no longer includes boundaries, square and lot numbers in the primary text section in Subtitle D, and there is no reference directing the reader to go to Subtitle W. This same void exists for many of the overlays.	Language clarifying the connection between the subtitles will be reviewed. The proposed organization of the draft text is more user friendly. The boundaries are relevant to the initial mapping of the overlay/New Zone. Once established and mapped the overlay/new zone is regulated by use standards and conditions which continue to be those of the existing overlays.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	overlays	Overlay zones have been rewritten. The development standards and overlay specifics are separated in the text to reflect the standards of similar residential zones. Specific tree protections, a major purpose of the overlay, are listed in the following regulations. The punitive regulation § 301.3 was reduced by OP from 7 years to 5 years.	Thank you for your comment.
141	D	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	overlays	Overlays - One final example of an area of concern is overlays. There are currently over 20 overlay districts in DC. All are area specific and some are also thematic, e.g., tree and slope protection, arts-mixed use, commercial, and diplomatic. This has been a very valuable planning and zoning tool for areas wanting to shape their development and there are actual penalties for violation. In my neighborhood, a builder that gouged out a wooded slope not in accordance with the Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace Overlay District, was prohibited from building on the site for 7 years. While he was eventually able to build after the 7 years, it was a significant penalty and will likely deter others. Current overlays would continue to exist in the revised zoning rules, but they are weakened and corrupted. New purposes have been added beyond the ones agreed upon by those participating in the overlay development process. The tree and slope penalty is now 5 years instead of 7. Why is the penalty being weakened? Is the creation of new overlays being eliminated or can communities somehow continue to use this valuable tool. It's not clear if Subtitle X, Chapter 4 "Applications for Amendment to Create a New Zone" is supposed to replace overlays. Also, what happened to the poor substitute of customization? Is there no way for neighborhoods to protect their unique character and protect themselves from the proposed one-size-fits-all rules.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
249	D	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	overlays	Overlays should not be eliminated as a stand alone zoning district and should be reinstated in their current form.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
451	D	ANC 3D Comments	12/9/2013	overlays	Maintain the existing overlays for Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace (<i>Chapter 3</i>) and Wesley Heights (<i>Chapter 8</i>) and oppose OP's recommendation for combining the underlying zones with an overlay into a single zone district.	The intent and provisions of the overlays are all embodied within the new zones; the restrictions, conditions and limitations also are in the new zones.
480	D	Mike Gold Vice Chair ANC 3D Comments	1/29/2014	overlays	Maintain the existing overlays for Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace and Wesley Heights and oppose OP's recommendation for combining the underlying zones with an overlay into a single zone district.	OP is proposing to bring forward the requirements of the Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace and Wesley Heights overlays without modification.
545	D	Connie Carter Testimony	2/11/2014	overlays	The Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace Preservation Committee is strongly opposed to any changes to the format or protections of Section 1565, the Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace Overlay District.	Thank you for your comment.
492	D, H	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	overlays	Overlays – We want to urge the Zoning Commission to maintain neighborhood commercial and residential overlays in their current form. We request that you reject the Office of Planning's substantive change and maintain the overlays in their current form.	Thank you for your comment.
64	G	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	overlays	Fast food establishments - The current code allows fast food establishments in C-2-A areas with a special exception (§ 733). In the ZRR, in Subtitle G: Mixed Use (M) Zones, there are three M zones relevant to 6B: M-4/C-2-A -- PA Ave SE past 12th ST SE, M-26/C-2-A/CHC -- PA Ave SE between 4th and 12th, and along 7th and 8th ST SE, M-27/C-2-A/CHC -- 200 & 300 blocks of PA Ave SE. This proposal would prohibit (i.e. a change from a special exception) fast food establishments, among other places, in M-4 and M-27 Mixed Use zones (that is, the east and west ends of 6B's portion of PA Ave SE), as follows: Subtitle G § 1414.2(a)(1): In the M-4, M-25, and M-27 zone a fast food establishment, a drive-through, drive-in operation or food delivery business shall not be permitted. For reasons that are unclear and unexplained, however, the proposed Section 1414.2(a)(1) quoted above does not include Mixed Use Zone M-26, the middle segment of PA Ave SE through the Hill including the 7th and 8th ST SE commercial corridors. It may be that the omission of the M-27 zone was an oversight and thus subject to a technical correction. In any case, ANC 6B requests that the same standard apply in all three M zones (4, 26 and 27) and that the standard be that fast food establishments need a special exception.	M-26 should be included and OP will make the necessary correction prior to proposed action.
195	H	Loretta Neumann Neighbors Inc. Comments	11/4/2013	overlays	Takoma Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone (N-2) appears to combine current zoning with a commercial overlay that was adopted several years ago, but it is hard to tell. Also, while the area in the zone is entirely within the Takoma Historic District, no mention is made of that, whereas among the purposes of the Cleveland Park N-3 District the text specifies encouraging compatibility of development with the historic district. Recognize that the Takoma historic district reference was not included in the original text for the Takoma Overlay District, and request the ZC to add it to the purposes of the new Takoma N-2 District. Further request that OP provide a more detailed explanation of how the Takoma N-2 District differs from current zoning. Absent this information, we cannot make an informed statement for or against its provisions.	The overlays are a combination of a base zone with additional provisions/restrictions (the overlay). The N-2 zone represents the C-2-A base zone with the Takoma Overlay provisions incorporated. The original Takoma Overlay did not include a reference to the historic district; therefor, a reference has not been included in the draft proposed text.
190	B	Fred Gorove, et al Parking Development Solutions Comments	11/4/2013	parking	Writing in support of Automated Vehicle Storage and Retrieval Systems and to request that AVSRS be included as an acceptable parking system to meet requirements.	OP has no objection to changing mechanical parking to automated parking.
190, 191	B, C	Fred Gorove, et al Parking Development Solutions Comments	11/4/2013	parking	Presented information in support of automated parking, or Automated Vehicle Storage and Retrieval Systems (AVSRS) and to request that AVSRS be included in the rewritten zoning regulation as an acceptable parking system to meet the requirements of the regulation.	OP has no objection to changing mechanical parking to automated parking.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
192, 193	B, C	Marc Slavin Marc Parc Comments	11/4/2013	parking	Urge the Commission to discontinue restrictions that ban providing any incidental service or repair activities in parking facilities, which are established in various existing and proposed definitions, to allow parking garage owners/operators to better serve their patrons/customers without creating any adverse external effect. This should be allowed for garages open to the public as well as those that serve only owners/tenants of a specific property, where the garage itself is technically an "accessory use" and the incidental services would be only incidental to that specific operation. The services would not be directly marketed to the non-parking patron. Our intent is to make our parking patron have a more enjoyable convenient star. The parking operator(s) will take responsibility for controls, rates, and implementation of these ancillary amenities.	Thank you for your comment. OP will review the possibility of permitting incidental services.
3	C	Councilmember Mary Cheh	9/9/2013	parking	The proposed reductions in parking minimums, executed without a comprehensive, District-wide plan for parking is troubling. Two primary concerns with the proposed changes to the parking minimums. First, the data that supports changes to the parking minimums is not anchored in District-focused analysis. Second, if enacted, OP's proposed parking minimums will precede other necessary changes to parking management in the District.	The data used in the OP reports and recommendations is DC based from the US Census. OP will continue to coordinate with DDOT on the on-street proposals which are addressed through regulation and the off-street recommendations which are regulated through zoning. The data is available on the OP website www.planning.dc.gov under the link DC Data and Maps .
6	C	Councilmember Jack Evans	9/9/2013	parking	Writing to express misgivings with OP's proposed parking minimums. We need to develop parking regulations using District-focused data. In order to fully develop parking regulations that are best for the District, more data - and more refined analysis - is needed. I ask that the Zoning Commission consider removing the proposed parking minimums from the plan entirely and -- instead -- consider requesting that OP develop a fully-researched, data-driven analysis of the parking demands of the District. In order to draft ideal parking regulations for the updated zoning code, OP should concurrently conduct an analysis with DDOT. It makes sense to remove the parking proposals from the zoning rewrite and, instead, develop a set of policies, along with DDOT, that looks at parking issues coherently and comprehensively. I ask that the Zoning Commission consider removing the matter of parking minimums from the zoning rewrite proposals.	The data used in the OP reports and recommendations is DC based from the US Census. OP will continue to coordinate with DDOT on the on-street proposals which are addressed through regulation and the off-street recommendations which are regulated through zoning. The data is available on the OP website www.planning.dc.gov under the link DC Data and Maps .
52	C	Jeffrey Norman Comments	10/21/2013	parking	I support the proposals of the Office of Planning to sharply reduce the number of required parking spaces for new residential buildings that are close to either a Metrorail station or a bus line with frequent service.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	parking	C1901.5 contains the minimum parking requirements for apartment buildings in residential zones ("Residential, Multi-Household"), requiring "1 per 3 dwelling units in excess of 4 units, except 1 per 2 dwelling units for any zone within Subtitles D or E...." What this means along our Conn. Ave. commercial corridor is that an apartment building with less than 4 units need provide no parking, and an apartment building with 9 units need provide only one parking space (one for the three units in excess of four, with the remainder of two more units not yielding an additional parking spot requirement). Our Task Force disagrees with this relaxed parking requirement -- it should be a simple rule of <i>one spot for every three units</i> .	This is a correct calculation. The proposed ratio for smaller apt buildings allows for the infill of small lots, where the provision of parking can be particularly difficult
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	parking	C1902.1 troubles the ANC Task Force, in that a WMATA-declared "Priority Corridor Network Metrobus Route" would by itself relax all the parking requirements on C1901.5 by a full 50%. We think it is inappropriate to let a decision by WMATA to determine the parking requirements applicable under D.C. zoning regulations, and would argue that such decisions should be made by an agency of the District government. We recommend eliminating such an alteration by WMATA unless pursuant to a process that involves the ANC and the Zoning Commission. a) The problem with such relaxed parking requirements, of course, is that apartment building tenants more often than not have cars, which they then park on nearby residential streets. Recently constructed apartment buildings (including near Metro stops) provide a ratio of approximately 2 spots for every 3 units, far more spots than the draft 1-for-3 requirement. In other words, a 2-for-3 ratio is the market reality. b) We believe the Zoning Commission needs to take into account the realities of how apartment dwellers in many neighborhoods live (they tend to have cars), not idealistic hopes of how policy makers wish they would behave (forgo cars and rely on public transit). A disconnect between the foreseeable reality now and an ideal future would result in even less parking available on nearby residential streets.	You can find more information on WMATA's Priority Corridor Network on their website -- including a listing of the routes and a map -- at http://www.wmata.com/about_metro/bus_planning/priority_corridor_network.cfm . OP is not proposing a parking maximum; providing parking in excess of the minimum requirement is, and would remain, permitted.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	parking	C1902.3(a) - our Task Force agrees with the parking exemption for a single family home that does not have access to an alley.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	parking	C1907 provides that if an owner chooses to provide more than 1.5 times the minimum parking spaces required, the owner must implement certain "Transportation Demand Management Features" (TMF) intended to reduce the number or mitigate the impact of private vehicles. While we understand the impetus for this approach, our Task Force has concerns with the specifics. First, the absolute minimums can be significantly lower than the current market provides, as noted above. Second, an owner may want to provide more than 1.5 times the minimum parking because of obvious tenant-market demand for in-building parking. But the penalties could discourage the provision of such parking, defeating market forces, and also shifting tenant parking onto nearby residential streets. We propose that the trigger for the TDMF should be two times the base minimum parking requirement, unaffected by any reduced requirements that may be in place through C1902.1. a) This is more reasonable because if the current market provides approximately 2-for-3 parking, and the new requirement is 1-for-3 parking, then two-times the minimum is simply what the current market demand suggests, and there should not be a penalty for a builder that simply builds to market demand.	OP agrees that the standard is too low and has already proposed raising this standard. The mitigation for excess parking is intended to help the city address broader environmental and transporation efficiency impacts.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	parking	Concerned about the PCN. We think it is inappropriate to let a decision by WMATA determine the parking requirements applicable under zoning, and would argue that such decisions should be made by an agency of the District government. We recommend eliminating such an alteration by WMATA unless pursuant to a process that involves the ANC and the Zoning Commission.	You can find more information on WMATA's Priority Corridor Network on their website -- including a listing of the routes and a map -- at http://www.wmata.com/about_metro/bus_planning/priority_corridor_network.cfm .
62	C	ANC 6B Comments	10/24/2013	parking	Parking -- ANC 6B supported the Office of Planning's original proposal to eliminate the minimum parking requirements in residential zones. ANC 6B is discouraged that the Office of Planning's final proposal would restore the current minimum parking requirements in RF Zones. ANC 6B urges the Zoning Commission to eliminate the minimum parking requirement in residential zones.	Thank you for your comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
66	C	ANC 3C Comments	10/24/2013	parking	Parking requirement for multi-family residential zones and in zones replacing existing commercial zones should not be changed until the Office of Planning can present reliable data that the current requirement provides significant excess parking supply in ANC 3C. Reductions in parking requirement based solely on proximity to frequent bus routes or a metro station should not be approved because there is a process currently available through the special exception procedure whereby a developer/owner requests a reduction in parking requirement; that process should be maintained. Penalties for providing 1.5 times the minimum amount of parking required should not be approved. Changing the minimum required parking formula for private schools from an intensity of use formula to a square footage formula should not be approved.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. OP researched issues by Census tract, Wards, ANC, District wide and by zones. OP will be evaluating the TDM requirements and has already proposed a higher standard when the provision would apply. For private schools, OP will be revising the proposal so parking is calculated in a manner similar to the current code.
76	C	Allen Seeber Comments	10/25/2013	parking	Opposes revisions to parking regulations.	Thank you for the comment
80	C	Daniel Hecker Comments	10/27/2013	parking	Regarding the Zoning rewrite, I request that you reject the provisions that would limit the number of parking spaces in the District. The mayor, to his credit, plans to make DC “age-friendly”, reports the Northwest Current. Yet the rewrite proposals would decrease the number of parking spaces in DC, particularly in commercial areas. That will make it more difficult for residents to park their cars, seriously limiting the mobility of elderly, disabled, and those with young children.	Thank you for the comment. The revised OP parking proposal would continue to require parking in all areas, other than the downtown.
82	C	Parking Development Solutions Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Allow automated parking by right and change mechanized to automated.	OP has no objection to changing mechanical parking to automated parking.
101	C	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	parking	General support for Subtitle C and the proposed parking requirements. Suggests that further consideration be given to elimination of parking minimums near transit zones, TDM features proposed when excess parking is provided (threshold for trigger), impact of landscape requirements, minimum short and long term bike parking requirements, and queuing provisions.	OP's original proposal included removal of parking requirements proximate to metro stations; the revised proposal would continue to require parking, but at a rate of 50% of the parking elsewhere required.
112	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Remove the matter of parking minimums from the zoning rewrite proposals at this time (1901.5). Need to include provisions for enforcement and monitoring for the location of off-site parking (1901.8). Need to provide for monitoring and enforcement to ensure continued compliance in shared parking situations (1901.9). 50% reduction in required parking is inconsistent with ZC 08-06-C, OP must explain its mapping and demonstrate compliance with the Comprehensive Plan (1902.1). Concern that WMATA PCN does not involve citizen input (1902.1(d)). Mitigation provision imposes too substantial a penalty and should be deleted (1907.3).	Thank you for your comments and suggestions.
132	C	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Subtitle C, Chapter 19 Vehicle Parking. It is in Section C 1902.2 that the requirement for Residential Single Family dwellings to provide one off street parking space is found, provided there is access available from an improved alley at least 10 feet in width; otherwise, there is no longer a requirement to provide one off street parking space per dwelling in the low density residential zones. This provision is another that has caused much public concern, but the Office of Planning has continued forward with its plan to place as much parking on the street as possible. Having parked cars lining low density residential streets does little to improve the attractive open spaces of these neighborhoods.	Requiring a curb cut to allow a driveway from a public street disrupts the pedestrian way, impacts streetscape character, increases pavement in front of a house and reduces on-street parking by the same number of required parking spaces, so there is no gain in requiring off-street parking in the R-1 zones. The proposal has also garnered much public support.
157	C	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	parking	Existing parking minimums for all multi-family residential and mixed use buildings, including those in transit zones, should be retained.	Thank you for your comment.
157	C	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	parking	New zoning regulations facilitate shared parking and allow developers to rent out unused spaces.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
157	C	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	parking	Reductions in required parking should only be granted through the variance process, which gives the City and residents an opportunity to evaluate community needs on a case-by-case basis.	Thank you for your comment.
101	C	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	loading	Supports removal of 55-foot truck bay loading requirement, shared loading between uses and adjoining buildings. Suggests further consideration of requirement for trash rooms immediately adjacent to loading areas, clarification of GFA measurement provisions (C § 217) and include the existing gasoline service station provisions (§ 2205.2).	Thank you for your supportive comment.
170	C	Dorcas Adkins Comments	10/31/2013	parking	Supports the proposed revisions to the parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
178	C	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Testimony	11/1/2013	parking	Modify 1902.1 to eliminate to zero, rather than reduce by 50% the requirement for buildings near transit. Make 1907.3 then use as the threshold for TDM the underlying parking minimum that would have applied in the absence of transit.	OP's original proposal was to eliminate parking requirements proximate to metro stations, but has since proposed a compromise where parking would remain required, but at this lower rate that otherwise required. OP will be evaluating the TDM requirements and proposing alternate standards.
180	C	Alex Posorske Comments	11/1/2013	parking	Supports the proposed revisions to the parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
185	C	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	parking	ANC 4D opposes the reduction in parking minimums for multi-unit housing development that will be located on streets adjacent to and bordering residential streets so that the occupants of the multi-unit housing will not have to compete for existing residential parking.	Thank you for your comment.
189	C	John Parsons Comments	11/4/2013	parking	Parking proposal is based on national rather than DC trends. Shouldn't base proposal on behavior during recession with high gas prices. Defer parking until more analysis is completed. Requirements should be neighborhood-specific.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. OP researched issues by Census tract, Wards, ANC, District wide and by zones. Unlike the current regulations, the proposed regulations would recognize neighborhood-specific conditions - areas more rich in transit areas tend, in teh District, to have lower or much lower rates of car ownership and is reflected in the proposal.
191	C	Fred Gorove, et al Parking Development Solutions Comments	11/4/2013	parking	Writing in support of Automated Vehicle Storage and Retrieval Systems and to request that AVSRS be included as an acceptable parking system to meet requirements.	OP has no objection to changing mechanical parking to automated parking.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
233	C	Dennis Chestnut Comments	11/6/2013	parking	Support for the proposed changes to the off-street parking requirements in the zoning code. I ask the Zoning Commission to move forward with the proposed significant reductions in parking minimums, particularly near transit, because we need to give people the option to use more sustainable and affordable transportation modes.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
234	C	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	parking	Supports reducing parking requirements in certain areas served by transit, and for new commercial and residential projects where current parking requirements are excessive.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
240	C	Nathaniel P. Baldwin Comments	11/6/2013	parking	I am especially pleased by: 1) The elimination of parking minimums in the downtown area. 2) The reduction in parking requirements in general, and specifically in areas well served by Metro and bus service. 3) The fact that fewer expensive spaces will need to be provided in many multi-family rental and sale buildings, increasing the possibility of more affordable housing for middle income residents. 4) The encouragement of shared parking spaces. 5) The greater use of car sharing spaces, and counting such spaces against minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
240	C	Nathaniel P. Baldwin Comments	11/6/2013	parking	Very supportive of the proposed changes in the DC Zoning Code as they relate to the Off-street Parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
280	C	Debbie Smith-Steiner ANC SMD 5E01 Comments	11/12/2013	parking	Expressing concerns over private residential development projects/mixed use development whereby, their residents are being issued Residential Parking Permits (RPPS).	Residential Permit Parking (RPP) is managed by DDOT and additional information about the program, including eligible blocks can be found online at http://ddot.dc.gov/node/547972 .
281	C	John Wheeler Comments	11/12/2013	parking	Writing in favor of lowering the off-street parking minimum requirements. I expect that you will be hearing people testify about how important parking is to elderly people. As an elderly person, I believe that is not true. My opinion is supported by statistics--it's the young and the old who are doing without cars; to some extent for different reasons. If people live long enough, they most likely will lose their ability to drive long before they lose their ability to walk. Therefore, walkability and livability are essential to continuing to live in my neighborhood. I think that reducing the minimum parking requirements is one of the things that you can do to make DC a better place for people to live from birth to death and not force people to leave to find housing on one living level that is affordable. If multi-family housing can be built with less parking, it will significantly reduce the cost of that housing. For neighborhoods such as mine with easy access to transit and accessible stores, that definitely should be done.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
285	C	Michael Farrell Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	I support the Office of Planning's proposals for reducing parking minimums. Residential parking minimums raise costs and hurt affordability, for housing and everything else. Parking breeds driving. Parking is ugly, and makes for boring streets. A major gap in the OP's proposal is on street permit parking. On-street parking is nearly free for residents, even in very expensive and congested neighborhoods. This encourages people to use the streets as long-term storage facility for little-used vehicles. Handicapped placard abuse. Parking benefit districts are needed.	Thank you for your comment.
286	C	Juliet Six Tenleytown Neighbors Association Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Parking in and around the residential neighborhoods of DC was handled in the ZRR in much the same way that OP handled the issue of the Height Act. There has been a marked pattern of rushing to put through changes without adequate substantiation of the facts. Attached is an example of the type of study which might have been done. In the case of parking DDOT has as yet to provide the supporting data: see letters from DC Council Members Cheh & Evans. The ZRR reduces parking everywhere in the city. And, it cuts the reduced numbers in half near transit including Tenley: less than 1 space for 6 unit. I ask you to consider the consequences of all of this when making your decisions on the parking proposals in the ZRR. The ZRR is a one size fits all proposal. Your decision can make all the difference in a neighborhood such as Tenleytown. In the second oldest neighborhood in Washington it is not surprising that many of the homes have neither garage nor driveway. On street parking then becomes essential. People who walk to use mass transit must still have a place to park their car(s). We (young and old) must retain the option to be multi-modal. DDOT stated as recently as 11/4/13: "A well-balanced and multi-modal transportation system is by nature intended to serve a diverse set of users and needs." The ZRR does not reflect this sentiment. We have been told that the parking changes are intended to curtail traffic & pollution. However while people circle to find parking it adds to traffic as well as pollution. The current zoning requirements for parking are already far below the statistics on car ownership in DC. Thus, the current parking requirements should be retained or raised.	Thank you for your comment. OP has been proposing changes to the parking requirement, through the working groups, Zoning Commission direction, and community meetings for more than 5 years. OP data and reports are available on the ZRR website.
287	C	Bradley Green Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	I support the changes to the zoning code as proposed by the Office of Planning. These proposed changes are an important step toward making it easier to get around this great city without a car. In fact, I wish the proposals did away with parking minimums entirely, as it seems to me that the market is a much better judge of parking demand than the government. It is in support, therefore, of a livable, walkable, and affordable city that I urge you to adopt the zoning changes proposed by the Office of Planning.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
288	C	Allen Seeber Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Opposes elimination of parking minimums. Takes issue with OP's imposition of "urbanist" ideology via the ZRR without attention to evidence or consequence. At least one parking space should be required for every three multi-family units. The community bears the brunt of regulatory and developer errors and omissions regarding parking. Off-street parking minimums represent our ounce of prevention.	Thank you for your comment.
289	C	Judy Chesser Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Please keep the already low current minimum parking requirements.	Thank you for your comment.
291	C	Anthony and Alice Giancola Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	People live near transit because they do not own nor want to have a car. There is no longer need for the now outmoded parking requirements. We came here today to tell you - times change, people change and it's time for the zoning to change. Therefore we would suggest that parking requirements around and within a half of a mile from Metrorail stations need to be minimal and certainly no more than .33 cars per unit of housing. In summary we support the parking proposals to: Eliminate minimums downtown; Allow the reduction of parking minimums in commercial or mixed-use zones with frequent rail or bus service or within transit zones, however, using a .33 minimum requirement (1 space to 3 units); Retain parking minimums in neighborhood corridors without frequent transit; Eliminate parking minimums for buildings under 4 units; and Retain parking minimums for churches, schools, and other non-residential uses in residential zones. Finally we strongly recommend that the Zoning Commission support the proposed zoning change noted above.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Assessing a penalty on developers who choose to provide adequate parking: Even though OP is proposing to increase the trigger for assessing a penalty on developers providing more than the required parking, given the very low minimum parking requirements, far below the new parking demand generated, for many projects, a responsible developer choosing to simply produce adequate parking for the residents, employees, customers and visitors to the site will be assessed a penalty. This is simply a bad policy, and like so many other radical changes in this section, it does not have a basis in the Comprehensive Plan, and in fact, is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.	The proposed excess parking requirements are not a penalty; rather, the provide for some level of mitigation of the environmental and traffic issues arising from excess parking.
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	DC zoning requirements a function of unrelated WMATA decisions: Another example of poorly drafting was the section tying the minimum parking requirements to WMATA's decisions at to which routes are designated as Priority Bus Routes, meaning that DC's minimum parking requirements can change as a result of a WMATA action where there would be no opportunity to consider that impact.	You can find more information on WMATA's Priority Corridor Network on their website – including a listing of the routes and a map – at http://www.wmata.com/about_metro/bus_planning/priority_corridor_network.cfm .
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	OP's recommendations lack empirical support: OP has not provided any data to support their recommendations to reduce minimum parking requirements, and in fact all the data in the record indicates that our minimum parking requirements are much lower than the increased parking demand that a project would generate. When I asked OP for the reports cited in support of the recommendations, Jennifer Steingasser provided me with a report that included absolutely no data supporting the recommendations. There was no data on parking needs. The report simply compared our parking requirements with those for other jurisdictions. For the most part, our requirements were already significantly lower than the others. DDOT report does not provide any data on parking needs. It cites changing demographics, but provides no data. In fact, DMV data shows that vehicle ownership has been increasing, and Census data shows that the number of vehicles per household in DC has been roughly constant for a substantial period of time. The draft requires less than 0.167 spaces per housing unit in a large portion of the areas zoned for apartments, even though vehicle ownership rates are more than five times that amount. This is a recipe for disaster and simply is not sustainable. A sustainable parking policy would increase off-street parking at approximately the same rate as development is increasing demand for parking so that the limited supply of on-street parking is not overwhelmed, or further overwhelmed. The ZC should make no change to reduce the minimum parking requirements until there is area based data supporting that reduction.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website.
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Over time, the proposed changes can have a negative impact on walkability and the environment: The proposed changes do not improve walkability or help the environment. In fact, it has the opposite effect. When new buildings with inadequate parking are built near single family neighborhoods, we see that over time, more of the residents who did not have off-street parking find it necessary to pave over a portion of their yard. In other instances, since underground parking cannot be added after the fact, as parking becomes more of an issue, there is pressure for either more surface parking or structural parking, both of which have a negative impact on the environment and on the walkability of the area.	DDOT is conducting an on-street parking study and expects the first draft to be available by early 2014.
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	The proposed changes do not enhance housing affordability: You have heard much testimony tonight about how reducing minimum parking requirements will increase the supply of affordable housing. Our low minimum parking requirements do not increase housing costs for any car-free residents. For apartments, we generally require less than one space per two units. This low minimum does not force residents without cars to pay for parking. Further, the unpublished study that OP cited to support this claim was based on assumptions that simply do not apply to DC.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. OP researched issues by Census tract, Wards, ANC, District wide and by zones.
292	C	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	We ask that you, as suggested in letters by Councilmembers Evans and Cheh, and former Commissioner John Parsons, defer establishment of new parking regulations.	Thank you for your comment.
293	C	Gerald Fittipaldi Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Car Sharing: I am glad to see that DC is taking progressive steps towards requiring car-share vehicles for large residential buildings. In Section 1908.2, the recommended minimum number of car sharing vehicles is 1 when the number of total parking spaces built is 50-149. Could this minimum be raised from 1 space to 2 spaces?	Thank you for your supportive comment. OP will be evaluating the proposed car sharing requirements.
293	C	Gerald Fittipaldi Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Voice support of the proposed zoning changes regarding parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
294	C	Dorcas Adkins Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Speaking in support of proposed zoning changes to the minimum parking requirements. By reducing these requirements we can expect new residential development to cost less. Sees her neighborhood as one in which many people can easily live car-free. Reducing mandatory parking requirements for residential developments is both feasible and desirable. It reflects the reality of DC's changing population (more and more of whom live here car-free) and supports more of this change. This is one of the many important steps we need to take in the fight again suburban sprawl. I ask the Commissioners to adopt the proposed changes.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
295	C	Matthew Steil Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Testify in support of lowering mandatory off street parking minimums, as currently proposed by the DC Office of Planning. The current proposal to reduce off street parking minimums does not mean getting rid of parking or cars in this city. Rather it is a common sense approach to significantly reduce the burdensome cost of building unneeded parking - the result of which we will all benefit from, whether we choose to drive or not.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
296	C	Matt Malinowski Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Rather than perpetuating the current set of arbitrary requirements based on unknowable ratios of drivers to occupants, please focus on what we do know: land in DC is expensive and driving is unsustainable and causes congestion. Eliminating or minimizing parking requirements allows for the market to provide parking to those who truly need it, while making it clear that free parking is not a right, and that DC values its residents and natural environment over its cars.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
297	C	Alexandra Dodds Testimony	11/12/2013	format	Express strong support for the proposed changes to DC's zoning ordinance, including simplifying the overall code.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
297	C	Alexandra Dodds Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Express strong support for the proposed changes to DC's zoning ordinance, including the reduction of minimum parking requirements.	Thank you for your comment. As stated in the introduction to Subtitle C Chapter 6, Dwelling unit density regulations also, "(a) Conserve the District's inventory of housing for larger households, through the preservation of single dwelling unit houses; (b) Permit the provision of quantities of dwelling units consistent with designations provided in the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan; and (c) Provide housing options that are affordable through the ability to share common facilities, such as bathrooms and kitchens, while maintaining limits on the total number of occupants that may occur on a lot to prevent overconcentration."
298	C	Clark Larson Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Here to express very strong support for reducing the minimum off-street parking required for new developments in the District. Close to half a decade ago, I served on the citizen task force that investigated this question and looked at what other Cities like ours were doing and assessing the results they were seeing. After months of detailed deliberation, the task force advised the Office of Planning that it was time to remove mandated parking requirements and let developers and consumer demand determine the level of need and the best ways to accommodate it. Many of the task force members, myself included, testified before this commission a few years ago relating our findings and urging the removal of minimum .parking requirements. The proposal before you today aims to lower the parking minimum standards, as opposed to doing away with them entirely. After serving on the task force, my view is we were ready five years ago to eliminate the requirements altogether, and today, we are even better positioned to do so.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
299	C	Neha Bhatt Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Here to express very strong support for reducing the minimum off-street parking required for new developments in the District. Close to half a decade ago, I served on the citizen task force that investigated this question and looked at what other Cities like ours were doing and assessing the results they were seeing. After months of detailed deliberation, the task force advised the Office of Planning that it was time to remove mandated parking requirements and let developers and consumer demand determine the level of need and the best ways to accommodate it. Many of the task force members, myself included, testified before this commission a few years ago relating our findings and urging the removal of minimum .parking requirements. The proposal before you today aims to lower the parking minimum standards, as opposed to doing away with them entirely. After serving on the task force, my view is we were ready five years ago to eliminate the requirements altogether, and today, we are even better positioned to do so. Our City has become a national leader in diversifying its transportation system. (Just look at the number of competing car sharing companies doing business these days.) Even cities less ready than us - like Cincinnati who just passed their parking ordinance this summer- are letting go of the old-school parking mandate system. Regardless, this proposal to lower parking requirements represents a very positive step in the right direction. This is the right thing to do, and it is long overdo. We have to accommodate our growth with a balanced transportation strategy in mind. We know also, minimum parking mandates inflate the cost of housing - how else are developers going to recoup the cost of a \$30,000 parking spot? The seniors moving back to age in place and possibly give up driving someday soon, the millennials choosing to own fewer private cars; those families making less than the near-six figures that is the median income in this area... these are all beneficiaries of this important policy change. I'm very glad this commission is leading this important public discussion, and that we are finally at the precipice of dealing with the parking-mandate-albatross that's been weighing down our land development. It took considerable public debate to get to this point and I heartily urge the commission to codify this proposal. It reflects a critical evolutionary moment in DC's development. It may be obvious but perhaps worth noting that reducing parking requirements is not the same as not allowing parking. New developments will continue to include parking. But with this improved code, it will be responsive to what will work best. Please approve this code amendment, the sooner the better.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
300	C	Randy Speck ANC 3G Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	First, in section C1901.5, the parking requirements for residential, multi-family buildings provide for "1 pet 3 dwelling units in excess of 4 units, except 1 per 2 dwelling units for any zone within subtitles D or E " What this means along our Connecticut Avenue commercial corridor is that an apartment building with fewer than 4 units need provide no parking, and an apartment building with 9 units need provide only one parking space (<i>one for the three units in excess of four, with the remainder of two mote units not yielding an additional parking spot requirement</i>). Our task force disagrees with this relaxed parking requirement and urges the Commission to adopt a simple rule of one spot for every three units.	This is a correct calculation. The proposed ratio for smaller apt buildings allows for the infill of small lots.
300	C	Randy Speck ANC 3G Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Second, we are concerned that section C1902.1 would relax all the parking requirements in subsection C 1901.5 by a full 50% when WMATA identifies a Priority Corridor Network Metro bus' Route. It is inappropriate to let WMATA's decision determine the parking requirements applicable under the District's zoning regulations to control without review and decision by an agency of the District government. We recommend eliminating such an alteration by WMATA unless pursuant to a process that involves the affected ANC and the Zoning Commission.	You can find more information on WMATA's Priority Corridor Network on their website – including a listing of the routes and a map – at http://www.wmata.com/about_metro/bus_planning/priority_corridor_network.cfm .
300	C	Randy Speck ANC 3G Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Third, section C 1907 addresses mitigation steps for parking that significantly exceeds the minimum requirements and sets the trigger for this mitigation at 1.5 times the minimum level. We are sympathetic to the reasons for this mitigation provision, but are concerned that the level of the trigger is too low. Some recent experience suggests that the current demand for parking spaces in new buildings may be greater than 1.5 times the minimum levels - indeed at about twice the minimum levels (<i>i.e., 2 spaces for each 3 rental units instead of the minimum level of 1 space for every 3 units</i>). the proposed trigger for mitigation measures may not reflect actual market demand for parking, and we suggest increasing the trigger level to 2.0 times the minimum levels - in other words, at about the level of current demand.	OP has already proposed a higher standard when the provision would apply, in line with this recommendation.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
301	C	Steven Beller Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	I strongly support the Office of Planning's update of DC's Zoning Code - regarding Parking Minimums. To those who fear that residents of new buildings will take away their parking spots in front of their homes, I would say: a) the street in front of their homes is owned by the city, not them b) many could store their car on their own property, if they wished c) new projects will probably have many more than the minimum slots, as developers respond to market signals d) in the few areas where a parking problem for residents arises there are sensible parking management measures that could ensure that residents can park on public streets near their homes. Finally e) this is a separate matter of reforming DC's parking regime-and should not interfere with shaping DC for the next decades, and a less car-dependent future, which is the laudable aim of OP's proposed reform.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
299	C	Neha Bhatt Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Our City has become a national leader in diversifying its transportation system. (Just look at the number of competing car sharing companies doing business these days.) Even cities less ready than us - like Cincinnati who just passed their parking ordinance this summer- are letting go of the old-school parking mandate system. Regardless, this proposal to lower parking requirements represents a very positive step in the right direction. This is the right thing to do, and it is long overdue. We have to accommodate our growth with a balanced transportation strategy in mind. We know also, minimum parking mandates inflate the cost of housing - how else are developers going to recoup the cost of a \$30,000 parking spot? The seniors moving back to age in place and possibly give up driving someday soon, the millennials choosing to own fewer private cars; those families making less than the near-six figures that is the median income in this area... these are all beneficiaries of this important policy change. I'm very glad this commission is leading this important public discussion, and that we are finally at the precipice of dealing with the parking-mandate-albatross that's been weighing down our land development. It took considerable public debate to get to this point and I heartily urge the commission to codify this proposal. It reflects a critical evolutionary moment in DC's development. It may be obvious but perhaps worth noting that reducing parking requirements is not the same as not allowing parking. New developments will continue to include parking. But with this improved code, it will be responsive to what will work best. Please approve this code amendment, the sooner the better.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
302	C	Allen Greenberg Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	OP is right to propose reducing minimum parking requirements in transit-proximate developments, but for all the reasons above, such requirements should be eliminated entirely. I urge the Zoning Commission to promote transit-accessible and affordable housing, adaptive reuse of older buildings, and compact community development by eliminating minimum parking standards, imposing parking maximums and new off-street parking design standards, and requiring sufficient bicycle parking, all consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Act of 2006.	Thank you for your supportive comment. OP originally supported removing the minimum parking requirement proximate to metro stations, but has revised the proposal to the current proposal of maintaining a parking requirement, with a reduction by 50% of the otherwise required number of spaces.
303	C	Liz Borkowski Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Testify in favor of updating parking requirements as part of the District's Zoning Code updates. I support the Zoning Commission's proposals to remove and relax parking minimums because doing so will help make housing more affordable and contribute to creation of the "well-balanced and multi-modal transportation system" called for in the DC Comprehensive Plan. In short, removing and reducing parking minimums will help achieve a healthier and more equitable future for the District of Columbia.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
304	C	Aimee Custis Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Here to express strong support for lowering off-street parking requirements, especially in areas with good transit. Affordability -- that the #1 reason I support the zoning update. With housing prices soaring across the District, we can't afford to build parking we don't need. While some people will always want or need to drive - and should always be able to - encouraging car ownership through policies like parking minimums has tipped the scales unfairly toward car ownership. I support the Office of Planning's proposal for removing parking minimums in neighborhoods like mine with great transit options. In fact, I wish the Office of Planning hadn't scrapped its original proposal for parking maximums in neighborhoods like mine. The District should be doing more, not watering down, policies to keep housing here affordable.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
305	C	Carol Wayman Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	I strongly support lowering and eliminating parking minimums. I support removing minimum parking in the expanded downtown. I support standardizing the minimum parking requirement in multi-family residential to 1 parking space for 3, 4, or 6 homes - or even fewer depending on the need. I am glad that car sharing and bike parking is included in the building requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
306	C	Erica Flock Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Here to support the proposed updates to the zoning code, particularly the exemptions from parking minimums. Please make DC a more affordable and pedestrian-friendly place to live by approving the proposed updates.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
307	C	Geoffrey Hatchard Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Before you to state strong support for the proposed changes to the DC zoning code, particularly regarding parking requirements. I am excited to see that the ability to share parking between adjacent sites with differing uses has been retained in the current proposal. I encourage adoption of these changes to the zoning regulations.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
308	C	Jim Schulman Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	On page C-63 I notice that off-site parking is stipulated at a maximum distance of 400' from the use or structure. Prince George's County allows off-site parking to be within 500'. Are the residents of Prince George's County able to walk further than DC residents? I think not, and urge the off-site parking distance to err on the side of liberality. We want to encourage folks to walk a little bit further.	OP will review the offsite parking provisions and adjust the standards as appropriate.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
308	C	Jim Schulman Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	With respect to the proposed changes in Subtitle C, I generally concur with reducing or eliminating minimum parking requirements. Although the reduction in parking minimums does not go as far as is needed for the long-term health and well-being of the District of Columbia and the Metropolitan Region, they do represent a significant improvement from the current Zoning Code. Reducing the heavy impacts of car-centric transportation planning and lifestyles is something with which our government leaders and agencies are actively grappling, and it is much to their credit. Ultimately we need to turn an already quite walkable municipality into a one where uses are so mixed that 90% of all of residents' jobs, housing, services, recreation and amenities are met within 1 mile. When that happens, less public and private money will need to be spent on transportation, and we will all be the wealthier for it! As a townhouse resident on Capitol Hill, I recognize that the proper way to address the high demand for street parking on residential streets is through reform of the Residential Parking Permit (RPP) rules, not necessarily via zoning. With greater restrictions on access to RPP's, it seems that zoning-wise we could reduce primary household parking minimums to below one per principal dwelling that has alley access.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
309	C	Eric Fidler Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Express support for the Office of Planning's update to the zoning code. I wish OP had stuck with the original idea of eliminating, rather than halving, these requirements, but OP, through countless meetings over several years has struck a good balance between residents' opposing views. I strongly urge the Commission to approve OP's draft without delay.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
310	C	Patty Rose Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Green space's original mission was to make affordable housing. and its neighborhoods green, or sustainable. I have worked with real estate development professionals to improve the performance of the District's affordable housing design, construction, finance and operations. While we also worked with commercial and retail development professionals it is the affordable housing residents that will benefit most from the significant reduction of minimum parking requirements for higher density mixed use areas that are well-served by transit. Riding public transportation, walking, and biking is not only healthier for one's body but also for one's pocketbook since not owning a car saves, on average, \$10,000 a year. Most residents of affordable units don't own cars and cannot afford to or prefer not to have to pay for parking they don't need. Parking requirements unnecessarily increase housing costs. Parking requirements subsidize car ownership, causing more people to own cars than would if they were making a trade-off between the full costs of different transportation choices. Reforming parking mandates recognizes that more than half of all renters in the city don't own a car. The District's zoning policy should support those households that don't own cars and developers and property owners should not have to be forced to go through a Board of Zoning Adjustment process to reduce their parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
327	C	Allen Greenberg Report on Cost of Parking Spaces	11/14/2013	parking	Report entitled, "How New Parking Spaces May Effectively Increase Typical U.S. Urban Housing Total Unit Costs by \$52,000 to \$117,000" FHA, Office of Policy	Thank you for providing a copy of the report as requested by the ZC.
339	C	Jonathan Weidman Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	Express strong support for the reduction of parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
362	C	Jason Broehm Comments	11/12/2013	parking	I support the proposed update to the DC zoning code, particularly the changes that would modernize outdated parking requirements, and I strongly urge the Zoning Commission to revise DC's 1950s-era zoning regulations to encourage continued progress toward making DC an even more vibrant city where it is easy to get around by foot, bicycle and transit. The OP proposal to decrease parking minimums on sites located near transit, remove minimum parking requirements downtown, and encourage car sharing and bike parking constitutes an important step forward. Easing parking requirements can help incentivize people to get around the city by foot, bicycle and transit, and encourage more walkable, vibrant and affordable neighborhoods. I urge you to support the Office of Planning's proposed update to the DC Zoning code to bring our parking policies into the 21st century.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
368	C	Larry Werner Comments	11/19/2013	parking	OP could not be more wrong in its parking recommendations. We need to INCREASE the off-street parking requirements. The best option is to return the entire zoning rewrite to the Office of Planning with instructions to include in any future proposals only those items it clearly documents as being in the existing code and in compliance with the existing Comprehensive Plan. If OP believes changes are needed, it should identify each change separately, support each such proposal with actual evidence and demonstrate exactly how Washington's citizens have participated in - and contributed to - the end product. The second best option - at least for parking - is to increase parking requirements in each and every case that OP has proposed reducing them. The third best option - again limited to parking, would be to retain all existing parking minimums.	Thank you for your comment.
310	C	Patty Rose Testimony	11/12/2013	parking	Fact: The cost of off-street parking is almost never paid for by the user, but instead is subsidized by everyone in the building because the market price is below the actual cost. This is unfair to people who want to live without a car. One U Street developer estimated that the cost of a parking space is about \$480 per month per space. The market price however, is on average \$221 per month. The huge gap in cost is made up in higher housing costs for everyone. We are all better off as DC residents if new housing can right size the parking supply to meet the demand of residents rather than build to a government mandated minimum. Rather than subsidizing parking and driving, we should let the market build parking for those who want to pay for it. There is a growing realization that the dysfunction caused by poorly conceived parking policies is a major impediment to creating an effective and balanced urban transportation system. We don't want the District to be designed around parking. Let's leverage our city's parking policy's to affect positive environmental objectives and productive economic outcomes.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
373	C	Susan Taylor Cleveland Park Citizens Association Comments	11/19/2013	parking	CPCA believes that a blanket minimum parking requirement policy for all areas of the District of Columbia does not serve the city well and will have an unequal impact on individual neighborhoods. Particular concern for requirement for education related uses. CPCA calls on the Office of Planning to postpone issuance of its proposed parking provisions until it can develop proposals, in consultation with DDOT and individual communities, which take fully into account the specific transportation and parking needs of individual communities, the availability of viable public transportation options for all segments of the population, the city's environmental sustainability goals, and the Comprehensive Plan's mandate for adequate public and private parking.	OP's proposal is not a blanket minimum parking requirement for all areas of the District, but is tied to uses, proximity to transit, and other factors.
375	C	Cyril Crocker Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Feels that reducing the parking requirements for developments in the District is a good idea. Parking regulations should reflect the realities of the community. We simply are no longer a city made up exclusively of car dependent residents. The District offers many viable alternatives to car ownership. With densification encourage at and near metro stations, residents have access to much of the capitol region without having to own a car, and that is one of the factors making such multifamily developments worth a premium in the market. The dollars invested in the creation of such developments would be much more wisely spent in creating more units of affordable housing than in housing space for when the residents of these units have clearly chosen to live in an environment that supports alternative means of transportation.	Thank you for your comments.
376	C	Tom Quinn Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	On-street parking pressure and the associated traffic along with the frustration residents feel when they have trouble finding parking near their homes is a real concern for some people in my SMD. But the problem is not a lack of off-street parking - the problem is that the on-street parking is not appropriately priced or even priced at all which leads to a wild imbalance between supply and demand. The solution to the problems of on-street parking demand in management of on-street parking supply but the Zoning rewrite and the Zoning Commission is not the appropriate forum for resolving this problem. The Office of Planning has regrettably already watered down the reduction in required parking minimums in the Zoning rewrite but the new regulations as proposed still represent a tangible improvement on the current law and for reason merit your support.	DDOT is conducting the study and reported it is already in progress and they expect the first draft to be available by early 2014.
377	C	David Ogunsanya City First Homes Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Supports parking reforms to reduce or eliminate parking minimums in high density areas that have multiple sources of transportation readily available.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
381	C	Denis James Kalorama Citizens Association Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	DC Office of Planning's proposal to eliminate minimum parking requirements for new construction or construction that significantly alters existing properties will not serve the needs of Adams Morgan, and that the existing parking minimum requirements in the zoning regulations should remain unchanged for Adams Morgan. The transit zone policy should not be applied to Adams Morgan due to our long-standing deficit of available street parking and that Adams Morgan would benefit from not having the parking minimums removed within its boundaries.	Thank you for your comment. OP will review the concerns expressed by Adams Morgan.
382	C	Steve Seelig Ward 3 Vision Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Ward 3 Vision supports lower or no parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
383	C	Melissa Kunstadter Tenleytown Neighbors Association Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Speak against the changes proposed by the Office of Planning to the city's zoning regulations as they pertain to parking requirements.	Thank you for your comment.
384	C	Sonia Conly Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Express 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 three 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. 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 are of insufficient size to expand horizontally.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
385	C	Leslie Steen Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Support reducing parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
387	C	Jalal Greene Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Support reducing parking requirements for the development of affordable housing. By reducing parking requirements for affordable housing and locating more affordable housing in transit oriented areas, we address both issues. It is important that we determine parking needs for affordable housing based on many factors to ensure that we spent our limited public resources to get the desired outcomes.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
388	C	Bremma Barber Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Strongly support easing off-street parking minimum requirements in areas with good transit, allowing accessory dwelling units, and more corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
389	C	Holly Chase Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Testify in support of the proposed update to the zoning code, specifically the reduction in minimum parking requirements. I feel very strongly that abundant and free off-street parking is an outdated, unsustainable expectation. Reducing parking minimums will offer DC residents more, not less, transportation choice.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
393	C	Rick Rybeck Just Economics Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Wish to lend support to the proposed zoning update in general, and to the provisions related to inclusionary zoning and reduced parking requirements in particular. I encourage the Zoning Commission to avoid setting parking minimums or to set them as low as possible.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
394	C	Mitchell Crispell Jews United for Justice Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Support for lowering off-street parking minimum requirements. The proposed regulations allow true parking demand to be met, lower housing costs, and encourage what we need most of all -- affordable housing units. Believe the city should allow new housing development to "right size" the parking supply to meet demand rather than build a government-mandated minimum. Encourage you to adopt the proposed changes to the parking regulations.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
395	C	Brian Cohen ANC 3B Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Continue to support the rewrite. Current parking minimums undermine market forces, increase housing costs, reduce incentives to use mass transit, and damage the historic and walkable form of many neighborhoods. The changes proposed in the draft zoning code - which are limited to downtown and areas well served by transit , would mitigate these problems.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
396	C	Chris Furlong Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Testifying in favor of lowering the off-street parking minimum requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
397	C	Cheryl Cort Coalition for Smarter Growth Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Express support for the proposed reduction and removal of parking minimums in Subtitle C.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
398	C	Megan McConville Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Express strong support for the proposed update to the DC zoning code, specifically the reduction of minimum parking requirements. The proposed changes to the zoning code are key to making our city even more attractive, inclusive, and economically competitive, and I urge you to support them.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
399	C	Ivan Fishberg ANC 6B Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	ANC 6B supports the Office of Planning's original proposal that there be no parking minimums required for new construction of single-family houses or residential development of less than 10 units. ANC 6B also supports OP's proposal that there be no parking minimums in Apartment and Commercial/Mixed Use zones within 1/2 mile of Metro stops or 1/4 mile of high-service bus corridors (so-called "transit zones"). Our Commission urged the Office of Planning to use its authority under the city Comprehensive Plan to guide DDOT toward a revised RPP policy.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
401	C	Sue Hemberger Testimony	11/19/2013	parking	Fun facts about PARKING [SEE SUBMITTED TESTIMONY]	Thank you for your submission.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	parking	We oppose the change in the private school parking formula. Not one shred of data was produced to support the change from a demand-based to square-footage based formula. OP had no idea what the impact would be on the parking requirement. The after-the-proposal survey of a few schools showed that some of the most parking intensive schools would see a significant decrease in their parking requirement per the formula change. At the same time there is no data to indicate that these schools have any less impact on neighborhood parking supply. We strongly urge you to restore the current parking formula and continue the practice of putting the burden on schools in special exception proceedings to demonstrate that the demand they create is less than the requirement.	OP reviewed the metrics used by other jurisdictions, which tended more toward structure; will return to employee based standards.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	parking	The 50% reduction in minimum parking requirement proposal should be eliminated until there are targeted studies and proposals per the Comprehensive Plan. The recent addition of penalties should also be eliminated. They were not discussed at the task force, nor were they submitted to the public for comment. This is another example of imposing a point of view on car ownership and using the zoning regulations to try to control behavior. That seems a more appropriate role for the Council through the Comprehensive Plan and so far they have only suggested using parking maximums as part of analyzing and mapping TOD overlays, not as part of a general restriction on production of parking citywide. We also suggest special exceptions for parking require applicants to meet all the proposed list of proofs to establish that there won't be unintended consequences rather than allowing applicants to pick one and call it a day.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. OP researched issues by Census tract, Wards, ANC, District wide and by zones. The OP proposal for mitigation of excess parking is not a penalty, but rather mitigation to help to address the environmental and traffic impacts of the provision of excess parking, such as the planting of trees in public space and providing additional bike or car shar facilities.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	parking	The Committee of 100 agrees with many of the comments opposing the parking proposals. There is no DC-based data that we have seen to support reducing the minimum parking requirements. In single family and two family zones the requirement for on-site parking would be waived, if there is no alley access. Why would we want to discourage driveways where a family's car(s) could be parked and visitors and maintenance vehicles parked in order to relieve on-street parking demand? How does alley access change the need for accommodating the demand for parking in neighborhoods? We do not think this is a practical proposal and suggest the waiver should be deleted.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. OP researched issues by Census tract, Wards, ANC, District wide and by zones.
406	C	Commissioner Patrick Flynn Comments	11/20/2013	parking	Stress the importance of and express my strong support for removing the minimum parking requirements, not only for downtown, but also along major transit corridors across the district. Simple laws of economics dictate the cost of housing, but zoning codes dictate the minimum number of required parking spaces. By doing away with parking minimums you permit developers to devote valuable space and resources toward creating vibrant urban living areas rather than wasteful and undesirable concrete slabs. And in doing so, together with the other measures proposed in this zoning re-write, you create an opportunity for not only more reasonably priced housing and a more accessible community, but you have the opportunity to position DC to be prepared for the inevitable car free future.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
410	C	ANC 6C Comments	11/21/2013	parking	Subtitle C, section 1902.1, reorganization and clarification - make clear that residential zones covered by Subtitle D and E are excluded from the 50% parking reduction requirement. Specifically, subsection (a) should be incorporated into the introductory paragraph of this section rather than being broken out in the list of subconditions (which are otherwise applicable in the disjunctive). Is was suggested that the submission include the wording that "this is how we interpreted the section and we endorse the interpretation."	Thank you for your comment.
412	C	A Kemerer Comments	11/21/2013	parking	Keep parking minimums. In your zoning rewrite, please address the needs of DC residents and taxpayers like me, and don't be intimidated by the shrill voices of know-it-all, arriviste-parvenus - many of which don't even live in our city.	Thank you for your comment.
416	C	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	parking	Support of the proposed Zoning Re-Write as it pertains to the reduction of parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	parking	In the R5 and commercial zones OP is proposing a single parking requirement that exempts the first residential 4 units and applies 1 space for every 3 units, which would eliminate the escalating 1 per unit up to 1 per 4 unit current requirement. We have seen no persuasive information that this proposal won't result in exacerbating spillover parking in areas adjoining new multi-family buildings. The DC percentage of households owning cars has been pretty consistent, no big increase or decrease, according the Census Bureau over the past twenty years. Without neighborhood specific data demonstrating that car ownership, on-street demand, and business support lead to the reasonableness of reductions, we think reductions will create more frustration and anger in neighborhoods due to spillover. There is no guarantee that absent parking new units will be more affordable. If you want to ensure a connection between parking and affordability, you might consider continuing to require a special exception, but condition approval partly on a demonstration that a majority of the units will be affordable for a range of incomes. This is potentially an opportunity to leverage a waiver or exemption for a beneficial land use goal. In my neighborhood a building on Wisconsin Ave. was converted to housing and the 1 space per 3 unit parking requirement was provided but experience shows it is inadequate to meet the tenants' need for parking so they park in the street, and one tenant actually had the chutzpah to park in a resident's driveway and leave a note estimating when they would return. I receive constant complaints about how much on-street parking these tenants consume. We recommend that the minimum parking requirements continue and be reduced only by special exception.	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. OP researched issues by Census tract, Wards, ANC, District wide and by zones.
417	C	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	parking	Support of the proposed Zoning Re-Write as it pertains to the reduction of parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
419	C	Christian Crowley Comments	11/21/2013	parking	Support updating the DC zoning code. In particular, reducing parking minimums will recognize and support the District's transformation into a more walkable, bikable, and livable community. The District's 1950s-era zoning code could be updated to better match the dynamic city that Washington is quickly becoming. A zoning code at its best reflects and enables residents' ideal lifestyle: promoting outdoor activity, ensuring pedestrian safety, protecting local resources like historic neighborhoods, clear air and areas of vibrancy or quiet, and accommodating future residents sustainably. Revising the DC zoning code presents an opportunity to do all of this in a simpler way than our current code allows. Reducing parking requirements helps to create and preserve walkable neighborhoods, and allow the space currently occupied by unused cars to instead be enjoyed by the people who live and visit our city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
420	C	Capitol Hill Village Comments Vira Sisolak Testimony (on behalf of Donna Barbisch)	11/21/2013 2/8/14	parking	Believe that the current version of the rewrite is better than the earlier draft, but we continue to have concerns. As seniors, we have needs that are different from those of young people, who are the focus of presentations about the zoning rewrite. One of our concerns with the zoning rewrite is with transportation. It is important that parking minimums be maintained in all new residential construction, both low-density and high-density dwellings.	Thank you for your comment.
429	C	Bernard Ries Comments	11/24/2013	parking	There are legislative approaches for more carefully considering the possibility of easing parking minimums - indeed, the existing DC code and OP's proposal permits some regulated flexibility in appropriate circumstances. But in my view, OP's sledgehammer approach must be rejected at this time, a disposition which, I believe, would be consonant with what I regard as "wise Growth."	Thank you for your comment.
430	C	Steve Strauss Comments	11/26/2013	parking	Comments in support of the Office of Planning's proposed changes to vehicle parking requirements and downtown parking minimums within the Dc Zoning Code. Urge the Commission to approve the proposed parking updates to the zoning code. The issues have been more than adequately discussed, vetted, and considered by all reasonably committed parties. It is time to bring the District's Zoning Code into the early 21st century.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
442	C	Bob Summersgill ANC 3F07 Comments	12/5/2013	parking	I support the overall goals of the Office of Planning's proposed zoning regulations. In particular, Subtitle C, chapter 19 on parking. I appreciate the goals stated in section 1900.1, especially 1900.1(c), "Ensure that surface parking areas are planted and landscaped to be compatible with their surroundings, and to reduce environmental impacts." This goal would be better achieved if throughout the regulations, the Zoning Commission adopts a philosophy of no net loss of green space or trees. There will be occasions when design and practical matters require surface parking or buildings in existing green spaces, but an equal amount of green space and/or trees should be created and planted to make up for the loss. Sections 1905.4 and 1906. I should explicitly protect the total amount of green space and trees. Section 1903.2 should allow the Board to reduce parking minimums in order to protect trees and green space. Cutting down a tree solely to meet parking minimums should not be allowed. Section 1907.3(a)(2) is at odds with the Urban Forestry Administration's efforts to plant a tree in every empty tree box in the next five years. Instead of requiring developers to plant street trees, it would be preferable to require them to contribute to the tree fund or to plant trees on private land in the District; ideally, within the same Ward or ANC.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
449	C	Jim Campbell Comments	12/9/2013	parking	Strong support for eliminating or significantly reducing the requirement for parking for multifamily apartment communities in the District, particularly for affordable housing.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
452	C	Jane and Ken Lieberthal Comments	12/9/2013	parking	Urge the Commission to maintain parking space minimum requirements for new residential buildings in DC.	Thank you for your comment.
454	C	Carol Wayman Comments	12/12/2013	parking	I was very disturbed that Chairman Hood seemed to suggest that lowering the parking minimums was hostile and damaging to elderly people. As many of the witnesses testified, nothing could be further from the truth. Transit-rich environments allow people to age-in-place. People with limited mobility can get around more than relying on a vehicle or a personal driver. Naturally occurring retirement communities (NORCs) need higher density and more transit, not car dependency. I strongly support lowering parking minimums in order to increase housing that is in demand, lowering the cost of housing and reducing congestion and pollution. I also support raising fees on street parking permits. Each household should be required to pay a higher price for each additional car. If we maintain the status quo, we will not be able to provide enough housing to meet the need of new residents, we will increase congestion and pollution. We will also continue to make DC a more expensive place to live with fewer homes affordable to those of modest or extremely low-incomes.	Thank you for your comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
476	C	ANC2B Comments	1/23/2014	parking	ANC 2B does not support the growing practice of prohibiting residents with certain addresses from obtaining residential parking permits as a “trade off” with the neighborhood and Zoning Commission for reducing parking minimum requirements. This practice rewards developers without a proven benefit to the neighborhood while dismissing the rights of tax-paying citizens to the same city services as others. ANC2B encourages the Zoning Commission to cease any such future arrangements and instead to work with the District Department of Transportation, ANCs and developers on more reasonable, effective and egalitarian solutions to parking concerns. The Commission implores the District Department of Transportation to conduct a survey of existing parking utilization and conduct a public process to create new parking regulations which allow for our concerns about short term on-street parking, as expressed above, to be ameliorated, but, also believes the also-important five year process of the Zoning Update should not be delayed to conduct research in another part of the District’s government.	DDOT is studying on-street parking and reviewing the RPP regulations.
442	C	Bob Summersgill ANC 3F07 Comments	12/5/2013	parking	Reducing parking minimums-as the proposal calls for-is a step in the right direction, but it should go further. Subtitle I, Chapter 11 removes parking minimums for downtown. This is a good improvement over the existing regulations, but could be improved if a maximum is set. Parking minimums induce a demand for more cars, more congestion, and more dangers for pedestrians. Parking maximums ensure that we prioritize pedestrians and help make our neighborhoods more walkable. The proposal calls for shared parking (1901.9), car sharing (1901.11), and bike sharing (1907.3(b)) to offset the minimum parking requirement. Each of these has an effect of removing more than one car from the street. Each space taken by one of these shared systems should result in more than a one for one space. A ten for one substitution is appropriate, but as little as a two for one substitution is better than the proposed regulations. Section 1912.3 will induce a demand for SUVs. The issue of size of parking spaces should be left to market demand, or favor smaller cars. The zoning regulations can be the tool to eliminate impervious parking lots over time. Allowing for impervious pavements doesn't help the removal of impervious surfaces which, contribute to storm water runoff. Paragraphs 191 1 .8(b) and 1913. I can eliminate the phrase, "In addition to traditional impervious surfaces," and allow only pervious parking lot surfaces as we go forward. Section 1915 is excellent. Paragraph I915.7 might be better as a reference to section1703. These sections should be harmonious. Maisie Hughes of Casey Trees and Laszlo Bockh have both submitted testimony for strengthening Chapter 17, and I fully support their suggestions. A purely formatting issue, section 1915.7(d) through (g) are subservient to (c) and should be indented and renumbered (1) through (4).	Thank you for your supportive comment.
483	C	ANC 1C Comments	1/30/2014	parking	Personally in favor of proposal for mandatory relaxation of parking minimums for new developments in newly created high-transit zones. Thought it was appropriate for OP to try not just to catch up current zoning law to the present with its proposals in the ZRR, but also to propose regulations that would be useful for the future. There are many Adams Morgan residents glad to see the mandatory minimum parking requirements continue in place.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
484	C	ANC 3B Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	Urge Zoning Commission to approve the draft revisions to the zoning code. Supports parking proposals. The proposed changes are not radical; they are long overdue modifications to an out-of-date, 1950's zoning vision.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
486	C	ANC 3B Brian Cohen Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	The updated draft proposal contains limited changes to current mandated parking minimums. Current parking minimums undermine market forces, increase housing costs, reduce incentives to use mass transit, and damage the historic and walkable form of many neighborhoods. The changes proposed in the draft zoning code - which are most significant for downtown and areas well served by transit, would mitigate these problems. They would allow room for automobiles, but create new incentives and opportunities for environmentally- and neighborhood-friendly transportation options: walking, car- and bike-sharing, and mass transit. These changes would apply to Wisconsin Ave. in Glover Park and Cathedral Heights, which is served by numerous bus lines. We support the proposed changes to the zoning code with regard to parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
488	C	ANC 6C Mark Eckenwiler Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	Support denying the 50% parking reduction to any site within a residential zone covered by Subtitle D or E. Recommend that section 1902.1 be revised to clarify this point. The terms of subparagraph (a) should be incorporated into the general introductory clause, and subparagraphs (b) through (d) renumbered accordingly as (a) through (c).	Thank you for your comment. OP will provide clarifying language in Section 1902.1
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	process	I appreciate the extensive public engagement on zoning revisions over the past 6 years with the Office of Planning, the D.C. Council, and the Zoning Commission. Usually, a notice in the D.C. Register is all that is done to reach the public.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	I support the overall goals of the Office of Planning's proposed zoning regulations, in particular, Subtitle C, chapter 19 on parking. I appreciate the goals stated in section 1900.1, especially 1900.1(c), "Ensure that surface parking areas are planted and landscaped to be compatible with their surroundings, and to reduce environmental impacts." This goal would be better achieved, if throughout the regulations, the Zoning Commission adopts a philosophy of no net loss of green space or trees. There will be occasions when design and practical matters require surface parking or buildings to be built in existing green spaces, but an equal amount of green space and trees should be created and planted to make up for the loss. Sections 1905.4 and 1906.1 should explicitly protect the total amount of green space and trees. Section 1903.2 should allow the Board to reduce parking minimums in order to protect trees and green space. Cutting down a tree solely to meet parking minimums should not be allowed.	Thank you for your comment. OP will review the regulations and determine whether language can be proposed that would protect existing trees and green space, as they relate to parking.
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	Section 1907.3(a)(2) is at odds with the Urban Forestry Administration's efforts to plant a tree in every empty tree box in the next five years. Instead of requiring developers to plant street trees, it would be preferable to require them to contribute to the tree fund or to plant trees on private land in the District; ideally, within the same Ward or ANC.	Thank you for your comment. OP worked with the UFA in drafting the proposed regulations and will ensure that the draft text is consistent with District policies.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	The proposal calls for shared parking (1901.9), car sharing (1901.11), and bike sharing (1907.3(b)) to offset the minimum parking requirement. Each of these has an effect of removing more than one car from the street. Each space taken by one of these shared systems should result in more than a one for one space. A ten for one substitution is appropriate, but as little as a two for one substitution is better than the proposed regulations. Section 1912.3 will induce a demand for SUVs. The issue of size of parking spaces should be left to market demand, or favor smaller cars.	Thank you for your comments.
489	C	ANC 3F07 Bob Summersgill Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	The zoning regulations can be the tool to eliminate impervious parking lots over time. Allowing for impervious pavements doesn't help the removal of impervious surfaces which contribute to storm water runoff. Paragraphs 1911.8(b) and 1913.1 can eliminate the phrase, "In addition to traditional impervious surfaces," and allow only pervious parking lot surfaces as we go forward.	OP is not proposing to prohibit the installation of a traditional impervious surface parking lot but is proposing to encourage the installation of pervious parking surfaces in the future as new development comes online.
490	C	ANC 6B Brian Flahaven Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	ANC 6B strongly supports the Office of Planning's effort to update the city's zoning code and urges the Zoning Commission to approve the update as soon as possible. While ANC 6B is pleased with most aspects of OP's revised proposal, we were disappointed that OP weakened its original proposal on the elimination of parking minimums. ANC 6B urges the Zoning Commission to support OP's original proposal eliminating parking minimums required for new construction of single-family houses or residential developments of less than 10 units. ANC 6B also urges the Zoning Commission to support OP's original proposal eliminating parking minimums in Apartment and Commercial/Mixed Use zones within 1/2 mile of Metro stops or 1/4 miles of high-service bus corridors (so-called "transit zones"). The commission's vote on this position was 7-2. As our commission evaluated OP's original parking minimum proposal, we supported a long term vision of moving beyond auto-centered development and acknowledged that the proposed zoning regulation on parking minimums was a policy change that would have an impact on the built environment for decades to come. Many of us noted the declining share of DC residents who own vehicles, while others highlighted the arbitrary nature of the current parking minimum requirements. Unfortunately, OP's revised proposal continues to preserve arbitrary parking minimum requirements, with the exception of downtown. We urge the Zoning Commission to adopt OP's original proposal on parking.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
491	C	ANC 3D10 Joe Wisniewski Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	We also strongly oppose penalties, termed mitigation in the proposal, for exceeding parking minimums. What we support is the maintenance of the current regulations that allow minimum non-residential parking minimums to be reduced by Special Exception, and we would favor extending this process to residential parking minimums.	The OP proposal is not a penalty, but rather is intended to provide for some environmental and traffic related mitigation for the impacts of additional vehicles.
492	C	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	Parking – We oppose changing the school and church formula from a user based standard to a square footage standard. ANC 3C does not support reductions in the minimum parking requirements for multi-family residential zones or in commercial zones. We do not support administrative reductions in parking requirements based solely on proximity to frequent bus routes or a metro station. We also strongly oppose penalties, termed mitigation in the proposal, for exceeding parking minimums. What we support is the maintenance of the current regulations that allow minimum non-residential parking minimums to be reduced by Special Exception, and we would favor extending this process to residential parking minimums.	OP will be revising the proposal so parking is calculated in a manner similar to the current code.
496	C	ANC 3E Tom Quinn Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	Proposed Subtitle C, Section 1900.2 requires preparation of a parking plan for all projects and Proposed Subtitle C, Section 1900.3 authorizes the Zoning Administrator to request that DDOT review and make recommendations relating to parking plans prior to approving a building permit. These sections could be revised to require development of a Transportation and Parking Demand Management Plan ("Management Plan") for projects covered by Proposed Subtitle C, Section 1902.1, which could address parking supply in the area, access to private, off-site parking, any steps taken to avoid adverse effects flowing from the approach taken to providing onsite parking and plans for support for public transit, car-sharing and alternative transit modes. Notice of the Management Plan should be provided to the relevant ANC. DDOT should be called upon to create a menu of mitigation tools that an applicant can draw from in crafting a Management Plan, including template enforceable lease provisions to foreclose access to Residential Parking Permits (RPP) for residents of a new building as well as the kinds of measures listed to address mitigation when there is excess parking under Proposed Subtitle C, Section 1907 and included in the voluntary agreement crafted by our ANC in the 4600 Wisconsin A venue matter. DDOT shall approve such a Management Plan if it includes enforceable prohibitions on access to RPP for residents of the building as well as other incentives to encourage use of public transit and/or alternative modes of transit. If a Management Plan for such a project does not include enforceable restrictions on access to RPP or otherwise does not secure DDOT approval, a Special Exception should be required. Moreover, in all cases for projects in these zones, under Proposed Subtitle C, Section 1903.2, we would urge that significant weight be given to whether or not restrictions to access to RPP have been included, including for reductions below 50% of the otherwise governing minimum. DDOT should be empowered to require modifications to the Management Plan as a condition of approval of a building permit. Proposed Subtitle C, Section 1902.1 defines the places in which the 50% reduction applies. One of the locations - within a 1/4 mile of a streetcar line that is operating or under a construction contract --relies on a snapshot approach - designating a place with the knowledge that in the not too distant future there could be other places that would qualify based on characteristics, but do not based on timing. Another location - within a 1/4 mile of a WMATA identified Priority Corridor – allows for flexibility based on the actions of others in the future. An additional provision should be added allowing for changes and additions to the Proposed Subtitle C, Section 1902.1 list based either on Amendments to the Code or direction in the Comprehensive Plan. In the meantime, while we applaud the mitigation requirements when a site exceeds a minimum – we believe they should apply when they exceed a minimum by 100%. The approach on this score does not prohibit provision of additional parking but appropriately balances the goal of accommodating an owner, while also requiring the owner to support broader goals when their use of their property could create burdens for others.	Thank you for your comment. OP is proposing to require mitigation of some of the environmental and traffic realted impacts of excessive parking. Requests to reduce parking below that required would require a special exception, which would provide an opportunity for public input.
490	C	ANC 6B Brian Flahaven Testimony	1/30/2014	process	ANC 6B strongly supports the Office of Planning's effort to update the city's zoning code and urges the Zoning Commission to approve the update as soon as possible.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
498	C	ANC 5E05 Joyce Robinson-Paul Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	While ANC 6B is pleased with most aspects of OP's revised proposal, we were disappointed that OP weakened its original proposal on the elimination of parking minimums. ANC 6B urges the Zoning Commission to support OP's original proposal eliminating parking minimums required for new construction of single-family houses or residential developments of less than 10 units. ANC 6B also urges the Zoning Commission to support OP's original proposal eliminating parking minimums in Apartment and Commercial/Mixed Use zones within 1/2 mile of Metro stops or 1/4 miles of high-service bus corridors (so-called "transit zones"). The commission's vote on this position was 7-2. As our commission evaluated OP's original parking minimum proposal, we supported a long term vision of moving beyond auto-centered development and acknowledged that the proposed zoning regulation on parking minimums was a policy change that would have an impact on the built environment for decades to come. Many of us noted the declining share of DC residents who own vehicles, while others highlighted the arbitrary nature of the current parking minimum requirements. Unfortunately, OP's revised proposal continues to preserve arbitrary parking minimum requirements, with the exception of downtown. We urge the Zoning Commission to adopt OP's original proposal on parking.	Thank you for your comment. The Zoning Commission will determine whether it is appropriate to modify OP's proposal for required parking. OP is proposing to require TDM when parking provided is significantly in excess of that required. Requests to reduce parking below that required would require a special exception, which would provide an opportunity for public input.
500	C	Virginia Daley (Lanier Heights) comments	1/29/2014	parking	Avoid exacerbating off street parking: retain existing minimum parking requirements for new development and institutions. Remove proposed penalties for providing necessary parking supply. Ensure public process in response to any requests to reduce parking requirement.	Thank you for your comment.
492	C	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	We oppose changing the school and church formula from a user based standard to a square footage standard.	OP will be revising the proposal so parking is calculated in a manner similar to the current code.
492	C	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	ANC 3C does not support reductions in the minimum parking requirements for multi-family residential zones or in commercial zones. We do not support administrative reductions in parking requirements based solely on proximity to frequent bus routes or a metro station.	
501	C	Bonnie Roberts-Burke Comments	1/29/2014	parking	We want zoning solutions that would avoid exacerbating off street parking in Lanier Heights; retain existing minimum parking requirements for new development and institutions; remove proposed penalties for providing necessary parking supply; ensure public process in response to any requests to reduce parking requirement.	Thank you for your comment.
502	C	David Burke (Lanier Heights) Comments	1/29/2014	parking	We want zoning solutions that would avoid exacerbating off street parking in Lanier Heights; retain existing minimum parking requirements for new development and institutions; remove proposed penalties for providing necessary parking supply; ensure public process in response to any requests to reduce parking requirement.	Thank you for your comment. The Zoning Commission will determine whether it is appropriate to modify OP's proposal for required parking.
507	C	Marsha Lea (Ward 6) Comments	2/4/2014	parking	Supports GAR and parking.	Thank you for your comment.
508	C	Robert Ehrmann (Ward 6) Comments	2/4/2014	parking	Supports eliminating parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
509	C	AIA-DC (Ward 1) Comments	2/5/2014	parking	We strongly support the reduction in the parking minimums as it more accurately reflects changes in travel behavior that are present in the city today - let alone how they may further manifest in the coming decades. With Metro, buses, a new streetcar system, car-sharing services and Capital Bikeshare, to name just a few options, there are many ways to travel around the city other than by car. The proposed reductions to parking minimums in areas well served by transit, the standardization of 1:3 ratio for multifamily housing and allowing a special exception to further reduce parking are all reasonable.	Thank you for the supportive comment.
510	C	Carolyn Stoesen (Ward 1) Comments	2/5/2014	parking	The Subtitle C Parking proposals that lower minimum parking requirements make sense for DC. One of the things I love about DC is the fact that you don't need a car to live here. I lived in DC for 10 years without a car, biking most places, or taking buses and Metro. The carless lifestyle in DC has gotten even easier recently (I love Capital BikeShare) and the increase in local, easily-reached retail, restaurants, and community amenities make DC better than ever for residents like me. I think the parking proposals can be good for all DC residents. Many seniors don't have cars, don't want to drive, or are no longer able to drive, but in DC it is easy to get to services and stores without a car. Our connected neighborhoods help seniors maintain community, avoid isolation, and stay independent. Ensuring that we are prioritizing housing, and not parking, will help us remain a great place to grow old. I love DC and I think we are moving in the right direction. Making changes to these Zoning Regulations can help ensure that I can stay here, even if I don't have a car, and maintain an integrated, active, connected lifestyle as I age. And it will help DC's diverse workforce, like those employed at Annie's Hardware, enjoy the benefits of our city.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	parking	Section 1901.13 requires all non-required parking spaces to comply with the applicable provisions of Chapter 19, including access and size. This requirement is a change from the current Zoning Regulations, which permit non-conforming spaces to be provided in a parking garage but do not permit such spaces to be counted for the zoning minimum. For example, tandem spaces are commonly provided in below-grade parking facilities, but only count as one space for zoning. This section would eliminate the ability for tandem spaces or other types of non-compliant spaces to be provided above the minimum number of parking spaces required by zoning. Accordingly, the last phrase of this section should be deleted.	Thank you for your comment. OP's intent was not to foreclose the possibility of providing additional, non-compliant spaces, such as tandem spaces.
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	parking	Section 1907 - We support the errata contained in OP's report. The proposed provisions were too burdensome. With the changes proposed by OP (i.e., increasing the factor to two times the base requirement and removing the required reductions from Section 1902), the provisions are still onerous but more in line with market requirements for parking.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
511	C	Vornado/Charles E. Smith Comments	2/5/2014	parking	Section 1908 - We have major concerns with the specific provisions relating to car sharing spaces for a variety of reasons and suggest this section be eliminated. If maintained, we recommend the following revisions. First, car-sharing services are for-profit companies and as such, should not receive free parking spaces in privately owned garages. A building owner should be permitted to produce revenue for construction and provision of a car-sharing space. Accordingly, Section 1908.4 should be revised to delete the phrase "at no cost." Second, the requirement for car-sharing spaces to be "accessible at all times to subscribers" poses a serious security issue for both residential and office buildings. Specifically, residential garages must be secured to provide safe access to the residents. Allowing unlimited building access to car-sharing subscribers eliminates that secured environment compromising the lease-ability of the building. Moreover, garages do not operate 24/7 and are in some cases limited only to the tenants of the building. To require accessibility at all times to car-sharing subscribers creates operational and safety concerns.	OP will look at best practices for providing car share vehicles in private garages and refine the provisions, as appropriate.
512	C	Christian Alexander (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	parking	The parking revisions remove costly subsidies for cars and increases density, which allows for the possibility of more affordable and diverse housing.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
513	C	Christopher Winnike (Ward 6) Comments	2/6/2014	parking	Supports the proposed update to the zoning code, particularly the reduction in the minimum parking requirements. Disappointed that the proposals still require much more parking than is needed.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
517	C	Colin Hughes Testimony	2/8/2014	parking	Supports the proposed zoning amendments. The relaxation of parking minimums still allows parking where the citizens want it. It also allows there to be no parking where the citizens want no parking. It allows people to make more use of their properties with accessory and alley dwelling units and allows more mixed uses in our neighborhoods. That is good. The new zoning code gives more freedom for city residents to build and travel as they like, and it will be a more livable city for it.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
519	C	Donna Barbisch Testimony	2/8/2014	parking	One of our concerns with the zoning rewrite is transportation. Most of us can no longer ride bicycles and should probably not try, but the rewrite puts an emphasis on this means of transportation. Also, for many of us, walking more than a few blocks to a Metrorail station or a bus stop is beyond what we can do. However, we need reliable transportation that can get us where we need to go. So, may of us need our cars, and cars require parking spaces. In section of the city such as Capitol Hill, on-street parking has become very difficult to find in recent years. For this reason, it is important that parking minimums be maintained in all new residential construction, both low-density and high-density dwellings. Particular concern in areas that are being included in the downtown, such as NoMa and stadium area.	Thank you for your comment. OP is not proposing to eliminate existing parking and the revised parking requirements would impact on-site parking for new development. Street parking is regulated by DDOT.
520	C	Donna McLean and Marcus Peacock	2/8/2014	parking	Shouldn't allow residents of buildings with no parking to get RPP stickers.	Residential Permit Parking (RPP) is managed by DDOT and additional information about the program, including eligible blocks can be found online at http://ddot.dc.gov/node/547972 .
523	C	Stacey Kornegay Comments	2/7/2014	parking	I also support parking reforms as currently stand in the draft, as a compromise that can support ADUs.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
528	C	Tom and Dorothy Belcher	2/7/2014	parking	The zoning code should include a minimum parking requirement, especially for residential buildings to accommodate travel for the disabled, or when public transit is not a reasonable option, and to provide spaces for car sharing, regardless of the proximity to Metro stations.	Thank you for your comment. OP has amended our original proposal, so parking to maintain a parking requirement, other than downtown, in part to help address the needs of people with disabilities.
532	C	Karyn Posner-Mullen Comments	2/10/2014	parking	The zoning code should include a minimum parking requirement, especially for residential buildings to accommodate travel for the disabled, or when public transit is not a reasonable option, and to provide spaces for car sharing, regardless of the proximity to Metro stations.	Thank you for your comment. OP has amended our original proposal, so parking to maintain a parking requirement, other than downtown, in part to help address the needs of people with disabilities.
535	C	Kathleen Quinn Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	I support and urge you to support the proposed changes to parking minimums as currently proposed by the Office of Planning.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
539	C	Larry Martin Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	Reducing parking minimums in areas well served by transit is a good move.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
540	C	Gary Malasky Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	A trend which is starting to show up in the region is building larger apartment units with more bedrooms. While the supply of small units is plentiful, there has been little to meet the expected demand from couples with children and empty nesters who want to stay in the city, but need space. The proposed minimum parking regulations are fine, especially for buildings with all smaller units. Ultimately, the market and lender requirements will determine how much parking is actually built. I am somewhat concerned about the provision to establish TDM guidelines when parking provided exceeds 150% of the zoning standard. That provision is fine for efficiency and 1 bedroom apartments, but I think 2 bedroom and larger units should be exempt. It is important to keep those people needing the larger units in the city, and to recognize that their needs may be different from those occupying the smaller units.	Thank you for your comments. OP has already proposed raising the standard at which some level of parking mitigation would be required.
542	C	William N. Myhre Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	Express support for the proposed changes that will eliminate or reduce parking minimums. Transit zones are the very places where we should focus dense development, to create more opportunities for affordable housing, and to provide options for people who are interested in car-free or car-lite living. Imposing parking minimums of projects in transit zones needlessly raises project costs, which get passed through - making already expensive housing even more unaffordable for average citizens. It is in the long-term best interest of all who live in DC to provide housing that it more attainable to a wide swath of individuals - our teachers, government workers, etc. - not just those at the upper end of the income scale. Reiterate support for proposal to reduce or eliminate parking minimums as part of the new Zoning Code.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
543	C	Bernard Ries Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	Life without ready access to a car would be, in fact, a diminished life for us. Having cheerfully paid District taxes for more than 5 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.	Thank you for your comment. OP is not proposing to eliminate existing parking and the revised parking requirements would impact on-site parking for new development. Street parking is regulated by DDOT.
549	C	Thomas C. Hier Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	Supports revisions to the 1950s-era zoning regulations related to parking - specifically to urge the Commission to support the removal of parking minimums downtown and ease requirements for parking minimums in transit corridors across the city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
551	C	Susan MacKnight Comments	2/11/2014	parking	Opposes parking proposal. Should retain the current minimum of one off-street parking space for every two to four units in new residential buildings.	Thank you for your comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
551	C	Susan MacKnight Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	The draft requirement for onsite parking in projects in transit-centric zones is clearly untenable. I urge the Zoning Commission to direct OP to rework its proposal to reflect the actual parking demands generated by apartment and condo developments. At the very least, the result of this process should be retention of the current minimum of one off-street parking space for every two to four units in new residential buildings.	Thank you for your comment.
552	C	Jessica Zdeb Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	Speak in support of the updates to DC's Zoning Code, especially reforms to parking requirements for residential development. I believe that these reforms can help make DC a more environmentally sustainable and affordable city which are two aspects of this city that I value highly. The current zoning code will not lead to development that supports a green, diverse city, and that's what I want to see. I hope you will bring this long process of the zoning update to a close by supporting these changes which will help make and keep DC the modern, world-class city it's meant to be.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
552	C	Jessica Zdeb Testimony	2/11/2014	parking	Supports updates to DC's Zoning Code, especially reforms to parking requirements for residential development. The reforms can make DC a more environmentally sustainable and affordable city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
555	C	Kelly Blynn Comments	2/12/2014	parking	Express support for the updates to the Zoning Code, which I believe are essential to setting a blueprint to guide our changing city to be more sustainable and equitable as it grows. I believe the proposal to lower parking minimums that is a part of this update is one of the many measure we must take to make it possible to build and preserve more affordable housing in the city. Overhauling the 1950s zoning code is the right move for DC. Moving away from car dependence is not just a fad embraced by young people like myself. It is essential for embracing what I believe are the twin crises of our time: climate change and inequality. By creating a blueprint for DC's future growth that supports sustainable transportation choices and affordable housing, we can simultaneously lower carbon emissions and lessen the high burden of transportation and housing costs.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
556	C	Ross Dannenberg Comments	2/12/2014	parking	I also support parking reforms as currently stand in the draft, as a compromise that can support ADUs.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
557	C	Commissioner Carolyn Cook ANC SMD 3/4G01 Comments	2/12/2014	parking	Recommend you retain existing minimum parking requirements for new development and institutions. Do not impose penalties for providing necessary parking supply and guarantee a public process in response to reducing parking requirements. I would also add with the city's increased push for ridership on Metro bus and rail, where are the lower costs passed on to us as their customers? Why does DC continue to operate public parking garages unlike our neighbors in Bethesda, Rockville and Arlington County that charge exorbitant, inconsistent rate? Should district residents not be entitled to subsidized parking as an incentive to ride public transportation?	Thank you for your comment. OP is proposing to require mitigation of some of the environmental and traffic related impacts of excessive parking.
560	C	Garrett Honea Testimony	2/12/2014	parking	Emphatically supports the proposed update to the DC zoning code - in particular the proposed reforms to parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
566	C	Chrissy Martin Comments	2/14/2014	parking	Supports the proposed update to the DC zoning codes, especially the revised parking minimums and the allowance of more corner stores, because I truly love my neighborhood.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
570	C	William H. Mosley Comments	2/18/2014	parking	Supports proposed changes to required parking; however, could have gone further in reducing or eliminating requirements for parking.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
575	C	Jim Feldman Comments	2/20/2014	parking	Strongly supports zoning changes that reduce parking minimum requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
577	C	Mary Reuling Comments	2/24/2014	parking	Express support for the proposed reduction and removal of parking minimums in Subtitle C. This proposal will help make our neighborhoods more walkable, decrease traffic congestion, and support the more environmentally sustainable traffic choices of the nearly 40% of DC household that, like us, do not own a car.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
578	C	Nancy Fox Comments	2/24/2014	process	You have the opportunity and responsibility to set in place a new zoning framework that can accommodate a future that we can't possibly conceive right now. The last zoning overhaul happened some 55 years ago, and it's possible that the zoning overhaul you are contemplating will survive longer than any of us before it is fully considered again. With your actions, you could take the safe route, avoiding and changes to parking regulations that might be considered controversial. Or, your actions can bequeath a legacy that can provide our children and future residents with the possibility a more sustainable, more livable city by institutionalizing a more flexible approach to parking as the city continues to develop. I wholeheartedly encourage you to embrace the latter choice.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
581	C	Daniel Levine Testimony	2/25/2014	parking	In favor of the proposed zoning change. In particular, I support provisions that would relax parking requirements for new buildings in certain areas. While these provisions fall short of the full set of reforms the District requires, I support the compromises made and hope the commission puts them in place without further delay.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
583	C	Michael Holzheimer Testimony	2/25/2014	parking	Express strong support for the proposed update to the DC zoning code, especially reforming the outdated parking requirements. I urge the Zoning Commission to revise DC's 1950s-era zoning regulations for parking, and help to take a great city with great neighborhoods and turn it into an even more vibrant, walkable, and inclusive place. Eliminating and reducing parking minimums will help make this city that I've come to love even more walkable and inclusive.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
594	C	Jeremy Van Ess Testimony	2/26/2014	parking	Support for provisions regarding accessory apartments and corner stores - two things that along with parking updates will make our city more livable, accessible and friendly.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
599	C	Sebastien Guilnard Testimony	2/26/2014	parking	Support the change to remove restrictions on parking, however, would like to see some provision for large residential and commercial buildings, whether they provide vehicular parking or not, to provide secure bicycle parking on premises. New construction should be required to provide a good amount of dedicated motorcycle parking.	Thank you for your supportive comment. OP is proposing bicycle parking requirements in Subtitle C, Chapter 20 that are not linked to the vehicular parking requirements, which is the current practice.
603	C	Nancy Fox Testimony	2/26/2014	parking	Institutionalize a more flexible approach to parking.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
604	C	Megan Kanagy Testimony	2/26/2014	parking	Supports the proposed update to the DC zoning code, especially the reforms concerning parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
605	C	Darnell Grisby Testimony	2/26/2014	parking	Supports the proposed revisions, especially reducing minimum parking requirements in new development.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
606	C	Tom Millar Testimony	2/26/2014	parking	Supports lower minimum parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
607	C	Lyn Stoesen Testimony	2/26/2014	parking	Supports lowering parking minimums - will help slow increases in housing costs and can provide more residential options near jobs.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
610	C	James Daniel Malouff Comments	2/27/2014	parking	Supports efforts to reduce parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
611	C	Thomas Millar Comments	2/27/2014	parking	Supports the lower minimum parking requirements for Subtitle C.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
617	C	ANC 4C Report	3/5/2014	parking	Recommend that the Board retain existing minimum parking requirements for new development and institutions; ensure that the community retains a voice in any requests to reduce parking requirements; and eliminate penalty for too much parking spaces. The issue of when off-site parking can serve as a substitute for the on-site parking requirement should be addressed in the regs. The public should know when or under what conditions off-site parking can be substituted for on-site parking requirements in an open process such as a rulemaking which sets out guidance.	Thank you for your comment.
665	C	Joyce Rice-Saunders Comments	3/10/2014	parking	Specific comments regarding RPP in Ward 3.	We have forwarded these comments to DDOT, the agency responsible for RPP and on-street parking.
681	C	Alex Block Comments	3/15/2014	parking	I support any effort to reduce the amount of required parking in the city. The Comprehensive Plan calls for regulations that are responsive to demand. Given the rise of car-free living, for any given development, a plausible amount of new parking demand is zero. Therefore, the least restrictive regulation would be to not require parking at all. Surely, developers and builders should be allowed to provide parking if necessary, but they should not be required to build it at all. In many cases the best way for the Zoning Commission to achieve the city's goals (as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan) is not via regulation, but via relaxation of those regulations. Cities are complex environments, and we should recognize our limited ability to regulate such complex systems efficiently - as well as the benefits of allowing these complex systems and environments to thrive without undue meddling. The proposed changes in the zoning code are a promising start towards reforming parking requirements. I support the proposed changes.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
685	C	S. Jean Stewart Comments	4/2/2014	parking	Would like to see modifications of the parking minimum rules for Adams Morgan's specific needs, so that overall reductions in minimum parking requirements do not further exacerbate our already congested traffic and very difficult parking situation. Hope that new parking minimums for the neighborhood would be designed so as not to discourage residence for families, people with disabilities, and older adults who may not be fully able bodied.	Thank you for your comment.
692	C	Daniel Winston Comments	4/11/2014	parking	Strongly urge ZC to support a revision of the District's Zoning Code. Relaxing parking mandates, in a thoughtful manner, will have a positive impact on our city's livability and affordability.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
694	C	Stephan Roha Comments	4/17/2014	parking	I urge the ZC to revise DC's 1950s-era zoning regulations for parking, and help to take a great city with great neighborhoods and turn it into an even more vibrant, walkable, and inclusive place. Eliminating and reducing parking minimums will help make this city that I love even more walkable and inclusive.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
696	C	Anne Womeldorf Comments	4/22/2014	parking	Propose that the Commission retain existing minimum parking for new development and institutions, remove proposed penalties for providing necessary parking supply and ensure public process in response to any requests to reduce parking requirements.	Thank you for your comment.
697	C	Laurence Pearl Comments	4/22/2014	parking	Propose that the Commission retain existing minimum parking for new development and institutions, remove proposed penalties for providing necessary parking supply and ensure public process in response to any requests to reduce parking requirements.	Thank you for your comment.
472, 473	C	Colleen Hawkinson Comments	1/10/2014	parking	Urge ZC to update and simplify the zoning code and support accessory dwelling units, parking minimums and corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comments
499, 529	C	ANC 6B05 Brian Pate Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	The relief granted in the ZRR is welcome, though an imperfect compromise that still results in an arbitrary minimum. That said, it's important for the ZC to wield its influence to ensure that DDOT amends the RPP program so that those developers that benefit from parking minimum relief do not simply off-load the problem onto adjacent residential streets.	Thank you for your supportive comments. DDOT is conducting an on-street parking study and expects the first draft to be available by early 2014.
504, 505	C	Malcolm M. Kenton Testimony	2/2/2014	parking	Supports reducing or eliminating parking minimums.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
written testimony not submitted	C	Dan Miller Testimony	2/8/2014	parking	Urge the Commission to pass the update, and to make sure that residents can live more affordably and more conveniently whether or not they own a car.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
587	C	Melissa Kramer Comments	2/26/2014	parking	Express strong support for the zoning code update, especially reforming the outdated parking requirements. The 1958 zoning code reflects the outdated belief that what would make the city great is a car for every one of these people with a place to park it at home and everywhere else that they might want to go. But this neighborhood is not improved by mid-block curb cuts that make walking around less appealing and more dangerous, nor by the traffic that's generated when the cheapest and easiest way to get around is by one's own car. I should be clear that my husband and I own a car and do not have access to an off-street parking space. We have the same frustrations as everyone with how difficult it can be to park in the neighborhood. However, I'd like to see DC address that problem with a comprehensive neighborhood-wide parking management strategy that recognizes the true market value of DC's public street-side spaces. Requiring private developers to provide something at great expense increases the cost of housing even for people who choose not to own a car and will not solve our problems as long as DC continues to give away the product nearly for free. I want more people to live in the neighborhood and continue to support the things here that I love, but I certainly hope that more and more of those people choose to live here without a car. If developers' market research indicates that they can attract those types of buyers or renters, DC should not stand in their way and demand that they create parking they don't want to sell, that people don't want to pay for, and that I don't want in the neighborhood.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
571	C, D	Hugh Morris Comments	2/18/2014	accessory apartments	Supports easing restrictions on Accessory Dwelling Units.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
571	C, D	Hugh Morris Comments	2/18/2014	parking	As the variety of transportation option INCREASES, the need for accommodating the private automobile (on both public and private land) DECREASES.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
616	C, D	Jonathan Parker Comments	3/5/2014	parking	We need a modern set of rules which allows for maximum development flexibility, and one that encourages more walking, biking, and transit use, and less driving, as the demand for car use declines in our city. In particular, we should not only allow, but encourage less required parking, and this code fulfills those goals.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
695	C, D	Georgia Gann Comments	4/18/2014	parking	Requiring mitigation improvements like extra bicycle parking, tree planting, electric car charging stations, etc., for projects providing additional parking will promote balance in the district. These mitigation activities will also benefit long-term stability in our city.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
695	C, D	Georgia Gann Comments	4/18/2014	parking	Increasing flexibility regarding parking requirements (including incorporating shared parking, reducing or eliminating parking minimums) will help ensure that the city infrastructure meets residents' needs, while allowing the city and associated developers to be responsive to market demand.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
421, 422	C, D	Louis Thomas Comments	11/21/2013	parking	In strong support of updating the outdated zoning code, particularly in regards to the reduction in vehicle parking requirements.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
425, 426	C, D	Henry McCaslin Comments	11/22/2013	parking	Express support for eliminating minimum parking requirements for new buildings that have access to transit resources and modifying our zoning code to allow for accessory apartments and corner stores.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
427, 428	C, D	Elizabeth Carswell Comments	11/22/2013	parking	Walkability and diversity (across many dimensions - age, ethnicity, gender, etc.) make this city great. Please update the zoning codes regarding parking requirements so that we can continue to feed the fantastic growth this city is experiencing.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
432, 433	C, D	Ellen Bass Comments	12/2/2013	parking	I write in support of the revisions to the zoning code proposed to reduce minimum parking requirements for new construction in areas where public transit is available and in support of easing approval requirements for certain accessory apartments. My overall rationale is that these revisions are supportive of good urbanism: encouraging walkable neighborhoods, promoting (but not requiring) use of transportation modes other than cars where most feasible, improving the environment by addressing the causes of global warming, promoting less expensive housing alternatives, and growing the tax base.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
450, 451	C, D	ANC 3D Comments	12/9/2013	parking	Oppose the revisions proposed by OP to update parking requirements for new developments and to support maintaining existing regulations for parking requirements.	Thank you for your comment.
487	C, D, E, X, Y, Z	ANC 5B Shirley Rivers Smith Testimony	1/30/2014	parking	I strongly oppose the adoption of the Office of Planning's proposed minimum and maximum parking requirement changes. At this time I recommend that further study need to be done.	Thank you for your comment. The Office of Planning has amended the parking proposal considerably as a result of community input; and for example is not proposing a parking maximum in any zone.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Education, private, uses and residences for teachers and staff of a private school, but not including a trade school, shall be permitted by special exception subject to existing conditions with the exception of parking based on number of faculty and staff. This is very problematic as adequate onsite parking has been one of the most important regulations related to both campus plans and private schools located in residential zones. The previous parking formulas should be brought forward into the new code.	OP will be revising the proposal so parking is calculated in a manner similar to the current code.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	parking	There is no longer a requirement to provide one off-street parking space in low density residential zones unless access from an improved alley at least 10 feet in width is available.	Requiring a curb cut to allow a driveway from a public street disrupts the pedestrian way, increases pavement in front of a house and reduces on-street parking by the same number of required parking spaces, so there is no gain in requiring off-street parking in the R-1 zones.
235	D	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	parking	Supports reducing parking requirements in certain areas served by transit, and for new commercial and residential projects where current parking requirements are excessive.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
239	D	Brian Levy Comments	11/6/2013	parking	I strongly support the proposed changes to new zoning rules that allow residential alley dwellings in all residentially zoned alley areas. In addition, I support a change that allows an accessory apartment on an alley dwelling by special exemption, as some alley lots are very large and could easily accommodate both a primary and secondary structure.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
246	D	Donna Brockington ANC 4D Testimony	11/6/2013	parking	Opposes the reduction in parking minimums for multi-unit housing developments that will be located on streets adjacent to and bordering residential streets so that the occupants of the multi-unit housing will not have to compete for existing residential parking.	DDOT is conducting an on-street parking study and expects the first draft to be available by early 2014.
525B	D	Sarah Stevens Comments	2/7/2014	parking	Support parking reforms as currently stand in the draft, as a compromise that can support ADUs.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
263	E	Robert Robinson & Sherril Berger Comments	11/7/2013	parking	Parking - DC encourages commuter traffic.	Thank you for your comment.
685	F	S. Jean Stewart Comments	4/2/2014	parking	Urge the Zoning Commission take into serious consideration the DC Comprehensive Plan, and to ensure that the new regulations do not inhibit the Plan's vision of diverse and livable communities for all DC residents, including preservation of the character of unique neighborhoods. Quality of life is beginning to erode in the rush to overdevelop everything in sight. Hope that the changes in the zoning regulations will permit retaining the overall character of this attractive, lively, diverse, and livable neighborhood that I love.	The Zoning Regulations adopted by the Zoning Commission may not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
139	I	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Parking -- The new zoning rules for downtown zones would not require any minimum parking and in fact appears to “penalize” anything provided over what is required. Some of the penalties—electric car charging station, bicycle racks and bike sharing space, and car sharing service space—don’t seem appropriate or likely to be applied in a way that efficiently meets needs in the area. Why provide free space to a commercial car sharing company or bicycle sharing enterprise? Do we really need those services provided in the random locations that these “penalties” might apply? The Office of Planning points out that over 38% of DC households don’t own cars (which apparently hasn’t changed in the past 10 years but is a larger number since the number of households has increased). For those that do, why should they have to choose between living downtown and owning a car? It’s true that many DC residents do commute by bus, Metro, or bike. However, this overlooks the huge influx of commuters from outside DC that arrive in cars. Do we want DC to continue to be the Central Business District of the metropolitan region? Is it realistic to think that people won’t drive to work because there is no space in their building? Or will some enterprising developer build an above ground garage to accommodate the likely influx of cars and we’ll be back to having multi-story parking garages. Once a building is built without below ground parking, it’s not like you can retrofit it with some. In the current downtown, the public underground parking garages provide parking during the day for workers and visitors to doctors’ offices and other businesses and in the evening for diners and theater patrons and on weekends for activities including shopping and visiting galleries. Certainly, underground parking is much better both visually and functionally and will realistically be needed. Letting “the market” or “developers” decide may sound simple and rational, but is that how the public interest is best served? Why not maintain the current parking minimums and let developers and the market demonstrate based on some more rational analysis why less parking would be needed for their project by exception. “We don’t want more cars downtown because it’s already congested and we want more people to ride bicycles and take public transit” may be a good aspiration but it is not analysis. The reverse of ‘if you build it, they will come’, i.e., if you don’t build it, they won’t come, does not necessarily apply. Might it not be beneficial to have public underground parking and actually get rid of on-street parking to free up space for bicycles and transit?	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website.
142	I	Sue Hemberger Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Parking and Land Use. One of the most distinctive aspects of our CBD, is that almost all parking has been undergrounded and, as a result, less than 1% of our land is devoted exclusively to parking. By contrast, many other US cities devote 25% of their land downtown to aboveground parking structures and surface lots. With both changes in the Height Act and the elimination of on-site parking requirements downtown currently on the table, the incentives that have made undergrounding near-universal in DC will disappear.	Thank you for your comments. OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website.
236	I	Roger Lewis Comments	11/6/2013	parking	Supports reducing parking requirements in certain areas served by transit, and for new commercial and residential projects where current parking requirements are excessive. Allowing accessory apartments in low-density residential house zones, if specified criteria and conditions are met. Allowing modestly sized, convenience-style corner stores in rowhouse and multi-family residential zones, if specified criteria and conditions are met.	Thank you for your comment. The current provision that above grade structured parking would could towards FAR would be retained in the proposed code, so OP does not see how the proposal would encourage above grade parking downtown.
331	I	Gerald Fittipaldi Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	Supports reducing parking requirements in certain areas served by transit, and for new commercial and residential projects where current parking requirements are excessive.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
336	I	Allen Greenberg Testimony	11/14/2031	parking	Supports eliminating parking minimums downtown. Should continue to pursue maximums or capping the total number of downtown parking spaces.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
341	I	Payton Chung Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	Supports removal of parking minimums in downtown.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
342	I	Zachary Smith Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	Strong support for the proposed update to the DC Zoning Code to remove parking minimums downtown.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
344	I	Jo-Ann Neuhaus Penn Quarter Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	Good reason to require a minimum number of below grade parking spaces, in fact if none are provided, residents, developers, cultural venues, retailers, and restaurants have expressed concern. Request that you include a minimum parking requirement, especially for residential buildings, in the Downtown zone, regardless of the proximity to Metro stations.	DDOT addresses RPP issues. Will need an RPP exclusion in some of these areas, and OP will review the proposal.
345	I	Cheryl Cort Coalition for Smarter Growth Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	Support proposed reforms to the 1958 zoning code, which would eliminate parking requirements from the downtown.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
339	I, J, K	Jonathan Weidman Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	Express strong support for the proposed update to the DC zoning code for the removal of parking minimums in downtown. Urge the ZC to revise DC’s 1950s-era zoning regulations to continue transforming Downtown into a more vibrant, walkable, and inclusive place. Also want to express strong support for the reduction of parking minimums proposed in Subtitle C.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
133	J	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Subtitle J bases parking on the square feet of the facility rather than the number of vehicles related to the facility and vehicles of employees of the PDR zone. The current code and initial ZRR proposal (February 11, 2011) based parking on the number of commercial vehicles related to the facility. PDR parking requirements need to be reviewed and changed to ensure appropriate parking exists on site and does not spill over into nearby residential zones.	Thank you for the comment.
338	J	Alma Gates Neighbors United Trust Testimony	11/14/2013	parking	The proposed parking requirement of 1.67 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft., in excess of 3,000 sq. ft., may or may not suffice to accommodate off street parking for both site related and employee’s vehicles. OP has not provided the basis for its calculations for PDR parking or other applications where GFA is used as the basis for numbers of parking spaces. Does the GFA-based parking formula improve the impacts of parking associated with PDR zones or will spill over parking become an unintended consequence of the zoning revision?	OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website. OP researched issues by Census tract, Wards, ANC, District wide and by zones.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
134	X	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	parking	Private school plans were not discussed or reviewed by the ZRR Task Force. Absent in § 103 is any referral or reference to parking other than the requirement for a parking plan under § 101.15. The proposed new parking formula for private schools is found in C § 1901.5 and requires a minimum of 1.25 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of GFA. This replaces the current parking formulas or private schools found in Title 11 § 2102 that calculates parking according to potential use by faculty and staff for lower grades and number of seats in the largest common space. The existing requirement is based on actual numbers, not some arbitrary figure pulled out of the air by the Office of Planning. Chapter 4 Applications for Amendment to Create a New Zone - it is unclear if these are the procedures to be followed for a "customized zone." Chapter 6 Design Review § 600.1(e) - is it possible to grant flexibility in building bulk without increasing density. Is Design Review required for theoretical lot subdivisions (C § 407)?	Proposed for better predictability of minimums and to accommodate school programmatic changes without requiring returning to BZA. Reviewed metrics used by other jurisdictions, which tended more toward structure. Will return to employee based standards.
348	X	Alma Gates Neighbors United Trust Comments	11/17/2013	parking	Retain current parking formula for private schools and reference them in Subtitle X. Student driving and parking policies should be clearly outlined in the school's operations manual and made a condition of special exception approval.	Proposed for better predictability of minimums and to accommodate school programmatic changes without requiring returning to BZA. Reviewed metrics used by other jurisdictions, which tended more toward structure. Will return to employee based standards.
415	X	Larry Werner Testimony	11/4/2013	parking	Send the proposal back to the Office of Planning with instructions to take into account public concerns about these (parking, ADUs, transit zones, etc.) and hundreds of other issues and questions in open and public meetings.	Thank you for your comment.
480	C	Mike Gold Vice Chair ANC 3D Comments	1/29/2014	parking	Oppose the revisions proposed by OP to update parking requirements for new developments and to support maintaining existing regulations for parking requirements.	Thank you for your comment. The Zoning Commission will determine whether it is appropriate to modify OP's proposal for required parking.
377	C	David Ogunsanya City First Homes Testimony	11/19/2013	parking IZ	Commend the ZC for creating the Districts IZ program.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
223	B	Judi Jones ANC 4B07 Testimony	11/5/2013	PDR	CM-1 to P-1 - CM-1 includes Commercial and Light Manufacturing. As I understand the term, it does not include repair although there are at least six auto repair shops within the Chillum Place industrial zone. The industrial use should not change to fit without having some saturation point. Those industries that impact the quality of life issues should be special exception instead of matter of right. Auto repair shops impact the environment tremendously. Storm water runoff along chillum place impacts the community in a way that unless you live in the area, you wouldn't see. Our community has tried to resolve/relieve the situation for the last 15 years. Then, Ward 4 CM Fenty did take on the task of trying to resolve the problem with a comprehensive approach to redesigning the commercial strip back in 2006. Saturation and industrial use should be considered part of the variance process rather than special exception when allowing repair shops a c of o when a industrial zone is at saturation for a business that would impact the environment negatively. As an ANC and neighbor to an industrial zone, repair shops have pulled the most safety and environmental resources. More consideration for their existence near residential areas should be a special exception rather than matter of right. Their description as repair within the CM to P definition should be deleted and explicitly defined with environmental restrictions in place. One of the restrictions should be consulting with the residential community (ANC) about its operation and impact on the environment.	OP will review the uses and propose a limit and special exception standards.
223	B	Judi Jones ANC 4B07 Testimony	11/5/2013	PDR	Industrial zones should be categorized as potential overlays or PUDES. No residential area that abuts an industrial zone wants the industrial zone to stay the way it is. The ward 4 CM uses the few industrial zones as the toilet of Ward 4 without consulting the ANCs. To move industries that are contrary to the plans of the community and some businesses on the industrial strip is asking for political suicide. The industrial zone in the Lamond/TakomaDC area has a non-profit community development corporation, Lamond CDC. It was formed to facilitate the design and implementation of the industrial zone. There are six private and charter schools along the chillum place strip. While the community is happy to work with the educational opportunities of the schools, I, as ANC am constantly fighting off marijuana clinics/outlets and auto repair shops.	There is a new proposal in the draft text to require a 25 foot buffer on industrial lands when adjacent to residential lands. The buffer requirements include both a solid screening, such as a fence or wall, and landscape screening (Sub J Section 209). The section is title "Transition Section" but could be renamed "Buffer" if the Commission finds it a more direct section title. With respect to the issue of specific uses, OP will review the uses and propose a limit and special exception standards.
105	J	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	PDR	Concern about FAR limitation introduced for "other" vs. "industrial" uses.	There is a limited supply of industrial land in the District and it should be preserved and protected for appropriate PDR uses.
133	J	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	PDR	Subtitle J carries forward into the new code many of the likely environmental justice issues that currently exist in the C-M and M zones where PDR zones abut residential zones.	There is a new proposal in the draft text to require a 25 foot buffer on industrial lands when adjacent to residential lands. The buffer requirements include both a solid screening, such as a fence or wall, and landscape screening (Sub J Section 209). The section is title "Transition Section" but could be renamed "Buffer" if the Commission finds it a more direct section title. Additional external effects are generally regulated by other agencies (DDOE and DCRA). The draft text proposes that the external effects be applicable to all industrial uses. OP will include a reference to the other regulations in the new text.
133	J	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	PDR	Subtitle J does not expand the current transition or buffer zones between PDR and non-PDR uses.	The draft text proposes that there be a buffer in all industrial zones which is an expansion of the requirement from the current code which has that requirement only in the LO area.
133	J	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	PDR	Subtitle J does not reflect guidance provided in the Comprehensive Plan: 1. The Comprehensive Plan seeks to guide industrial land uses into certain areas, but also seeks to provide spatial separation of industry with incompatible land uses such a housing. 2. The Land Use Element prescribes that industrial areas shall be designated in areas where buffering can protect adjacent residential areas from adverse impacts or where no residential areas are present.	The draft text proposes that there be a buffer in all industrial zones which is an expansion of the requirement form the current code which has that requirement only in the LO area. The draft text proposes additional conditions on certain uses and when adjacent to residential areas. The industrial zones remains those that are identified for PDR uses on the FLUM.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
153	J	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	PDR	Concern about FAR limitation introduced for "other" vs. "industrial" uses. § 301 Use Categories Permitted by Right: This section lists categories that are "permitted by right" in the P zones, but not all of them are allowed to use the full FAR for "permitted" uses. Uses that are permitted by right and not subject to conditions are less intrusive and should therefore also be able to achieve the full FAR for permitted uses in each category (e.g. art design and creation; education; health care). Other uses permitted subject to conditions or permitted by special exception should also be able to use the full FAR (e.g. entertainment, assembly and performing arts; services general).	There is a limited supply of industrial land in the District and it should be preserved and protected for appropriate PDR uses.
338	J	Alma Gates Neighbors United Trust Testimony	11/14/2013	PDR	Ensure the proposed zoning regulations provide equal and fair access to a healthy environment regardless of community location: 1) Expand the minimum distance of separation between PDR and residential and school zones to 1,000 feet. 2) Provide parking minimums for PDR sites that accommodate on-site parking for all vehicles related to each site as well as vehicles driven by employees related to site operations. 3) Avoid spill over parking on nearby neighborhood streets.	There is a new proposal in the draft text to require a 25 foot buffer on industrial lands when adjacent to residential lands. The buffer requirements include both a solid screening, such as a fence or wall, and landscape screening (Sub J Section 209). The section is title "Transition Section" but could be renamed "Buffer" if the Commission finds it a more direct section title. Additional external effects are generally regulated by other agencies (DDOE and DCRA). The draft text proposes that the external effects be applicable to all industrial uses. OP will include a reference to the other regulations in the new text.
338	J	Alma Gates Neighbors United Trust Testimony	11/14/2013	PDR	Why does zoning permit less exclusive residential zones in other parts of the city to be located as close as 200 ft. to an open cement or asphalt plant on a full-time basis? That degree of separation is not the length of a football field making the protection threshold three times less than that provided for the residents of Spring Valley. Does the ZC actually believe a 15-foot wide evergreen buffer or 10-foot tall fence, wall or other type of screening will prevent particulate matter and exhaust fumes from reaching beyond a 200 ft. radius? How can these measures ensure toxic airborne elements will not effect nearby residents and students? Has any air monitoring been done when these production sites are in operation to verify that distance is sufficient? Is the cumulative effect of pollutants on sensitive populations a concern? The Com Plan is unequivocal in its guidance on achieving Environmental Justice.	Such a use would only be permitted by special exception and the special exception review process includes the following provisions at J 303.7(h), "The Office of Zoning shall submit the application to the D.C. Office of Planning for coordination, review, report, and impact assessment, along with reports in writing of all relevant District departments and agencies, including but not limited to the Departments of Public Works, Transportation, and Health, the Department of Environment, if a historic district or historic landmark is involved, the State Historic Preservation Officer."
413	J	Peta-Gay Lewis ANC SMD 5D01 Comments	11/21/2013	PDR	We want new development taking place on underutilized land in our community of which there is abundance in close proximity to our community and major transportation corridors such as New York Avenue.	Thank you for your comment.
462	J	Alma Gates Comments	1/31/2014	PDR	The standards of external effects should be carried forward in Subtitle J.	OP is proposing to carry forward the standards of external effects.
53	A	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	penalties	WECA requests that the ZC increase the penalty level for violations (A § 305) so that it will act as a deterrent to noncompliance.	Thank you for your comment.
496	C	ANC 3E Tom Quinn Testimony	1/30/2014	pervious surface	We applaud the provisions in the Proposed Code focused on Pervious Surfaces (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 16), Green Area Ratios (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 17) and Tree Protection (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 18). The proposed rewrite aspires to bring our Zoning Code into the 21st Century and express 21st Century values. A critical such value is the protection of our environment. Already the Proposed Code calls for using mitigation measures when variances, exceptions and PUDs must be approved to bolster the goals of Chapters 16, 17 and 18. If the Zoning Commission asks the Department of Planning to propose further revisions to the Code, we would urge that the Office of Planning should look for additional ways to use mitigation generally to advance these important goals. We believe that while the rewrite addresses Green Area Ratios, Tree Protection, and Pervious surfaces requirements, the concept of such equitable environmental mitigation should be extended to new residential construction, and additions to existing residential structures that result in lot occupancy in excess of current defined maximums.	The pervious surface requirements apply to the residential zone districts in Subtitles D and E as follows: (a) The construction of a new principal structure; (b) An addition to a principal or accessory structure, other than a historic resource, that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by ten percent (10%) or more; (c) The construction of a new accessory structure that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by ten percent (10%) or more; or (d) An addition to a historic resource that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by twenty-five percent (25%) or more.
541	C, D, E	Judi Jones Testimony	2/11/2014	pervious surface	The new zoning regulations don't address reasonable remedies for the existing homeowner to reduce the burden for the lack of impervious or fees on their water bill. Existing homebuyers should not bear the burden new zoning regulations that were not in effect when the home were built unless they intend to renovate. I am asking that Zoning Commission to consider wording in the new regs that would not penalize homeowners of existing structures' lack of impervious surfaces until major renovations or permits are requested, or some other reasonable method of incorporating impervious surfaces for residents in the green area ratio.	The Zoning Commission adopted new regulations for pervious surfaces that apply to the residential zones, which would apply only to new construction or when an addition to a principal or accessory structure increased the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by 10% or more. The pervious surface requirements are tied to zone and minimum lot area.
682	B, C, D, E	Comments on Director's Letter to Councilmember Graham from Todd Crosby	3/20/2014	pop ups	Office of Zoning should issue a public memo that as of such and such a date, new pop ups will not qualify for grandfathering - meaning that should developers choose to build pop ups after said date and should these pop ups not meet future codes, then they will be required to be torn down.	The ZC is charged with preparing, adopting, and subsequently amending the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map in a means not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital area. The ZC is looking at the issue of pop ups as a part of the ZRR process.
258	D	Councilmember Jim Graham Ward 1 Testimony	11/6/2013	pop ups	Pop ups.	The draft text includes some measures that could help, including how building height is measured and reducing the permitted height for roof structures to 10 feet. OP will look at other tools, including limiting number of stories, height of buildings, and design review.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
457	D	Councilmember Jim Graham Comments	12/12/2013	pop ups	As you will recall, I presented testimony to the Zoning Commission regarding the ZRR and specifically on the issue of ‘Pop Ups’. That evening I asked several questions including: 1) What is the Zoning Commissions intent in addressing the issue of “Pop Ups”? 2) Is there any authority vested with the Zoning Commission that addresses this issue, aside from remapping and down zoning areas with existing structures? 3) Are there other means or thinking within the DC government to address these circumstances? 4) Is there a need for design review for Matter of Right Projects? Would this help or hurt a majority of projects? Could a volunteer/ professional group be organized to perform peer design review in selected areas? Would this be done with in individual Council Members’ offices? Can there be an incentive for a builder to engage in a peer design review? 5) Perhaps in order to fully address this issue we should look at the areas that have changed well beyond what was is the current ‘context’ and see how celebrated and successful they are-Perhaps there are many more of those. Is the Zoning Commission aware of such a study? Could it request one? I am critically concerned that any discussion of design review in this City quickly becomes the vehicle of those that are committed to be against everything, thus becoming a stifling process not an incentive process. You stated the Commission would provide for me answers to the inquires made and I am following up to see if any progress has been made in doing so.	The draft text includes some measures that could help, including how building height is measured and reducing the permitted height for roof structures to 10 feet. OP will look at other tools, including limiting number of stories, height of buildings, and design review.
263	E	Robert Robinson & Sherril Berger Comments	11/7/2013	pop ups	Bump-ups - don't want pop ups to shade solar arrays.	The draft text includes some measures that could help, including how building height is measured and reducing the permitted height for roof structures to 10 feet. OP will look at other tools, including limiting number of stories, height of buildings, and design review.
584	E	Andrew Krieger Supplemental Testimony	2/26/2014	pop ups	Supplemental photos	Thank you for providing additional photos.
579A	E	Andrew Krieger Enlargement of Photos	2/26/2014	pop ups	Supplemental photos	Thank you for providing additional photos.
614	Z	Douglas Kingsbury Comments	3/3/2014	pop ups	I support re-zoning Lanier Heights to restrict the height, depth, and number of units in row house modifications and new construction.	Thank you for your comment.
595	A, C, F, G, W, X, Y	Peter Lyden Treasurer Reed Cooke Neighborhood Association Testimony	2/26/2014	process	1. Neighborhood organization wishing to deal with a number of issues within our neighborhood, and not to concentrate solely on one problem. But, the way ZRR has been introduced to use over a number of years by OP, has been chaotic, it has had complete reversals of direction, and has given us poor to false information about how the ZRR would be implemented and its effect on our neighborhood. This resulted in our loss of focus on the rewrite, with us moving on to other immediate issues that have occupied our limited resources. Now we are back, dealing with a document that is confusing to read, difficult to decipher, has internal contradiction, and loses the intent of zoning protections for residents that we have come to understand and expect. In short for us, it is mishmash.	OP has worked to refine the document over time, in response to guidance from the Zoning Commission and feedback received over the course of the public outreach process. OP has prepared section-by-section crosswalks detailing where provisions in the existing code can be found in the proposed code. The proposed text is draft, and OP is aware that certain provisions are repeated throughout the subtitles and that there are phrases that may be inconsistently used (e.g. “by special exception” and “as a special exception”). Provisions may also have been unintentionally omitted due to reformatting of the proposed text. The text will be edited and reviewed for legal sufficiency prior to final action by the Zoning Commission.
194	A, W, X	Loretta Neumann Neighbors Inc. Comments	11/4/2013	process	Require OP to immediately prepare a new document for citizen review that clearly shows the changes that are being proposed from current zoning (the current “cross walk” on the OP website is still too general to be of much use to residents); Direct OP to meet in smaller groups, at least at the ANC level, to discuss the ZRR document with ANCs, community leaders and residents who seek clarifications and/or changes in the text to try to develop a consensus position; Alternatively or in addition to face to face meetings, ask OP to provide an on-line means of direct communication via a “chat” function or a “webinar” in which community residents can raise questions to OP and discuss their concerns, make further recommendations, etc.; and Then, as proposed in your announcement of these hearings, hold another set of hearings to receive public response to the zoning text proposed by OP.	OP has worked to refine the document over time, in response to guidance from the Zoning Commission and feedback received over the course of the 4 year public participation and the public outreach process. OP has prepared section-by-section crosswalks detailing where provisions in the existing code can be found in the proposed code. The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward. 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANCs, community groups and special interest groups. July 29, 2013 – OP provided a copy of the draft, proposed text to the ZC. September 9, 2013 – the ZC set the proposed text down for public hearingsThe ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
194, 196	A, X	Loretta Neumann Neighbors, Inc. Comments	11/4/2013	process	Insufficient information to make an informed decision. More time and attention needed. The hearings this week are much too cursory to provide sufficient response from the community. Delay consideration for 6 months.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
453	B	Bernard Ries Comments	12/9/2013	process	Urge that when the Commission meets, this evening or at a more weather-agreeable time, to discuss how it should proceed, you will authorize a lengthy delay in order to permit a careful study of the draft to be made.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
698	B	George Clark Comments	4/23/2014	process	I come before you today as a member of the Zoning Regulations Review Task Force which was formed nearly 7 years ago and which met until last year. Focus on what the Office of Planning has been telling ANC's about the ZRR, as opposed to what the ZRR actually says. It is fair to say that OP is misleading the ANC about several key ZRR provisions, and not telling them about the many rights ANC's and ordinary citizens are losing under the ZRR. Why do we have 930 pages of new text which is supposed to mean what it said before? Why did we change it? What happens to the thousands of decisions that have been made under the old text? Will everyone agree that the new words mean the same? Or will this Commission have to re-decide the same cases hundreds or thousands of times when applicants and their lawyers argue that different words have different meanings. Why did OP do this? What possibly could have been gained?	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing. The Office of Attorney General will review all text for legal sufficiency. It is worth noting that jurisdictions all across the country revise their zoning regulations and change zone district names and the legal status of court ruling relative to zoning case does not lose their relevance.
349	C	Judith Brace Comments	11/15/2013	process	I know intimately the stresses on power, water, and infrastructure that increased congestion brings, and which do not seem to have entered the discussions about zoning changes. The implications of down-stream delivery of services in response to zoning changes should be driving these discussions of code changes.	The adequacy of public facilities are evaluated by the utility providers at the time of permit issuance.
382	C	Steve Seelig Ward 3 Vision Testimony	11/19/2013	process	It is time to move forward with this process, it has been too many years and hundreds of public meetings and there has been plenty of time for all voices to be heard. It is time to plan for the future of the District and no longer live in the 1950s past.	Thank you for your comment.
395	C	Brian Cohen ANC 3B Testimony	11/19/2013	process	Continue to support the rewrite. The five-year process has allowed for ample community input and education; representatives from the Office Planning and Office of Zoning have visited communities, heard from residents, and addressed concerns. It is time to move forward to update the District's out-of-date zoning code. Commissioners, I know that you are under heavy pressure to maintain the status quo, and I hope you will resist that pressure. The proposed changes are not radical; they are long overdue modification to an out-of-date, 1950's zoning vision. The proposed changes will make our neighborhoods and the District of Columbia as a whole a better place to love, work, and play in the years ahead. On behalf of ANC3B, I hope you will approve these changes in an expeditious fashion.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
416	C	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	process	Encouraged that DC is being forward-thinking and would urge the Board to consider that the chorus of opposition to these changes, while vocal, are not indicative of the broad public opinion within our communities.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
441	C	John W. Rollins Comments	12/4/2013	process	I recommend that the implementation of the new rules be prolonged for a period that is long enough for the changes to be better communicated to the residents of DC. The hearings held from Nov 4 -14 were completely inadequate in terms of communicating with all those whose lives will be impacted by the proposed changes. I'm sure there are dozens of other changes in Case No. 08-06A which will impact me that I am not yet aware of. I further suggest that someone who truly understands the substance of the 1,000-page proposal write a comprehensive summary of the major changes, which can be read by DC residents who do not have time to wade through the arcane language of the proposal itself. There must be someone smart enough in the Office of Zoning who can do this.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
448	C	Larry Werner Comments	12/9/2013	process	Recognize that while the Office of Planning was charged solely with cleaning and clarifying the existing code, there's no redline; ordinary Citizens and even experts aren't aware of what OP actually has done, but all can see that there have been major changes that rightly belong in the political realm rather than masquerading as zoning code clarification. Require OP to demonstrate by clear, convincing evidence that there's been - and will continue to be - real, substantial, interactive Citizen participation with full Citizen access to OP data. Require OP to support its many claims with actual facts which Citizens have had an opportunity to see, question and provide alternatives, additions and correction. Require OP to put forward the specific of how OP worked with DDOT, other City agencies and Boards, and Citizens to address as many realistically possible outcomes of its proposals as you'd want for a major personal like or business decision. Require OP to investigate and report on how to test and demonstrate its proposals' feasibility. Until OP has met such requirements, refuse the proposed rewrite in its entirety, or, failing that delay any ZRR approval until OP has provided the kinds of specifics reference above, provided demonstrated proof of real and substantial citizen participation, and demonstrated with written substance why Citizen concerns are incorrect. Changing our zoning correctly is far more important than changing it quickly.	OP's data and reports and presentations are all available on the OP website ZRR link. OP has prepared section-by-section crosswalks detailing where provisions in the existing code can be found in the proposed code. OP has posted all reports, ZC guidance reports, Public Hearing reports and consultant reports on the www.dczoningupdate.org website.
471	C	ANC 1A Comments	1/9/2014	process	Resolution in support of updates to the District of Columbia Zoning Code.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
476	C	ANC2B Comments	1/23/2014	process	ANC 2B supports the guidelines; values, public process, and forthrightness of the Office of Planning and Zoning Commission throughout the zoning update process.	Thank you for your supportive comments
616	C, D	Jonathan Parker Comments	3/5/2014	process	Fully supports the zoning rewrite as currently drafted. The District of Columbia has been stuck with an outdated code for over 50 years, and it's time to remedy that situation. We need a modern set of rules which allows for maximum development flexibility, and one that encourages more walking, biking, and transit use, and less driving, as the demand for car use declines in our city.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
427, 428	C, D	Elizabeth Carswell Comments	11/22/2013	general support	Express strong support for the proposed update to the DC zoning code. Walkability and diversity (across many dimensions - age, ethnicity, gender, etc.) make this city great.	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
494	C, D, E, X	ANC 4C08 Timothy Jones Testimony	1/30/2014	process	Express concerns about the Office of Planning's ZRR. The position of Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner is voluntary and unpaid. Like others ANC's must pay bills. Yet ANC's have been charged with reviewing and understanding a one thousand page document and make Public comment. A document few have read in depth or understand. The ZRR is a document will impact upon the District of Columbia and future generations for years. Though ANC's have their fingers on the pulse of the Communities that they serve, they will be denied review of certain zoning action under the proposed ZRR. The Great Weight of ANC's shouldn't be compromised or denied in any form. Some Neighborhoods are given the privilege of creating custom zoning to deny Pop-Ups and other forms of development they deem undesirable. Such actions should be available to all neighborhoods. Or precluded in the new Zoning Regulations. I like most ANC's. I feel that my Neighborhood and Single Member Districts. Shouldn't play second fiddle to others. The threat of commercialization in residential neighborhood with comer stores. Is something that shouldn't be considered unless a neighborhood has empirical evidence and support demonstrating a demand for such an entity. Commercial use in residential areas tend to place upward pressure on land prices in residential neighborhoods. Further worsening the Districts affordable housing crisis, Although ADU's or (Accessory Dwelling Units) will increase the supply of rental units without provisions for technical assistance for conversions and existing Accessory Dwelling Units lowering costs a probability exist for prohibitive rents and unsanitary and unsafe ADU' s The best Zoning Regulation Rewrite is one that is undertaken with the office of planning and other respective Government agencies walking hand in hand with the Community and its representatives during the Zoning Rewrite process. Since previous Zoning rewrites. Led to displacements in Georgetown and SW. I feel that a better ZRR product can be crafted through continuing discourse with community stakeholders. I Pray, that the office of planning. Will extend and delay the ZRR process. Allowing for continual briefing and updating of the proposed ZRR so that ANC's and other Community Stakeholders can better grasp and understand the final ZRR and are Cognizant of the lasting effect of the ZRR process and product.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing. The Great Weight standards continues to be applicable in the propopsed text, with a new opportunity for the ANC to weigh in at setdown of PUDs. Re Corner Stores: They are propopsed only for rowhouse zones (the existing R-3 and R-4) and only by special exception except for grocery stores whcih could be by-right subject to many conditions. This would allow the ANC and neighbors to weigh in at a public hearing. Re Accessory Apartments: they are currently allowed either by a special excpetion or by right for domestic employees over a garage. A business license is required to rent a unit. Becasue theproperty owner is required to reside on the property there is immediate accountability and reduced risk of unsafe units. Re Timeframe: The ZC has agreed to hold the record open until Spet 15, 2014, representing one year since the case was set for hearing.
487	C, D, E, X, Y, Z	ANC 5B Shirley Rivers Smith Testimony	1/30/2014	process	Last October ANC 5B submitted three resolutions, including: 2. Approved: the DC Zoning Rewrite Process because of our seniors and others in the community. We requested the Office of Planning to visit our community for one, or more as needed, public community meetings to discuss the impacts of their draft regulations and their specific impacts to our neighborhood, so we can understand the full scope of the amendments to provide informed feedback to the Zoning Commission. We also requested the Zoning Commission to postpone any decision-making or rulemaking, and keep the record completely open regarding the Zoning Rewrite process in our resolution we asked for at least 180 days, I now believe it should stay open much longer After reviewing the recommendations and attempting to determine how they would be implemented in the various residential districts zone within 5B boundaries, we came to the conclusion that we did not have sufficient information to draw any conclusions. Since we are concerned that our residents may not understand the potential impacts, pro and con, we request that the Zoning Commission seeks additional detail from the Office of Planning on how each recommendation would be implemented in each residential district zone that meets the definition of low or moderate density. In addition, we request that the record remain open so that ANC 5B along with other ANC Commissions would have time to review and comment on any new material submitted by the Office of Planning. We are requesting that The Office of Planning have a call out to each community like what was done in Georgetown. Where OP will conduct WORKSHOPS in all communities over a period of time.	Thank you for your comment. The record for submitting comments is open until September 15, 2014. OP has provided each ANC with a summary of how the main regulations would be relevant to that ANC.
141	D	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	process	Washington, DC is blessed with over a hundred interesting neighborhoods, each with their own character. Recognizing this, the Comprehensive Plan adopted by the DC City Council in 2006 says many good things about the importance of neighborhoods and the desirability of conserving and enhancing them. (See selected sections of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan attached.) The first policy in the neighborhood section of the Land Use Element says: Maintain a variety of residential neighborhood types in the District, ranging from low-density, single family neighborhoods to high density, multifamily mixed use neighborhoods. The positive elements that create the identity and character of each neighborhood should be preserved and enhanced in the future. Two of the biggest problems in my neighborhood are teardowns and mansionization—tearing down existing houses to build bigger ones and enlarging existing houses to two or three times their original size. These new larger buildings change the character of the neighborhood, are out of scale with their neighbors, and block light and air to adjoining properties. Unfortunately, the “one-size-fits-all” approach that the Office of Planning has taken in the zoning rewrite does little to advance policies on neighborhood preservation, some of the things it does do don’t work as well as they should, and some are downright harmful. The changes that OP described as minor in the ward meetings (which were also one size fits all and did not address issues specific to individual wards) are not minor. They will allow lasting impacts to neighborhood character. The Zoning Commission should require the Office of Planning to develop rules that support the policies and actions in the Comprehensive Plan and work to protect, not undermine, neighborhoods.	The Zoning Regulations adopted by the Zoning Commission may not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
219	D	Linda Schmitt Neighbors 4 Neighborhoods Comments	11/5/2013	process	Continued lack of public awareness about the ZRR - the public continues to be ignorant of the ZRR.	The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANC's, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearirngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
219	D	Linda Schmitt Neighbors 4 Neighborhoods Comments	11/5/2013	process	Role of Zoning Commission - the ZC has to ask, when and how was the public informed? May I recommend the ZC refrain from decisions until the public is fully informed about the changes and understand the proposed changes.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearirngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	process	ANC 4A cannot support this proposal and we ask that you reconsider. We also ask that you keep the record open for an additional two weeks to permit further comments or revisions to this testimony.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearirngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
242	D	Woodley Park Community Association Comments	11/6/2013	process	We generally support the changes proposed by the Office of Planning as we feel that they bring the zoning law into the 21st century.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
265	D	Susan Carr Comments	11/7/2013	process	Concerns about schedule and opportunity for comment.	Thank you for your comment; the Zoning Commission will continue to establish the schedule, including the extensive opportunity to provide comments.
417	D	Robert Ward Comments	11/21/2013	process	Encouraged that DC is being forward-thinking and would urge the Board to consider that the chorus of opposition to these changes, while vocal, are not indicative of the broad public opinion within our communities.	Thank you for your comment.
581	D	Daniel Levine Testimony	2/25/2014	process	In favor of the proposed zoning change. While these provisions fall short of the full set of reforms the District requires, I support the compromises made and hope the commission puts them in place without further delay.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
484	D, E	ANC 3B Testimony	1/30/2014	process	Urge Zoning Commission to approve the draft revisions to the zoning code. In February 2013, the five ANC 3B commissioners unanimously supported a resolution in support of the zoning rewrite. The five-year process has allowed for ample community education and input; representatives from the Office of Planning and Office of Zoning have visited communities, heard from residents, and addressed concerns. It is time to move forward to update the District's out-of-date zoning code. The proposed changes are not radical; they are long overdue modifications to an out-of-date, 1950's zoning vision. The proposed zoning changes will make our neighborhoods and the District of Columbia as a whole a better place to live, work, and play - not just for future residents, but for those who live in the District of Columbia today. I hope you will approve these changes in an expeditious fashion.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
486	D, E	ANC 3B Brian Cohen Testimony	1/30/2014	Process	I understand the temptation to maintain the status quo. And I hope that as you consider the Zoning Proposal, you don't succumb to theoretical worst-case scenarios that are nothing but efforts to scare you away from change. Sure, it's possible that if you allow by-right creation of accessory dwelling units a "bad tenant" could move into one of those ADU's. But the same tenant could move into an existing dwelling under current housing laws. And more importantly, there are existing agencies in the District – DCRA, MPD, and others whose job it is to protect District residents from these outcomes. The same hold true for any concerns regarding negative impacts from parking changes or neighborhood stores. I have no doubt that the changes under discussion are good for our city, and our city's residents, and are consistent with the long-term vision contained in the Comprehensive Plan for the Nation's Capital.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
493	D, E	ANC 6D07 David Garber Testimony	1/30/2014	Process	I appreciate the public outreach that the Office of Planning has conducted over the last four years, as well as the significant efforts to engage the public and listen to our input.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
539	D, E	Larry Martin Testimony	2/11/2014	process	What we have before us now is a very moderate compromise on many of the issues that were most contentious. In my opinion it was a good process with a good outcome. The kind of growth now occurring needs a code in touch with current trends and is forward looking. The key dimensions of this are addressed in the update, and include reduced parking minimums, more accessory apartments, and corner stores. To the extent that the update simplifies organization of the code, that is a good thing too. I urge you to accept the zoning revision proposal, which is the product of five years of dialogue and compromise. It is not a dramatic departure from what we know, but it is a modest step in the right direction for DC.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
263	E	Robert Robinson & Sherril Berger Comments	11/7/2013	process	Proposed zoning changes ignore comprehensive plan strictures.	The Zoning Commission may only approve revisions to the zoning code that are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
319	G, H	Faith Wheeler ANC 4B Testimony	11/13/2013	process	Recommend rescheduling OP's draft submission to the Zoning Commission to give every community the opportunity to develop its own "customization" proposals and for more comment. The "great weight" provisions of DC law should apply.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
499, 529	W	ANC 6B05 Brian Pate Testimony	1/30/2014	process	Time permitting, the draft regulations would benefit from accompanying maps. This would make it much easier for the public to understand the overlays and delineations spelled out in the narrative. Additionally, I would ask that OP work quickly to develop and codify the process by which it will work with communities to develop area specific overlays and special use areas. Again, I find some inequity in OPs willingness to work with Georgetown to create their own special overlay as part of the ZRR process, when they've told the rest of the City to wait because they don't have enough time to draft a process for the rest of us.	OP has provided maps to each ANC showing existing zoning along with the zone name conversion table. Subtitle X, Chapter 4 outlines the process by which a neighborhood could request a custom zone.
91	X	ANC 3D Comments	10/28/2013	process	Support revisions (consolidation of rules in Subtitle X, private schools and universities, DDOE review and report).	Thank you for your supportive comment.
196	X	Loretta Neumann Neighbors Inc. Comments	11/4/2013	process	Recommend that the ZC consider the November 2013 hearings as merely preliminary and delay any further consideration for at least 6 months until the Office of Planning has provided new text that reflects the concerns of the citizens. During this time, the ZC should: Require OP to immediately prepare a new document for citizen review that clearly shows the changes that are being proposed from current zoning (the current "cross walk" on the OP website is still too general to be of much use to residents); Direct OP to meet in smaller groups, at least at the ANC level, to discuss the ZRR document with ANCs, community leaders and residents who seek clarifications and/or changes in the text to try to develop a consensus position; Alternatively or in addition to face to face meetings, ask OP to provide an on-line means of direct communication via a "chat" function or a "webinar" in which community residents can raise questions to OP and discuss their concerns, make further recommendations, etc. Then, as proposed in your announcement of these hearings, hold another set of hearings to receive public response to the zoning text proposed by OP.	OP has worked to refine the document over time, in response to guidance from the Zoning Commission and feedback received over the course of the public outreach process. OP has prepared section-by-section crosswalks detailing where provisions in the existing code can be found in the proposed code. The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANCs, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hearings since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
206	X	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	process	Section 308.14 regarding the OAG response to the proffer says that the "OAG response will be treated as a confidential attorney client communication." Making the OAG opinion secret is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan policy that the Zoning Commission should have transparency in decision-making (Policy IM-1.5.4). The attorney client privilege is the client's, not the OAG's and the Commission may waive it at any time without the approval of the attorney. It is the Commission that owns the privilege. If this section is not deleted, a second problem with this confidential communication is created. How soon should it become part of the record and available to the public? Restricting it forever is unacceptable and is also contrary to transparency in government.	OAG will review the proposed text.
530	X	Andrew Reuter Letter in Opposition	2/7/2014	process	The proposal is an egregious overreach by the Office of Planning and the Zoning Commission. The proposed zoning changes favor outside developers over District residents and "one-size-fits-all" growth at the expense of the city's 131 distinct, diverse, and vibrant neighborhoods. The ZRR proposal threatens to destroy the unique character of District neighborhoods at the same time it disempowers their residents by reducing - and, in certain cases, eliminating - their ability to weigh in on zoning issues through community associations and their ANCs.	Thank you for your comments. The Zoning Commission will determine whether to bring forward the OP proposals. New speical exception uses have also been added including night clubs and auto repair in insutrial zones that will increase community input. Some speical exceptions are propoosed to be deleted becasue the use is no longer proposed such as Community-based residential facilities larger than 6 persons in any low density residential zone.
169	Y	Board of Zoning Adjustment Comments	10/30/2013	process	See Redline Comments.	The Office of Zoning is working with the Office of Attorney General on these subtitles.
483	Y, Z	ANC 1C Comments	1/30/2014	process	Comments from Larry Hargrove -- Authority and responsibility for adding new permitted uses or use groups should be retained by the Zoning Commission and not delegated to the Zoning Administrator, in order to ensure the public accountability of this process. Agency procedures for cases remanded from the District of Columbia Court of Appeals need to be developed and can be added as part of the ZRR. Urge the Commission and the BZA to give these remanded cases priority consideration (given the length of time they may have been at the DCCA).	The Zoning Administrator shall determine the category or categories for a use, which is consistent with current practice. OP will review text and propose that any interpretation that create a new use group be refered to the ZC for public hearing.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
579	Y, Z	Andrew Krieger Testimony	2/25/2014	process	1. Guidelines for historic district zones. 2. Guidelines for neighborhood non-historic, profile and character zones (evolve to historic?). 3. A redefinition of the roles of local ANCs in neighborhood planning. 4. Inclusion of the OP office in neighborhood planning as variance are requested, the profile, footprint and square footage of a structure request change. 5. Institute a system of only 2-3 meetings a year where several OP members attend ANC meetings for proposed neighborhood projects that impact profile, will alter the character of a neighborhood and are seeking a variance. OP sits in an advisory role, offering its expertise and advice to the community it is hired to serve. Residents are notified and encouraged to attend. 6. A city wide overview system that removes the right of 3rd party inspectors to be the sole green light of inspection on these projects to go forward. 7. Put in an enforceable, or create an enforcement body to manage and penalize as necessary 3rd party inspection bodies if they are not operating in accordance with the laws or violate the laws and practices of the District of Columbia, Health and Safety, Hours of Work, Employment of a % of local residents on the job, register sites so inclusion of DC trade schools in using these sites for educational on site training can take place. 8. Infrastructure capacities for zone development, public notice to upgrades and conditions. 9. Guidelines and system of permitting and inspection (not 3rd party - or strictly regulated 3rd party with a review system containing harsh penalties for fraud, misrepresentation and negligence) that hold planning and inspections to neighborhood guidelines/standards. 10. The discontinuance of general variances - variances should be sought before a board of professional planners and the public, with public notice given with adequate time to alert the residents of this district for input. 11. The management and reallocation of permit duties so developers are not allowed to cross permit on their jobs and are governed by better systems of enforcement. 12. If variances are granted, a fund established comprised of 20% of gross project profits - funded by those granted the variances, funds will be used to assist others that have been put into hardship, their quality of life impacted - the enjoyment of the peace/tranquility of ones home compromised - by the granted variance. If no resident can claim this condition the funds would go towards a district or local scholarship fund for DC youth, the greening of the district and the needy. 13. As this will be the first rewrite of the zoning regs in approximately 60 years, the next review of these guideline's and this process should take place in 5 years. An assessment to the City Council/Mayor by a body created to monitor and track this policy should happen at that time and with public input into its success. The existing regs should be tweaked as needed with a motion put forward to amend aspects of the process to keep up with the evolving issues, profile of day-to-day urban life and commerce in the District of Columbia. 14. The zoning regs of the District of Columbia be put on a long term schedule for discussion and review, 5, 5, 10 or 3, 5, 5 - etc.	1 and 2) OP is not proposing modifications to DCMR Title 10 at this time. 3) OP Neighborhood Planning staff coordinate with ANCs during any and all neighborhood planning efforts. 4 and 5) OP is not proposing changes to the process by which ANCs participate in Board of Zoning Adjustment or Zoning Commission reviews. 6, 7, 9 and 11) DCRA is responsible for inspection and permitting processes. 8) Adequacy of infrastructure is reviewed by the appropriate agencies at the time of building permit. 10 and 12) OP is not proposing modifications to the variance process at this time. 13 and 14) OP anticipates that the Zoning Commission will revisit and refine the zoning regulations on a regular basis.
690	Y, Z	Letter from ANC 3D	4/8/2014	process	ANC 3D calls on the Zoning Commission to ensure that the role of Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANCs) should not be diminished as a consequence of the rewrite of the city's zoning code. ANC 3D calls on the Zoning Commission to reject any provisions in the Zoning Regulations Rewrite that would dilute the ability of ANCs to provide feedback and offer formal recommendations on zoning-related cases.	The draft proposed text does not diminish the roles of ANCs and, in fact, includes provisions to allow more time for ANCs to review projects going to the BZA or ZC and to provide input.
690	Y, Z	Letter from ANC 3D	4/8/2014	process	Since taking action on these items, ANC 3D has grown increasingly concerned that the zoning rewrite as a whole will have the effect of limiting neighborhood input and diminishing the role of the ANCs in representing constituent and neighborhood interests in zoning-related matters. Consequently, at its regularly scheduled meeting on April 2, 2014, with a quorum (6) present at all times, ANC 3D voted 9-0 to approve a motion calling on the Zoning Commission to reject any provision in the ZRR that would dilute the ability of the ANCs to provide feedback and offer recommendations on zoning-related matters before the Zoning Commission or the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA). Based on ANC 3D's ongoing review of the proposed new (and evolving) zoning rules, the zoning rewrite would propose to limit the role of ANCs in some special exception cases, for example. An important and contentious case before ANC 3D now that relates to the conversion of a single family residence to a multi-family residence – that neighbors argue will permanently alter the character of the neighborhood – would become a matter of right under the proposed new zoning rules denying residents an opportunity to offer input and denying the ANC an opportunity to ensure that residents' views are represented. Based on the proposed new rules, the R-5-A zones within ANC 3D's current boundaries would be moved a new Subtitle on Apartment Zones and, thus, which would enable matter-of-right conversion from a single family unit to a multi-family unit. The ANC considers several issues nearly every meeting that under the proposed new rules would become matter-of-right. These issues come before the ANC – not just procedurally – but because residents have interests that they want represented in the zoning process and look to the ANCs for representation in the process, especially since ANCs' views are to be given “great weight” under D.C. statute.	OP will provide an analysis of use permissions with respect to matter-of-right, special exception, and variance requirements.
207, 208	Y, Z	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	process	Section 404 (Requesting Party Status) does not address problems that CHRS has encountered in past cases. The first problem is that the required statement in Title Y 404.1(d)(6) apply only to persons and not organizations. Such things as what property you own and the distance from the subject property don't apply to an organization such as CHRS. CHRS is concerned that it will not qualify for party status under these conditions. The second problem is the timing of party status. a) In a few instances CHRS has had an expert witness ready to testify at a hearing only to be denied party status at the hearing and told it cannot call witnesses. Party status should be decided weeks prior to the hearing to avoid this event. This is especially important in Zoning Commission cases. Another problem with party status is that the service of documents is only required to be made on parties. Until party status has been decided no service is required to be made on someone requesting party status. Service on a party should be amended to require service on someone requesting party status.	The Office of Zoning is working with the Office of Attorney General on these subtitles.
184	Z	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	process	ANC 4D urges the Zoning Commission to enact the following procedural changes. 1. Change the current law, at DCMR 3012.3, to provide "the written reports and recommendations requested by the [Zoning] Commission pursuant to section 3012.1 shall be filed by the Director of the Office of Planning with the Director of the Office of Zoning at least 60 days in advance of the hearing." 2. change the current law, at DCMR 3114.2, to provide "when an application is referred in advance of the public hearing to any public agency for a report or recommendation, that report and recommendation shall be filed with the Board at least 60 days prior to the date for the hearing on the application." 3. Change the current law, at DCMR 11-3125.6, to provide "a decision or order shall become final upon its filing in the record and service upon the parties within 60 days."	OP does not recommend this change as it would add approximately two additional months to every BZA or ZC case.
483	Z	ANC 1C Comments	1/30/2014	process	Urge Zoning Commission to amend its regulations to allow more time, 30 days, for ANCs and the public to receive and review reports, recommendations and documents.	OP has proposed increasing filing deadlines to provide additional time for review.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
533	Z	Sandi Washington ANC SMD 5A07 Comments	2/10/2014	process	Submitting comments as it relates to the notification by OZ, zoning regulation changes to the residents of the District of Columbia. It is my opinion that the Office of Zoning has failed in this attempt. Every registered voter in the District of Columbia should be notified of the changes being proposed to the zoning regulations, that will affect each and every one of us in some form or manner. I realized that zoning laws indicate that you the OZ notify Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner, Civic and Community Associations and other organizations as well as through social media, etc. However, with these type of major changes to the zoning regulations that are being proposed, every registered voter should have been notified. Many constituents do not have or use computers let alone social media. WE have to make sure that everyone is notified. Seeking the Board's assistance in requiring the Office of Zoning to consider this request for OZ to provide a mailer notifying the residents via mailers of the extensive changes to the zoning regulations that they are facing in this great city we live in.	The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANC's, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
221		Karen Wirt ANC 6C	11/5/2013	process	Request to leave the record open for comments.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
224		ANC 8E	11/5/2013	process	Request to leave the record open.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
225		ANC 8C	11/5/2013	process	Request to leave the record open for 180 days.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
266		ANC 4A	11/7/2013	process	Comments from ANC 4A requesting additional time to respond.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
279		ANC 8A	11/12/2013	process	Request by ANC 8A to extend public hearings for 180 days.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
283		ANC 1A	11/12/2013	process	Request by ANC 1A to keep the record open for 180 days.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
363		ANC 7C	11/18/2013	process	Comments from ANC 7C seeking more public input.	The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANC's, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
374		ANC 5B	11/19/2013	process	Request to keep the record open for 180 days.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
405		ANC 3C	11/20/2013	process	Request for time extension of the ZRR.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
424		ANC 1D	11/22/2013	process	Resolution requesting an additional 90 days for ZRR review and comment.	The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
536		Anne Mohnkern Renshaw Testimony	2/11/2014	process	Asking the Zoning Commission to pause and not rush to judgment on the proposed zoning changes. Even if the zoning "language" and regulations are streamlined, the intent of the zoning redo seems to diminish neighborhood protections. Neighborhoods are feeling pressure, sensing that zoning regulations, as currently proposed, offer minimal protection. This is not an argument about the direction and amount of growth, but that zoning regulations should support individual neighborhoods trying to retain their special character and diversity. While the city has become more vibrant and modern, the citizens federation is also concerned that necessary infrastructure improvements cannot keep step with accelerated development. The Federation could see the cracks in the City's plans for growth when DC agencies appeared before us to discuss how revisions to the city's zoning regulations would impact their departments. In summary, the end result of the zoning rewrite must show a balance between neighborhood preservation vs. accelerated development and increased density. That request is what we're asking the zoning commission to guarantee and be reflected in any change to DC's zoning regulations.	The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANCs, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
562		Holly Muhammad Testimony	2/12/2014	process	Call for a moratorium on moving forward with the adoption of an regulations in the ZRR 08-06A until we have a new Director of Planning in place that will review this re-write , meet with the Wards regarding the specifics of each, and that will consider all of the different social and economic statuses in our city and all of the residents of the District of Columbia in a project that once adopted will affect the lives of all whom live here.	The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANCs, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
573		ANC 5A Report	2/19/2014	process	Urge ZC to require OP to engage in a vigorous, fair and open campaign of community consultations and meetings in an effort to ensure that all neighborhoods are provided equitable access to information and are equally afforded the opportunity to provide comment and input.	The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANCs, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
590		Committee of 100 2/10/14 Press Release	2/26/2014	process	At a Saturday afternoon convened in Columbia Heights by Ward 1 Councilmember Jim Graham, residents from across Ward 1 soundly rejected the rewrite of the city's land-use regulations proposed by the District's Office of Planning. Known as the Zoning Regulation Review (ZRR) and described at the meeting by the Committee of 100 on the Federal City's Chair Nancy MacWood, it would rewrite the city's complex and highly technical zoning code to change the character of the District's residential areas particularly single-family neighborhoods.	Thank you for your comments.
681		Alex Block Comments	3/15/2014	process	Finally, I would like to compliment the Office of Planning and the Office of Zoning for running an unprecedented series of outreach sessions to get the word out about the ZRR. Still, some opponents of this process have said it isn't enough. However, I would like to express concern that the scale and scope of the outreach and information efforts can never hope to meet an unreasonable standard. As I've expressed above, I think the policy changes proposed as part of the ZRR are relatively minor changes - I would actually like to see more extensive changes to the zoning code, but don't want to let my desire stop real progress in improving the flexibility and adaptability of our zoning code. Given the extensive public process to date, as well as the relatively minor changes proposed, I encourage the Zoning Commission to adopt the proposals from the Office of Planning.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
687		ANC 4B Comments	4/3/2014	process	Asks the Zoning Commission to consider delaying a vote on the new zoning regulations until the residents of ANC 4B have a good understanding of them (approximately 6 months). The new zoning regulations should increase community input by making the new zoning regulation changes special exceptions rather than a matter of right for a trial period of two years until the new changes have been filtered.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing. Persons who have previously testified, but still want to provide the Commission with additional comments, may do so by submitting comments in writing by September 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, as well as 12 months between the time draft text was submitted and the record is closed.
706		Jay Smith Testimony	4/24/2014	process	The Zoning Commission should tell OP that it wants to see the proposed changes submitted in the form of amendments to the existing zoning code. And then the Commission should take those amendments, group them by topic, and hold hearings that are focused on those specific topics.	The ZC began its process in that manner, but directed OP to bring forward a complete version of the draft proposed text for review and discussion. The process is consistent with ZC guidance.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
499, 529		ANC 6B05 Brian Pate Testimony	1/30/2014	process	Believe it is time to move forward with recommended changes. They are the product of years of process, work and public input. They've been tailored to accommodate local concerns and, I know first hand, incorporate a great deal of community feedback. A document of this size and complexity will never achieve full consensus, but, we should have the courage to move forward coupled with a commitment to revisit the code at regular intervals to perfect the changes as we find areas needing clarification or improvement. I fear that we've reached a point where people, my constituents, are delaying projects in order to see what the outcome of the rewrite• will be. Delay also incentivizes use of loopholes to skirt anachronistic elements of the code. For example, in ANC6B, we've seen a number of BZA cases featuring the use of a trellis to connect a primary and accessory dwelling, usually a carriage house, creating, in the eyes of the zoning administrator, a single dwelling, in order to gain relief from restrictions on additions to the accessory dwelling. I believe residents should not be forced to use loop holes to make renovations to their property that have become, de facto, by right' actions. Further, I believe we have an obligation to reduce regulatory uncertainty. Should the Zoning Commission decide to delay wholesale adoption of the recommended changes, it may be prudent and more effective to move less controversial elements one piece-at-a-time.	Thank you for your supportive comments.
698A		George Clark Comments	4/23/2014	process	Annotated version of OP ANC Zoning Regulations Summary Presentation distributed February 2014.	The ZRR process has been well-publicized and has included extensive community outreach. June/July 2007 – Zoning Commission roundtables. 2008 to 2011 - 81 public work group meetings were held on 20 topic areas, with over 1,000 participants. 2007 – 2013 – OP created a Task Force of 25 residents –met 42 times. 2008 – present – The Zoning Commission held 59 public hearings and meetings, to provide guidance and, in some cases, approve proposed text. December 2012 – January 2013 – Public meetings, one in each ward (8 public meetings, 2 twitter townhall meetings). 2008 – present – Over 100 meetings with ANCs, community groups and special interest groups. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing.
213	Z	Benedicte Aubrun Testimony	11/4/2013	process	Urge the Commission to allow more time for the residents to review the new zoning regulations report that was presented by the Office of Planning a little more than a month ago. Indeed, how can the residents without the proper expertise on zoning review and comment on such a massive document of 1000 pages in such short time? This process is not sufficiently collegial for there to be informed citizens participation. Citizens' review is further complicated by the failure of the OP's staff to indicate where changes were made and are being made for each update on the zoning regulations rewrite as we go through this process. I am questioning the motives of OP with such obstacles to overcome.	The ZRR has been a multi-year project with numerous public meetings. Most recently, OP submitted draft text for the ZRR to the ZC on July 29, 2013. On September 9, 2013, the ZC set down the proposed ZRR text for public hearings and has held 15 public hairngs since November 2013. The ZC has agreed to leave the record open until Sept 15, 2014. This provides additional time for review and comment, and represents 12 months since the ZC set the case for public hearing. Persons who have previously testified, but still want to provide the Commission with additional comments, may do so by submitting comments in writing by 3:00 p.m. on September 15, 2014.
528	I	Tom and Dorothy Belcher	2/7/2014	public space	Regulations are needed to restrict the location of newspaper boxes that block parking, loading, and bus stop areas from the sidewalk in highly used pedestrian zones, especially near entries to residential buildings.	Public space is regulated by the District Department of Transportation.
532	I	Karyn Posner-Mullen Comments	2/10/2014	public space	Regulations are needed to restrict the location of newspaper boxes that block parking, loading, and bus stop areas from the sidewalk in highly used pedestrian zones, especially near entries to residential buildings.	Public space is regulated by the District Department of Transportation.
559		Richard A. Drom Comments	2/12/2014	public space	Regulations are needed to restrict the location of newspaper boxes that block parking, loading, and bus stop areas from the sidewalk in highly used pedestrian zones, especially near entries to residential buildings. For example, a long line of newspaper boxes are located at the curb in front of the Residences at Gallery Place buildings entry. This is a very heavily used pedestrian areas and the only place residents can pull up to unload a baby buggy, an elderly parent, groceries, etc... It is impossible to maneuver between the parking area and the sidewalk because of the number of obstacles. It is very dangerous. These boxes are also used by folks to sit and hang out at the curb, making it even more difficult to maneuver around these obstacles.	Public space is regulated by the District Department of Transportation.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA recommends addition of "and project amenities" in §§300.1(b), 300.5, 304.4(b), and 305.6.	Sub X § 305.10 states that "A project amenity is one type of public benefit, ..." therefore it is not necessary to include "and project amenities" with each reference to "public benefits".
145	A, W, X, Y, Z	ANC 2A Testimony	10/28/2013	PUD	ANC 2A opposes OP's new allowable increases in density, percent nonresidential uses, and height for PUDs. ANC 2A strongly recommends that the Commission continue to allow the identification of non-public PUD benefits and amenities which are desired for the immediately impacted community.	Thank you for your comment. The ZC will consider whether to use a number or a percentage for density increases as part of the deliberations.
54	B	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA requests that the ZC amend OP's proposed definition of PUD to include a requirement for contiguity of Squares in any PUD, including an "omnibus" PUD.	Sub X §§ 301.3, 301.4 and 301.5 require that all the property within a PUD be contiguous; this is the same language currently used in the existing regulations.
319	G, H	Faith Wheeler ANC 4B Testimony	11/13/2013	PUD	New zoning regulations mandating impact fees earmarked for public benefits and services, such as water quality, infrastructure and street improvements, parking, mass transit, parks and recreation, and landscaping on public streets.	Potential public benefits are outlined in Subtitle X, Chapter 3, Section 305.5.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	Since "Majority" is not equivalent to "substantial" and since "the geographic area of the ANC" is not equivalent to the "community in which the PUD would have an impact," the WECA recommends that the exact statutory language be used instead of the paraphrased version in §305.4.	The language referenced as statutory by the comment is a Comprehensive Plan Policy Statement (Policy IM-1.1.8: Location of PUD Amenities). The Comprehensive Plan Action Item language is broader and the ZRR proposed language is a balance of the Policy and the existing language which requires "The off-site benefit shall be located within one-quarter mile of the PUD site or within the boundaries of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission for the area that includes the PUD site."
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA requests that the ZC not allow for increases in currently allowable density, percent non-residential uses, and height in Foggy Bottom West End and define and state governing provisions for "omnibus" PUDs.	Thank you for your comment. The ZC will consider whether to use a number or a percentage for density increases as part of the deliberations.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA strongly supports the provisions in Subtitle X §§300.6, 304.1, and 308.16 since the ZC should be able to approve modifications to a PUD application.	Thank you for your comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA supports inclusion of the alternative in §305.3(d) for monetary contributions/or non -District government programs; i.e. ., for other items or services appropriate and needed for the directly-affected community.	Thank you for your comment.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA supports the identification provision in X § 307.8(d) and thinks that it will assist the ZC in its questioning of the Applicant before the communities have had an opportunity to present their views in opposition.	Thank you for your comment.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA supports the Maximum PUD extension provisions and thinks that no more than two extensions should apply to BZA approvals as well.	Thank you for your comment.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA supports the provisions in Subtitle X §§301.3, 301.4, and 301.5 that require that the property in a PUD shall be contiguous and requests that provisions governing "omnibus" PUDs be addressed in all three subsections.	Size and standards for contiguous parcel are established in Sub X Ch. 3 and apply to all PUDs as stated.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA supports the provisions of X § 317.4 regarding PUD party status requests.	Thank you for your comment.
55	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA supports the requirement in X § 308.5(d) that requires OP to report on issues or concerns raised by the ANC or community members.	Thank you for your comment.
56	X	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	PUD	WECA requests that the ZC require public hearings for all "modifications of consequence" to Zoning Orders, including for PUDs.	Sub X § 312.6 establishes that the ZC shall determine the level of a modification and when a public hearing is warranted.
111	X	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Clarify when environmental and sustainable elements can count as public benefits (305.5(k)). Limit the location of off-site benefits to areas near the PUD site (305.7).	OP will add clarifying language that all benefits or amenities must exceed that otherwise required. (example: "An environmental or sustainability element shall not be considered a public benefit except to the extent it exceeds what would have been required through matter of right development under existing zoning".)
111	X	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Delete additional market rate housing as a public benefit for PUDs (305.5(f)(1)).	OP does not recommend this full change but will clarify that only housing that is in excess of that allowed by zoning or when provided in accordance with Comp Plan language as a priority should be considered a benefit; Housing has always been listed as a potential benefit in the existing regulations.
111	X	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Increase minimum land area requirement for PUDs in Zone Group 6 to more than 15,000. State explicitly that a waiver of the minimum land area requirement cannot be granted for Zone Group 6.	OP does not recommend this change and is carrying forward existing text that requires "a total of 15,000 sq. ft. for development to be located in any other zone district."
111	X	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Maximum FAR with a PUD should not be increased from the current maximums.	OP does not recommend this change; With the exception of 3 zones IZ provides equal or more density than a PUD under the current maximums which results in more PUDs w/map amendments and less predictability.
111	X	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Section 303.2 should provide the formula for the calculation of the maximum allowable FAR on a site that includes several zone districts (weighted average of the FARs for each zone with the weight being the percent of land area in each zone).	This is a good idea; OP will add proposed language.
111	X	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Section 303.3 refers to a table that does not exist - need to include a table of maximum FAR with a PUD.	Agreed; a reference table was provided for detailed comparison in the OP report but this section needs clarification based on feed back from ZC on FAR increase.
111	X	Marilyn Simon Friendship Neighborhood Association Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	State explicitly that the minimum land area for a PUD with a map amendment is based on the original zone and not the requested zone.	OP does not recommend this change; the existing text clearly states "...for a development <u>to be located in any</u> ... District" and the long practice have been to use the proposed zone.
118	X	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Sec. 602 is over broad because it grants unlimited discretion to waive height, setbacks, lot occupancy, courts, and building transitions in RF and A zones where predictable development standards are important, partly because they often adjoin low and moderate density R zones. Development flexibility must be defined and limited to prevent use of design review as a way to achieve PUD-like waivers without PUD-level requirements.	Section 602 does not grant the Commission authority to waive development standards, but establishes a design review process whereby the Commission can provide flexibility with respect to the development standards, subject to the design review standards established in X Section 603.
155	X	Trevor Neve Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Extremely concerned about the Zoning Commission's proposal to make a number of significant changes to West End's zoning regulations that will have a profound effect on our neighborhood. Proposal to expand either the CEA or TDRs into more of Foggy Bottom-West End; allow for increases in currently allowable density, percent non-residential uses, and height in the Foggy Bottom-West End neighborhoods; define and state governing provisions for "omnibus" PUDs; change the requirements for parking spaces in Foggy Bottom-West End; and no longer require public hearings for any "modification of consequence" to zoning orders (including for PUDs and Campus Plans).	* Foggy Bottom and the West End neighborhood are included within the Near Northwest Area Element (Chapter 21), not the Central Washington Area Element (Chapter 16). The new D zones reflect those areas within the Central Washington Area identified on the Future Land Use Map as high density commercial, high density residential or high density mixed use. The Central Washington Area, the Central Employment Area, and Central Business District are not the same rather the are very different and although they may overlap in certain areas of the city they are not interchangeable . All three are defined in the Comprehensive Plan. The Central Employment Area is: A legal definition used primarily by the federal government in the location of projects, leasing of space, determination of parking standards, etc. and synonymous with the major concentration of federal and commercial land uses in the core of the District of Columbia. (page 5, Glossary of Terms & Index, 2006 Comprehensive Plan). Central Washington is: Planning Area developed for use in the Comprehensive Plan; corresponds to the monumental core of the city and the adjoining central business district areas. Central Business District is: The major employment, shopping, and commercial activity center in the city. For the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan, generally refers to the area north of the National Mall and south of Massachusetts Avenue, between Foggy Bottom and Capitol Hill.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
155	X	Trevor Neve Comments	10/28/2013	PUD	Extremely concerned about the Zoning Commission's proposal to make a number of significant changes to West End's zoning regulations that will have a profound effect on our neighborhood. Proposal to expand either the CEA or TDRs into more of Foggy Bottom-West End; allow for increases in currently allowable density, percent non-residential uses, and height in the Foggy Bottom-West End neighborhoods; define and state governing provisions for "omnibus" PUDs; change the requirements for parking spaces in Foggy Bottom-West End; and no longer require public hearings for any "modification of consequence" to zoning orders (including for PUDs and Campus Plans).	There is no such thing a "omnibus" PUD. A PUD by definition may be large in nature, encompassing multiple properties. Section 2401.3 of the existing regs and Sub X Section 301.3 and 301.5 establish that <i>property included in a PUD shall be contiguous, except that the property may be separated only by a public street, alley, or right-of-ways</i> . And the ZC has the authority to establish time lines for implementation of a PUD. Although A modification of consequence is proposed to for no public hearing, there is still a required 30 day public comment period.
198	X	Elaine Mittleman Comments	11/4/2013	PUD	Ownership of the properties included in the PUD should be verified. There needs to be stricter verification of the ownership of the property included in a PUD application. Procedure needed to assure the recording of a proper covenant. There should be a procedure to verify that a proper covenant has been recorded. Notice of the application should be sent to additional categories of persons. Required notice should be given to categories of persons in addition to the ANC and nearby property owners. The provision about notice should be expanded to include additional categories of persons.	Section 313.3 of the proposed text states, "The Zoning Administrator shall not approve a permit application unless the applicant has recorded a covenant in the land records of the District of Columbia satisfactory to the Office of the Attorney General and the Zoning Administrator, which covenant shall bind the owner and all successors in title to construct on and use the property only in accordance with the adopted orders, or amendments thereof, of the Commission." OP is not proposing new notification requirements, but the Zoning Commission could consider imposing additional notification requirements, if suggestions are presented.
206	X	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	PUD	Section 305.5, public benefits of a PUD, on page X-24 should include dog parks.	Thank you for your comment.
211	X	Cheryl Cort Coalition for Smarter Growth Testimony	11/4/2013	PUD	Subtitle X, 305: Planned Unit Development Public Benefits. Regarding Subtitle X, 305: Planned Unit Development Public Benefits, we recommend deleting the 305.5 (f)(3) clause: Subtitle X, 305.5 (f) (3) Provides units with 3 or more bedroom. [sic] We do not agree that providing a 3 bedroom or larger market rate housing unit necessarily benefits the public since the market can supply large units if households will pay for it. Giving preference to affordable housing units with 3 or more bedrooms, may be a good idea, but that would need to be incorporated into section 305.5 (g) which addresses affordable housing. Please clarify the affordable housing public benefit in 305.6 (g) regarding income level. Subtitle X, 305.6(g) discusses affordable housing above Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) matter of right provision as a public benefit, specifically for a net gain in gross floor area set-aside for "low-income households." The definition for "low-income household" for Inclusionary Zoning of C, Chapter 22 is not provided. Nor does Subtitle B: Definitions, provide a definition for IZ "low-income" and "moderate-income" households. Instead Subtitle B refers to Subtitle C Chapter 22, Inclusionary Zoning. We presume 50% of AMI for "low-income" and 80% AMI for "moderate-income." These definitions need to be added for clarification. We recommend that "low-income households" meaning 50% AMI, be given preference as a public benefit in section 305.6 (g). Providing affordable housing at this income level- 50% of AMI- is much more beneficial than providing 80% AMI units, given the acute shortage of housing at a below this income level. Subtitle X, Section 306 Housing Linkage. We recommend deleting 306.2(b): 306:2 (b) No income limits shall apply to housing that is constructed on the site of the PUD. [Note: Need to coordinate with IZ][Italicized note in original]. The PUD housing linkage requirement appears to bar affordable housing from being provided in a PUD that is permitted to increase gross floor area devoted to office space over matter of right zoning. We recommend that the goal of providing dwellings affordable to low and moderate-income people be allowed on or off site. Per the reference to "low and moderate-income people" in section 306.2, we ask that these terms be defined as the same as the IZ definition- which does not appear to be defined, but is presumably 50% AMI and 80% AMI household income, adjusted for family size. Regarding exclusions in 306.4 (c) which includes a PUD for WMATA property. We question WMATA property being excluded from this requirement as WMATA policy is for its Joint Developments to comply with all local housing laws. Regarding 306.5, which addresses a PUD applicant fulfilling the housing requirement through constructing or rehabilitating housing, we ask if this provision is better implemented with a fee to the Housing Production Trust Fund given the success of the trust fund, and past experience of not realizing a fair value of the office density increase. Regarding 306.5 (c) the dwelling unit size minimum of 850 sq. ft. should be reexamined and standardized with IZ standards that provide smaller units size limits of 400 sq. ft. for studios, 550 sq. ft. for one bedrooms and 800 sq. ft. for two bedroom units. Regarding 306.5 (e)-We recommend that for rental housing, the term be the same as IZ, the life of the building or project, rather than 20 years as proposed here.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
214	X	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/4/2013	PUD	The PUD proposals include some serious policy considerations. We are giving away height and offering a way outside the PUD process to get unlimited FAR through TDRs. Why is the housing linkage for PUDs not applied to downtown and by right zoning bonuses not linked to affordable housing? Are we maintaining outdated incentives for developers, misjudging the current economic climate, and missing an opportunity to leverage density bonuses? The proposed design review process lacks limits on the amount of zoning flexibility that could be achieved. The Zoning Commission should not approve this unlimited authority and ask the Office of Planning to draft new text amendments that establish specific and more restrictive design review flexibility limits than can be achieved with a PUD. The benefit to the city is less when zoning waivers are not leveraged for public benefit.	OP will be addressing concerns raised regarding IZ through a separate process.
222	X	Judi Jones ANC 4B07 Testimony	11/5/2013	PUD	Section 3001.10 - the PUD process shall not be used to reduce requirements for designated uses, specifically retail, service, entertainment, and arts uses within an Neighborhood zone. Please explain. As I understand it, this means that a PUD should not be used to get rid of a business. Entertainment or certain types of entertainment should be stricken. Section 303.11 - the PUD height and density standards for the Subtitle K, Special Purpose Zones are contained within Subtitle K chapters for those zones. What are special purpose zones? Industrial zones? Overlays? If not, why can't CM-1 & 2 (P-1 & P-2 zones) be included or negotiated as PUDs? Otherwise there will be more overlays. Section 304 - ANCs should be included as part of the evaluation and approval process for the ZC. OP gets to input their report. ANC reports and the PUD's impact on the community should be just as important. Nothing about a PUD should be a matter of right. Once a PUD has been set, there should be no changes without going through the PUD process again. Example, 600 New Hampshire Ave development. There should be a process for industrial areas like the PUD process. Industrial areas are the best and worst of the city. CMs see them as a dumping ground. The Lamond CDC sees it as an opportunity to process the changes for the chillum place industrial area to be an asset to the residential area rather than a liability.	A PUD is a project specific zoning action that is intended to allow that is better than could be built as a by right project. The PUD process is designed to encourage high quality developments that provide public benefits. The goal is to permit flexibility of development including increased height and density; provided that the project offers a commendable number or quality of public benefits.

<i>ZC Exhibit #</i>	<i>Subtitle</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Comment/Testimony</i>	<i>OP Response</i>
530	X	Andrew Reuter Letter in Opposition	2/7/2014	PUDs	Furthermore, the last minute addition of the PUD changes to the zoning proposal is a significant and transformative adjustment that requires additional time for the city's residents and ANCs to assess. Moreover, the elimination of the promised step to review the commuting patterns of city neighborhoods before making sweeping changes to parking betrays both the Office of Planning and Zoning Commission's lack of commitment to base changes on real data that aligns with the transportation and parking needs of individual neighborhoods. All communities District-wide should have a say in the development of their neighborhoods. The ZRR proposal threatens this core principal. The zoning changes will be bad for the city, its residents, and its future. They should be overhauled from the ground up. Or, better yet, discarded entirely. There is no need to fix what isn't broken. Yes, there are parts of the zoning regulations that need to be updated. Instead of re-writing all the rules, focus on incrementally improving what isn't working instead of fundamentally transforming what is.	Thank you for your comments. The Zoning Commission will determine whether to bring forward the OP proposals.
163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168	B, C, D, E, F, Y	Gale Barron Black ANC 4A08 Comments	10/30/2013	residential	Exceptions – Do not permit the Board to modify or waive the requirements. Example 1605.4. Provide for public notice of such exceptions if allowed. Ambiguities – Reconcile Subtitle C and D regarding residential use. Alleys – City needs to follow street and alley closing act before it converts the use of a public alley. City should maintain a list of all public space, including streets and alleys. Lodging as Accessory Use – Disagree with boarders and 1600.5. Height – Have an absolute height limit for residential buildings. Use C 502.4 language. Front Setbacks – We may want more flexibility. For certain blocks. An overlay may be sought for Crestwood to keep low density, residential area. Side Yards – Preserve 8 foot side in R-1 and R-2. Strike 1301.2. Trees – Needs more of an explanation, seems unwise and burdensome. No. of Units – Hold steady and no new non-residential uses permitted by right if not in place as of January 1, 2013. Family – Single family – preserve concept and term. Parking – Delete all restriction on Parking. Strike C 1902. Accessory Dwellings – Interior only with D 1606 conditions. Strike 801.3, 801.4, 801.8. Accessory – No garage/exterior units, this should require special exception. Preserving Neighborhood Character – If non-commercial, keep non commercial.	Thank you for your comments. OP will review the draft text for consistency within and between subtitles.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	RF	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. The expansion of apartment houses in RF 4 and 5 zones based on 750 sf of lot per unit is not consistent with existing R4 requirement of 900 sf. The Zoning Commission should carefully consider where these zones will be mapped and what the current density allowance is to determine if this reduction would be compatible with conditions in the neighborhood. Since mapping will not occur before the regulations are approved, a better solution would be to delete Sec. 504.4 and add RF 4 and 5 zones to Chapter 6, which would apply 900 sf of lot per unit as the standard for all RF zones.	OP is proposing that a minimum of 750 sq. ft. be required for conversion in the RF-4 and RF-5 zones and 900 sq. ft. in the RF-1, RF-2, and RF-3 zones.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	RF	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. Suggested changes to each section are in italics. (1) Purpose statement, Subt. E, Sec. 100.3(a) is too all-inclusive and it removes the important purpose statement that R4 zones are partly intended to stabilize remaining single family homes. The policy statements regarding walkable neighborhoods, housing affordability, aging in place, improvements to the overall environment are land use policies that are self-evident for all zones, but are not mentioned in other residential zones. The existing purpose statement includes protection of single family homes from conversion to multi-family housing and that goal should be in the purpose statement. (2) The expansion of apartment houses in RF 4 and 5 zones based on 750 sf of lot per unit is not consistent with existing R4 requirement of 900 sf. The Zoning Commission should carefully consider where these zones will be mapped and what the current density allowance is to determine if this reduction would be compatible with conditions in the neighborhood. Since mapping will not occur before the regulations are approved, a better solution would be to delete Sec. 504.4 and add RF 4 and 5 zones to Chapter 6, which would apply 900 sf of lot per unit as the standard for all RF zones. (3) Height measurement of accessory structures from finished grade. Height measurements on same lot should be consistent and in RF zones should be from existing grade. (4) Corner store provision is unclear. Proposed Sec. 1106 provides for special exception for numerous types of corner stores, but none of these uses are listed as authorized on the RF use tables. Non-residential uses can destabilize a neighborhood and remove housing from the neighborhood inventory. Moreover one of the main reasons for creating RF 4 and 5 is to protect row house housing by down zoning and removing inappropriate density and uses. The Council should amend the Comprehensive Plan to provide policy direction regarding corner stores and RF neighborhoods should request these uses and under what conditions they would support them. The allowance, including special exceptions, should be removed. (5) Institutional uses and office uses (Sec. 1102.9 and 1102.10) in a residential zone have the potential to alter the quality of the neighborhood. These uses, if allowed at all, should have concentration limits not by square but by feet. There should not be one per block and two per block may be too much housing converted for non-residential use. The use should be incidental. Again, if the goal is to preserve the residential quality and encourage appropriate residential development in RF zones, these proposals are contrary to that goal. (6) The purpose statement in Subt. F, Se. 100.3 does not mentioned affordability even though the A zones provide the most housing density. If affordability is an appropriate purpose of RF zones, it should be an appropriate purpose in A zones. (7) RSA zones are not exclusively apartment zones. This zone should be moved from the A zone to the R zone. The RSA development standards and appropriate use authorizations are more aligned with R zone districts. (8) Eighteen and one-half foot (“18.5 ft.”) roof structures are out of scale on row houses and small apartment buildings. Extend the 10 ft. limit proposed for Capitol Hill R5B zones to all existing RSA and R5B zones, at a minimum. All row houses may not be mapped in RF 4 or 5 and they should be protected, as should smaller apartment buildings, from overly large roof structures.	1) The purposes of Subtitle E are drawn from the purposes for the R-4 zone in the existing code. 2) OP is proposing that a minimum of 750 sq. ft. be required for conversion in the RF-4 and RF-5 zones and 900 sq. ft. in the RF-1, RF-2, and RF-3 zones. 3) The Zoning Commission has adopted the revised height provisions (12-13). 4 and 5) OP is proposing that grocery stores be permitted by right subject to conditions. Other corner store uses would be by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for the neighborhood to weigh in on the application, which could include suggesting conditions to address design issues. The OP proposal includes location criteria that limits the placement of corner stores in close proximity (500 feet) to existing commercially-zoned areas. 6) The purpose statement language is derived from the existing code - affordability is not expressly stated as a goal of the R-5 zones in the existing code. 7) OP will include "residential" in the apartment zone names. 8) OP is proposing a 10-foot maximum roof structure height for the residential zones and an 18-foot 6-inch maximum height for other zones.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	RF	The Committee of 100 supports the following proposed concepts. (2) The limitation on conversions to 3 units in RF 4 and 4 units in RF 5.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	RF	The Committee of 100 supports the following proposed concepts. (1) Creation of two new zones, RF 4 and 5, for row houses currently zoned R5.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	RF	The Committee of 100 supports the following proposed concepts. Creation of two new zones, RF 4 and 5, for row houses currently zoned R5.	Thank you for your comment.
120	E	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	RF	The Committee of 100 supports the following proposed concepts. The limitation on conversions to 3 units in RF 4 and 4 units in RF 5.	Thank you for your comment.
263	E	Robert Robinson & Sherril Berger Comments	11/7/2013	RF	Concern about R-4 conversions.	Thank you for your comment. OP is proposing the new RF zones in an effort to address this issue.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
483	E	ANC 1C Comments	1/30/2014	RF	Desire that the ZRR maximize the ability of residential areas of Adams Morgan to downzone. Positive support for the creation of the new RF-4 and RF-5 row house zones. However, there are not currently FAR and setback standards for these zones, which need to be added. Refers to the Kalorama Citizen's Association resolution which calls for a limitation on the height of roof structures to 10 feet instead of 18 feet and application of the current sidewall setbacks in place of the currently prescribed formula.	If Adams Morgan is interested in downzoning, the community should initiate discussions with the Office of Planning. OP will review and clarify the development standards for the RF-4 and RF-5 zones. OP is proposing that roof structures be limited to 10 feet in residential zones.
601	E	Thomas Conway Testimony	2/26/2014	RF	Mt. Pleasant's Historic District is unique and needs a customized zone. Eliminate the lot occupancy bonus for conversions and set lot occupancy maximums by the type of structure and not the internal use. Eliminate the increase now allowed for conversions of detached and semi-detached houses to both "flats" and "apartment houses." Only row houses - houses that go from lot line to lot line - should be allowed 60% lot occupancy in the historic district. Do not reduce the minimum lot size per unit for conversions below 900 sq. ft. Conversions should be subject to review as variances and not matter-of-right which prevent any input from the community on impact on neighbors or the zone plan, which is intended to protect single family dwellings. Establish a moratorium on conversions until custom zones can be established.	The Office of Planning is working with Mt. Pleasant to address concerns raised regarding the ZRR and potential impacts to the historic district.
615	E	Colleen Hackett Comments	3/3/2014	RF	Concerned that the zoning revisions planned for the Mount Pleasant Historic District will further erode both the base of its affordable housing stock and our community's historic character. Has specific concerns relating to lot coverage and condo-conversion of single family home stock, but I also want to focus my comments on one of the biggest challenges we face at this juncture and that is: prior to lifting the lid off of current zoning regulations. the District already has a lack of budgeted enforcement of its existing regulations as well as poor municipal agency coordination required to guide them. Concerned about 60% lot occupancy proposed for row dwellings in the RF-1 zone.	The enforcement budget is not within the purview of the Zoning Commission. The existing matter-of-right lot occupancy for row dwellings in the R-4 zone is 60%.
691	E	ANC 1C Report	4/11/2014	RF	ANC 1C welcomes the proposed two new rowhouse zones RF-4 and RF-5, and Urges the Zoning Commission to: Eliminate the proposed commercial and other non-residential uses from the two new rowhouse zones RF-4 and -5 as well as from any RF-1 district resulting from future downzoning from and R-5 district; Strike §E- 504.4; Strike §E- 600; and Set an FAR limit of 1.8 for the proposed RF-4 and -5 zones.	Thank you for your comments. OP is proposing to permit corner store uses in the RF zones. OP has proposed a maximum FAR of 2.0 for the RF-4 and RF-5 zones.
271	E, F	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/7/2013	RF	Purpose statements should include the existing purpose of protecting single family homes from conversion to multi-family housing. Height measurement should be consistently measured from the existing grade and not from the finished grade. Conflicting language in the RF-4 and RF-5 regarding conversion to apartment building - minimum square footage of 750 vs. 900. Concern about corner store provisions. Permitting office uses in large historic homes is unwarranted, historic assets better utilized as housing. Add Residential to Apartment zone title. By right roof structures should be proportional to the maximum permitted height.	OP is proposing that a minimum of 750 sq. ft. be required for conversion in the RF-4 and RF-5 zones and 900 sq. ft. in the RF-1, RF-2, and RF-3 zones. OP will add "residential" to the apartment zones. OP is proposing a maximum height of 10 feet for roof structures in the residential zones.
582	E, F	Charles G. Burg Comments	2/25/2014	RF	Deeply concerned by the increased conversion of row houses in Adams Morgan into pop-up buildings that loom over their neighbors' properties and destroy the enjoyment and use of adjoining back yards. The R-5-B zoning is not characteristic of many of the residential neighborhoods in the city and allows property owners to build to the back and to the front of the lot, as well as pop-ups. As a remedy, we propose changing the current zoning for the cluster of streets with row houses - Lanier Place, Ontario Place, Argonne Place, Ontario Road, and 18th Street - with features adopted from the R-4 zoning requirements that limit the number of units in any one row-house to two, limit the part of the lot that can be occupied by new construction, and limit the height of row-houses to prevent the addition of a fourth floor. Existing apartments, condos, and multi-unit properties will be unaffected by this re-zoning - it will simply limit the ability of developers to convert more of the existing homes to pop-up developments.	If Adams Morgan is interested in downzoning, the community should initiate discussions with the Office of Planning.
585	E, F	Paul Alan Levy Testimony	2/26/2014	RF	Seek a rezoning of Lanier Heights to preserve the stock of single family homes by maintaining the current density of single-family neighborhood lots, to stop out-of-scale heights and intrusive pop-ups, and to avoid exacerbating off-street parking by retaining existing minimum parking requirements for new development and institutions. Although the majority of the residents uninvolved so far are the owners of row houses, resident of area apartment buildings are chiming in with support for this movement. Please allow the creation of a custom zoning overlay for our neighborhood that limits vertical construction (popups) that adds floors to our row houses, limits the depth of additions to existing row houses, which shrink the front and back yards of existing row houses, and limits to two the number of units per row house, in a designated residential area (the streets selected by and Lanier Heights group are: Lanier Place, Ontario Place, Ontario Road from Columbia Road to Adams Mill Road, Summit Place, 18th Street from Ontario Road to Harvard Street, Argonne Place, and Adams Mill Road from Lanier Place to Harvard Street).	If Adams Morgan is interested in downzoning, the community should initiate discussions with the Office of Planning.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
592	E, F	Denis Suski Testimony	2/26/2014	RF	Welcome the addition of the RF zones, however there needs to be a more defined path toward them. The RF-4 and 5 zone proposals that are intended to preserve the character of residential neighborhoods as stated in Section E however seem contradictory in their statements. Lot occupancy is far too permissive at 60% especially considering that the setbacks for these zones have been deleted. It does not seem possible to retain the character and homes of these neighborhoods when you are allowed to convert the homes into 3 and 4 units in these zones. I can't see how this is supposed to help retain the character, homes and green space of these communities. These homes and streets were built primarily to house 1 or 2 units, not 3 or 4. Additionally regarding the RF5 zone, allowing a height restriction of 50 feet will do little to stop adding additional floors to row homes and disrupting the skyline. We need to do more to ensure that these neighborhoods remain intact. Section E, 600.2 states that you can convert a building to an apartment if: The building is on a lot in the RF-1, RF-2 or RF-3 zone. Maybe I am reading this wrong, but it doesn't seem to make any statement about converting RF-4 and 5 zones. Much of the new zoning leaves far too many holes open for interpretation and over-development. The zoning commission needs to understand that we should not have to live in fear of what a developer sees fit to do to ruin our communities to make a quick dollar and move on to the next. I have no problems with increasing density when it's done responsibly and with regard toward other and the future, but I am concerned that what's happening in this city is very short-term and short-sighted. There should be room in this city for row-homes in neighborhoods and they must be protected because once they are gone they will not be back. I implore you to help add additional provisions to save what's left of DC's neighborhoods and row-homes.	OP has not proposed that the RF-4 and RF-5 zones be mapped at this time. The existing matter-of-right lot occupancy for row dwellings in the R-4 zone is 60% - OP is not proposing to change that but has been asked to review the provision to allow an increase in the Single family house lot occupancy in the RF zones.
685	E, F	S. Jean Stewart Comments	4/2/2014	RF	Subtitle F of the draft would replace Adams Morgan's current R-5B and R-5D residential zones with "Apartment" ("A") zones. This would not help us to curtail the current epidemic of ugly and obnoxious pop-ups and other high-density overdevelopment of many of our row houses. Pop-ups not only add too much density, but they take away previously green areas, where soil and plants absorb rainwater instead of adding to wasteful runoff. In the face of these unwelcome changes, there is growing interest in the community in seeking downzoning to one or more of the five new Residential Flat (RF) Zones defined in Subtitle E. This would help preserve the character and the scale of our residential neighborhoods, and prevent too much additional density. However, there are aspects of the RF Zone provisions in the draft that I feel are detrimental to keeping the general character of our neighborhood. One is that they permit the introduction of an unlimited number of commercial establishments into houses and apartment buildings, thus potentially taking away the residential character of the immediate neighborhood with enterprises such as pawnshops, appliance repair shops, carry-outs, and the like. The commercial sector of Adams Morgan already has a sufficient number of business enterprises. Further, the draft does not retain the floor area ratio (FAR) limits for dwellings. The current limit of 1.8 FAR should be retained for all residences. Otherwise, pop-ups and similar overdevelopment would have free rein.	The R-5-B and R-5-D zones are apartment zones and OP is proposing to add "residential" in front of apartment for the zone names. If the Adams Morgan community is interested in pursuing a rezoning to the RF-4 or RF-5 zones (or another zone), the community should initiate a discussion with the Office of Planning.
596	F	Olatokunbo Olowofoyeku Testimony	2/26/2014	RF	1. Do not allow developers to break up existing single family homes to create multi-unit properties. Redevelopment of such properties must be restricted to a maximum of 2 units. 2. Do not allow such future developments to occupy more than 60% of the land and space in the plot previously or currently occupied by a single family home. Following this rule will present developers blocking current direct access to sunlight for existing homes and their gardens. It infringes the neighbor's living space. 3. Absolutely no pop ups are to be allowed. There must not be any extra story added above currently existing family homes or properties occupying nearby similar plots. 4. Insist that each new home provide minimum parking requirement for one/two cars. 5. Gardens, leisure areas (unbuilt areas in a plot) are necessary for exercise and the well being of city dwellers especially where you have more than 2 occupants or children in the home.	(1) OP is proposing two new residential flat zones. The RF-4 and RF-5 zones are new and would permit three and four units respectively. They are not proposed to be mapped anywhere but would be available for communities who request a rezoning. OP would then work in consultation with the initiating ANC or neighborhood to map the new zone. (2) Lot occupancy is proposed at 60% for row dwellings. (3) OP is looking at the issue of popups and will be drafting proposed text for review by the Zoning Commission. (4) The current and proposed parking requirement for single-family residential is one space per unit; however, OP is proposing that the space not be required if there is no alley. (5) Thank you for your supportive comment. OP is proposing pervious surface and green area requirements.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
275	G	Claudia Schlosberg & Wayne Kahn Comments	11/9/2013	RF	We are increasingly concerned about the ability of developers to come into our neighborhood and convert single family homes into multiple condo units with no input from the neighborhood. As you are well aware, our large lots, coupled with the R-4 designation gives developers the ability to come in and subdivide single family homes into multiple units as a matter of right. Developers often request variances to create more units than even the lot size allows and these appear to be granted routinely. Our experience is that neighbors don't have any say in the process. Notices about variances are not sent or if they are, they are not effective in notifying neighbors of the issues or the process. The MTP Historic Association has no real authority and if the developer is acting "by right" our ANC will approve any proposal since the developers are acting within the law. These matter of right conversions are accelerating the loss of remaining single-family homes and are having a detrimental impact on our quality of life. The ability of developers to convert single-family homes into multiple condominium units is also helping to inflate housing prices. While historic designation has helped to stem the loss of exterior features, the gutting and subdivision of these homes means the permanent loss of historic interiors. Neighbors and neighborhoods need more protection against developers who are in the business to make money. They are able to run over ordinary citizens before we are even aware of what is happening. We are not against all condo conversions but we need stronger safeguards. The "by right" provisions need to be eliminated in favor of a process that allows for more consideration of the neighborhood interests including the preservation of historic structures and affordable rental units. Adjacent property owners must have greater rights. Variances should be allowed but they should be exceptions, not the rule. The process for notifying neighbors and giving them a real opportunity to participate in the process must be strengthened. There also must be standards in the regulations that favor existing uses and put the burden on the developer to make his/her case that there are significant impacts to adjacent neighbors and to the neighborhood. The bar must be higher for those who seek fundamental change. Ultimately, we must find ways to ensure that R-4 doesn't mean a free for all -- where developers come in and make changes to our community that have permanent, irreversible impacts that fundamentally change the nature of our community. Accordingly, we support the recommendations of Historic Mount Pleasant to remove Chapter 6 from Subtitle E, maintain current lot occupancy maximums for different kinds of housing; and set those maximums by building type and not the number of units. In other words, "flats" should not be entitled to more lot coverage than the building itself based on its exterior style, whether detached, semi-detached, or row. We also oppose continuation of the conversion authority, the current 20% lot occupancy conversion bonus, and the proposal to raise maximum lot occupancy to 60% for detached and semidetached single family residences, with or without existing accessory dwellings.	The Office of Planning is working with Mt. Pleasant to address concerns raised regarding the ZRR and potential impacts to the historic district.
618	Z	ANC 1D Comments	3/5/2014	RF	The proposed regulation permitting 60% maximum lot coverage for all dwellings in an RF-1 zone should be revised to require, at least within Mount Pleasant, that structures built according to the 40% coverage limit remain so limited, permanently.	The Office of Planning is working with Mt. Pleasant to address concerns raised regarding the ZRR and potential impacts to the historic district.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	roof structure	§ 505.2(e): This section states that roof structures must be set back from side (interior) lot lines, which is a change from the existing application of the Regulations. This is section is also inconsistent with the new Subtitle D, Section 1502.4(c). Is there a reason for the change?	OP will review the proposed language for roof structures.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	roof structure	§ 505.4: This section limits the area within a roof structure enclosing walls to 40%. Is there a reason for this limitation? Enclosures are often open to the sky and do not generate any rooftop FAR or usable enclosed space. What if there are rooftop elements greater than 4 feet in height that are necessarily spread across the roof and need to be enclosed? Why force the applicant to the BZA for a special exception in that instance? This section is also not consistent with Subtitle G, Section 1201.5, which permits up to 0.40 FAR for a roof structure.	OP will review the proposed language and correct any inconsistencies.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	roof structures	Comments on C502 and C505 are addressed above.	OP will review the text and propose changes to clarify.
66	C	ANC 3C Comments	10/24/2013	roof structures	Roof structures for recreation use should not be permitted, except by special exception, in existing low-density R-1 residential zones where rear and side yards are required, which typically provide recreation space that does not unduly impact nearby neighbors. Roof structures have potential to alter neighborhood character since roof top recreation structures are not currently allowed in low-density neighborhoods.	OP is proposing that roof structures be limited to 10 feet in the lower density residential zones, which is a reduction from the 18.5-foot limit which is currently permitted.
400	C	Brian O'Looney Torti Gallas Testimony	11/19/2013	roof structures	Why can't architects place pergolas and other architectural embellishments at corner locations like we used to. Please clarify the language for penthouses. Allowing market processes to work with parking will greatly improve efficiency of land use, return on parking investments, and increased land value.	OP is not proposing to restrict pergolas and other architectural elements through ZRR. See Subtitle C, Chapters 5 and 15, which address roof structures and transitions. Pergolas and similar structures may be built above the height limit established for the zone, subject to conditions and the Height Act.
492	C	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	roof structures	Roof Structures - We urge that the ANC and neighbors have an opportunity to suggest conditions through a Special Exception requirement to avoid unintended consequences from this new use.	OP is proposing that roof structures be limited to 10 feet in residential zones and OP has proposed to maintain the 18.5-foot limit for roof structures.
509	C, D, E, F	AIA-DC (Ward 1) Comments	2/5/2014	roof structures	In the discussions of the 1910 Height Act, AIA-DC recommended that the height of mechanical penthouses be increased to 20 feet above the height of the roof or any green roof-like system (from the current requirement of 18.5 feet) to better conceal mechanical equipment to improve the design of Washington rooftops. Although there has been a controversy about changing overall approach to the Height Act, most witnesses agreed that this proposal would provide a modest improvement to the design of rooftops. Since it is the Zoning Code that specifies a particular height, we recommend that this very modest increase be included in the update, as part of Subtitle C, Section 505.3. In addition, we believe that the requirement of "enclosing walls from roof level shall be of equal height" can lead to very big bulky roof structures. Variation of height could provide better designed rooftops while still masking the equipment. We recommend that this requirement be removed in the following sections: Subtitle D, Section 1502; Subtitle E, Section 1002.4; Subtitle F, Section 1001.3.	OP has requested that AIA-DC provide additional information regarding the need and potential impacts of increasing roof structure heights to 20 feet.
123	D	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	roof structures	By-right recreational use of roof structures should only be permitted in R-3 by special exception.	Thank you for your comment. Subtitle D limits the height of roof structures to 10 feet.
249	D	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	roof structures	Recreational roof structures up to 10 feet above the 40 -foot height limit should not be allowed except for in the R-3.	OP is proposing to limit roof structures to 10 feet in the R and RF zones.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
268	E	Cary Kadleccek Goulston & Storrs (on behalf of the Consortium of Universities and Independent Education) Testimony	11/7/2013	roof structures	Permit institutional structures to construct roof structures up to 18'6".	OP will revise the proposal to accommodate the 18'6" height for roof structures for institutional uses in residential zones.
121	F	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	roof structures	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. Eighteen and one-half foot ("18.5 ft.") roof structures are out of scale on row houses and small apartment buildings. Extend the 10 ft. limit proposed for Capitol Hill R5B zones to all existing R5A and R5B zones, at a minimum. All row houses may not be mapped in RF 4 or 5 and they should be protected, as should smaller apartment buildings, from overly large roof structures.	R-5 zones are apartment zones and, as such, OP has proposed to maintain the 18.5-foot height limit for roof structures.
685	F, G	S. Jean Stewart Comments	4/2/2014	roof structures	In further support of sustaining the livable and generally attractive quality of our community, I ask that the new regulations change the current requirements for roof structures by reducing the height maximum from 18.5 feet to 10 feet in the A and M zones. This would help to keep roof structures from being obtrusive and unsightly. This effect is even worse when the structure is a pop-up, which is obtrusive to begin with. The draft Subtitle C addresses a related roof structure issue with a formula for setback distances from side walls that is an improvement, and I would ask that it be applied to all row houses in at least the A and M zones.	R-5 zones are apartment zones and, as such, OP has proposed to maintain the 18.5-foot height limit for roof structures. OP is not proposing to change the permitted roof structure height for mixed use zones.
691	F, G	ANC 1C Report	4/11/2014	roof structures	Urge the ZC to limit the heights of roof structures in the A and M zones to 10 feet. Apply the side-wall setback formula provided in C 505.2(e) in place of the corresponding setback formula in the roof structure provisions for the A and M zones.	OP is proposing to limit roof structures to 10 feet in the R and RF zones, but is not proposing such a limit in the A zones. The limit in the A zones would remain at 18.5 feet, which is consistent with the existing code.
317	G	Cary Kadleccek DCBIA Testimony	11/13/2013	roof structures	Propose that you remove § 1201.4 in subtitle G, which creates a more onerous setback requirement for roof structures confronting open courts. This requirement does not exist now and should not exist under the new regulations. This proposed requirement will create a considerably more burdensome roof structure setback requirement that severely restricts building core design flexibility when the roof structure most likely will not have any impact on public space. Finding a suitable location for a roof structure and designing an efficient core may become extremely difficult, which would trigger the need for relief that would not have any impact anyway. For example, a roof structure may confront one wall of an open court, but that wall may not face an alley or a street. In this case, it should not be necessary that this roof structure is set back at a 1:1 ratio when it most likely will not have any visual impact on anything but the property itself, but the result would be that it would be necessary to see BZA relief. Accordingly, we request that you eliminate this change to the roof structure regulations.	OP will review the comments provided by DCBIA and determine whether revisions are appropriate.
317	G	Cary Kadleccek DCBIA Testimony	11/13/2013	roof structures	Under Chapter 12 roof structure standards in subtitle G, the requirement for enclosing rood structures with walls of equal height should be eliminated. This recommendation can be adopted for all of the proposed new zones. We recognize that this is a carryover from the present zoning regulations, but it is very common to request relief from this requirements. The basis for the relief is usually to create a roof structure that is less visible and has less impact, so it contravenes the intent of needing relief for a roof structure. At the very least, we recommend that this standard be modified so that walls of varying heights are permitted when minimizing the heights of a roof structure but for an elevator overrun or some other mechanical reason that causes part of the roof structure to be taller.	OP will review the comments provided by DCBIA and determine whether revisions are appropriate.
447	K	Greenstein DeLorme & Luchs, PC/Forest City Washington Comments	12/9/2013	SEFC	See comments for "redline" of Subtitle K, Special Purpose Zones, Chapter 2 regarding the Southeast Federal Center that contains revisions and corrections proposed by Forest City Washington. The "redline" shows additions and deletions to the proposed text by underlining and strike-throughs, respectively.	Thank you for your comments.
229	B	Chris Otten Adams Morgan for Reasonable Development Testimony	11/5/2013	setback	Required rear yards should remain for any lot given the importance of light and air, safety, and to prevent over-crowding.	OP is proposing a rear setback, which would be measured from the property line in.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	setback	C1201.3(d) addresses required rear yard setback for a principal building. We think subsection (d) should be amended as follows: "Where there is more than one rear lot line generally parallel to the front lot line but separated by a lot line generally perpendicular to the rear lot lines, then the rear setback shall be measured from the rear lot line more distant from the front lot line, and measured across the full width of the property to where it intersects both side lot lines; <u>however, in no case shall the rear setback be less than the required side yard setback.</u> "	OP will review this proposal.
60	C	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	setback	Would add the following to C 1201.3(d) "however, in no case shall the rear setback be less than the required side yard setback."	OP is not proposing to require that a rear setback shall not be less than a side setback.
132	C	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	setback	Subtitle C, Chapter 12 Rear Setbacks. Section 1201.3 addresses rear setback for R zones (a) The rear setback shall be measured as a vertical plane parallel to the rear lot lines, measured from the rear lot line into the lot; The point from which the proposed measurement is taken is exactly opposite the current practice - from the rear of the building to the rear lot line. The reason for this change is not known, however it may afford more room for accessory dwelling units. However, it eliminates the necessity for light and air at the rear of the primary residential building.	OP is proposing a revision to the rear setback requirement - using setback versus a required rear yard to improve predictability and consistency. The Zoning Commission will determine whether it wants to bring forward this proposed revision.
591	C, D, E	Chris Otten Adams Morgan for Reasonable Development Testimony	2/26/2014	setback	We want rear yards to remain for any lot given the importance of light and air, safety, and to prevent over-crowding. The new regulations should define the rear yard and rear lot line as they currently do now - primarily based on the principal building's rear line and projecting back. That way, no matter how irregular the lot, there is a rear yard buffer to meet the intentions and purpose of the Zoning Code as described by DC Code, Sec. 6-641.02.	OP is proposing to use rear setbacks, which would be measured from the rear property line inward, to provide a consistent method of measurement and buffer from adjoining properties.
61	D	Gary Thompson ANC 3/4G Comments	10/24/2013	setback	Task Force is pleased to see the draft regulations revert from prior OP versions to the existing setback minimums for R-1 and R-2 areas of 25 feet (rear) and 8 feet (side).	Thank you for your supportive comment.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
141	D	Carol F. Aten Comments	10/28/2013	setback	Front Setbacks - In an attempt to eliminate erratic looking streetscapes where one house is built close to the front of the lot, others are midway back, and another is way back, the new rules would allow setbacks for new or expanded houses to be anywhere in the existing range. While it is a good objective to avoid snaggle-toothed streetscapes, why allow new construction to replicate the more extreme anomalies? The new zoning rules should set a range that is more in line with the predominant setback on a street or require a front setback consistent with the immediate neighbors, or if they are different, the same as one of them.	There is currently no front setback requirement and OP believes that the proposed setback within the existing range of blockface would prevent anomalies while allowing flexibility.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	setback	Our neighborhood may want more flexibility for certain blocks. An overlay may be sought to ensure that front yards match what is in the neighborhood, but not unnecessarily limit the design choices.	Thank you for your comment.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	setback	Preserve the eight foot side yard in R1 and R2 areas. Strike 1301.2. Under this proposal, Section 1301.2, an accessory building “shall be permitted in a required side setback of a principal building.” What exactly does this mean? Are there side yards and will they be at least 8 feet? See also D-41. A side set back shall not be required along a side lot line.	OP is not proposing to eliminate the 8-foot side yard in the R-1 and R-2 zones. See Subtitle D, Chapter 2, Section 206.1. The Zoning Commission will determine whether it wants to modify OP's proposal to allow accessory buildings within the side setback.
492	D	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	setback	Accessory Structures in Side Yard Setback - We strongly urge the Zoning Commission to reject allowing accessory structures in the side yard setback and to maintain the current requirement.	The Zoning Commission will determine whether to bring forward the OP proposal regarding accessory structures. OP proposed that accessory buildings less than 10 feet in height and less than 100 square feet in gross floor area be permitted in the required side setback of a principal building.
63	E	ANC 6B Comments	10/21/2013	setback	Side Setbacks -- ANC 6B notes the problem presented by the current code requirement that a rear addition to existing semi-detached residential structure must either be set back 8 feet from the property line or go all the way to the lot line. This requirement often results in applicants proposing to expand rear additions to the side lot line, closing off views through side setbacks. This loss of view lines is especially frustrating where the applicants might well prefer to continue an existing setback that is less than 8 feet if the code permitted. ANC 6B supports the proposal to reduce the conforming setback to be 5 feet for any newly constructed unit, and further, ANC 6B supports the proposal: "In the case of a building existing on or before (Effective date of this title), with a non-conforming side setback, an extension or addition may be made to the building; provided that the width of the existing side setback shall not be decreased; and provided further that the width of the existing side setback be a minimum of two feet."	Thank you for the supportive comment.
102	G	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	setback	Generally supportive, but suggests further consideration of the following: exemption from rear setbacks for through lots with frontage on 3 streets; more flexibility under rear setback requirements (no setback below 20 - 25 feet and court in lieu); maximum FAR (especially non-residential) should be consistent with current standards for CAP and CHC (§ 601); provide more specific criteria for special exceptions from development standards; revise roof structure standards in C Chapter 12; and provide more specific special exception criteria for "miscellaneous uses" in some zones (§ 1421.2(k)).	OP will review this proposal.
316	G	Denis James Testimony	11/13/2013	setback	Sections 905.2, 905.3, and 905.4 - The rear setback rules are absurdly difficult to follow, but seem to encourage deeper development of the commercial lots below the 25 foot "horizontal plane." 905.4(a)(1) should not include a measurement taken from the middle of a public alley. There should be no merging of public property rule with those of privately help property. This provision seems likely to lead to commercial trash containers lining and blocking the public alleys, in many case alleys where the other side is in a residential zone. This will impede traffic flow, access of fire, EMS and MPD vehicles and presents public health concerns.	OP is reviewing the rear setback requirements and will include clarifying language, as appropriate.
317	G	Cary Kadlecck DCBIA Testimony	11/13/2013	setback	Propose that for corner lots, a conforming courtyard may be provided in lieu of a rear yard. Just as this is presently permitted in the C-3-B and C-3-C zones, this provision should be carried over to the proposed new higher-density mixed use zones, such as M-8 and M-9. Providing a courtyard in lieu of a rear yard is a common practice that allows many corner lots to be more easily developed, and many developers and architects rely on this practice in certain location as a means to provide adequate light and air without providing a complete rear yard. Allowing this practice to continue would simply maintain consistency with the current zoning standards.	Thank you for your comment.
103	H	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	setback	Generally supportive, but suggests further consideration of the following: clarify when design requirements apply; refine rear setback requirement to allow for an average distance calculation for an irregular rear setback; allow entertainment and performing arts uses to be designated uses in § 1101.4; remove the variance-like higher standard of an "exceptional circumstance" affecting the property for a special exception; eliminate non-relevant criteria such as traffic, parking and noise for special exception criteria.	The design requirement provisions are contained within the relevant chapters (Takoma, Georgia Avenue, H Street). Subtitle C, Chapter 12 establishes the standards for measuring rear setback. These standards are based on ZA interpretation. The Zoning Commission will determine whether it wants to modify the list of designated uses to include Entertainment and Performing Arts uses. OP is not proposing to modify the special exception criteria.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	subdivision	Chapter 4: The Office of the Surveyor Subdivision Regulations, 10 DCMR, currently regulates the subdivision of lots. Duplication of these efforts could lead to inconsistent interpretations. This Chapter should be deleted in its entirety	OP is not intending to supplant the role of the Office of the Surveyor.
497	C	ANC 7C Gregori Stewart Testimony	1/30/2014	subdivision	Information regarding minimum lot requirements -- concern that a number of nonconforming lots can't be developed and are contributing to neighborhood blight.	OP is not proposing a change to the minimum lot area but is proposing that the minimum lot area be applicable only for the creation of new lots, thereby allowing the majority of these residential property owners to build on their lots as a matter of right compliant with setbacks and lot occupancy.
574	C, D	Kishan Putta ANC SMD 2B04 Testimony	2/20/2014	subdivision	Stand in support of Wards 7 & 8. Encourage the ZC to provide flexibility so vacant lots can be redeveloped.	Thank you for your comment.
10	A	David Bardin	10/1/2013	sustainability	Add “urban tree canopy” and “sustainability” to Section 101.1(c) of Subtitle A, Chapter 101 (INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION).	OP will work with DDOE to define these terms as appropriate;
11	B	David Bardin	10/1/2013	sustainability	Add definitions of urban tree canopy and sustainability and amend the definition of “permeable paving” to add “flexible porous paving (including porous rubber)” in Section 100.3 of Subtitle B.	OP will amend the definition of permeable paving to include "porous rubber."
107	A	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	theoretical lot	Recommends amending A § 301.3 to add exception from record lot requirement for institutional campuses such as universities.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.
108	C	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	theoretical lot	Amend Subtitle C, Section 407.10 to remove requirement for institutional uses to secure theoretical lot approval.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
108	C	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	theoretical lot	If draft theoretical lot regulations do apply, them amend Subtitle C, Section 407.3 to clarify that limitations on private streets do not apply to institutional campuses.	N/A because of above
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	theoretical lot	§ 407 Theoretical Lot Developments: This section does not allow Theoretical Lot Developments in the commercial zones (as is permitted in current Section 2517). We do not think this limitation if intended should be adopted.	Provision not carried forward – regulations allow more than one building per lot in these zones
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	theoretical lot	§ 407.1 Theoretical lot developments in the residential zones: This section is not identical to current Section 2516. Is there a reason for the change?	Revisions were proposed to this section -- some provisions were not brought forward and other provisions were revised. See Chapter 25 crosswalk (http://www.dczoningupdate.org/documentframeset.asp?docname=https://www.communicationsmg.com/projects/1355/docs/Chapter%2025%20OLD%20v%20New%20Crosswalk%209-9-13.pdf) for specific changes proposed.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	theoretical lot	§ 407.3: This section states that private streets are no longer permitted for theoretical lot developments, and instead must be "dedicated as a public street." What happens if the Council does not accept the dedication? Street dedication is a lengthy and complicated process and could significantly hinder the utilization of underdeveloped sites.	Private drives are permitted, but the creation of private streets serving multiple land owners shall not be permitted.
106	X	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	theoretical lot	Concerns about requirement that institutional campuses create "theoretical" lots as part of the special exception approval process. If theoretical lot provisions do apply, concerns about private rights-of-ways.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	transitions	§ 1500: This Chapter should be revised to clarify that it applies only to those zones in which transitions are identified in the accompanying development standards chart.	Subtitle C contains general regulations - code users would determine applicability by reviewing the zone-specific requirements found in the Land Use Subtitles.
492	C	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	tree protection	Trees – We urge the adoption of a new provision that would require consultation with and guidance from the UFA before building permits are issued for commercial or residential construction that raise tree issues.	Thank you for your comment. OP worked with the UFA in drafting the proposed regulations and will ensure that the draft text is consistent with District policies.
496	C	ANC 3E Tom Quinn Testimony	1/30/2014	tree protection	We applaud the provisions in the Proposed Code focused on Pervious Surfaces (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 16), Green Area Ratios (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 17) and Tree Protection (Proposed Subtitle C, Chapter 18). The proposed rewrite aspires to bring our Zoning Code into the 21st Century and express 21st Century values. A critical such value is the protection of our environment. Already the Proposed Code calls for using mitigation measures when variances, exceptions and PUDs must be approved to bolster the goals of Chapters 16, 17 and 18. If the Zoning Commission asks the Department of Planning to propose further revisions to the Code, we would urge that the Office of Planning should look for additional ways to use mitigation generally to advance these important goals. We believe that while the rewrite addresses Green Area Ratios, Tree Protection, and Pervious surfaces requirements, the concept of such equitable environmental mitigation should be extended to new residential construction, and additions to existing residential structures that result in lot occupancy in excess of current defined maximums.	The pervious surface requirements apply to the residential zone districts in Subtitles D and E as follows: (a) The construction of a new principal structure; (b) An addition to a principal or accessory structure, other than a historic resource, that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by ten percent (10%) or more; (c) The construction of a new accessory structure that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by ten percent (10%) or more; or (d) An addition to a historic resource that increases the existing lot occupancy at the time of building permit application by twenty-five percent (25%) or more.
600	C	Vincent Verweij Submission	2/26/2014	tree protection	Arlington County tree protection information	Thank you for providing copies of the Arlington County tree protection requirements.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	tree protection	TREES – Part of the proposal that impacts Residential zones has to do with trees. It restricts homeowners’ rights to plant certain trees or to take down trees. This section needs further clarification.	Any tree protections found in Subtitle D are those carried forward from the existing Tree and Slope Protection overlay and have the same force and effect as the existing regulations.
705	D	Justine Kingham Dexter Street Coalition Testimony	4/24/2014	tree protection	Dexter Street Coalition is concerned with three aspects of the ZRR. Our greatest concern, however, is the lack of meaningful slope and tree protection throughout the city. Berkeley has experienced repeated and worsening destruction of natural terrain. We hope the Zoning Commission will consider adding tree and slope protections across all zones of the city. Had the TSP been applied throughout the city, instead of neighborhood-by-neighborhood, the city would be in a much stronger position to protect and enforce the purpose of the overlay.	Any tree protections found in Subtitle D are those carried forward from the existing Tree and Slope Protection overlay and have the same force and effect as the existing regulations. General Tree Protection provisions that apply city wide are contained in Subtitle C, Chapter 18.
147	A	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	use	A § 204.3(d) should include "customary incidental and accessory uses," as are referenced and allowed in the current Regulations. Is the intent to identify the full permitted list of those uses in the new Regulations?	No, zone-specific use permissions are identified in the Land Use Subtitles.
113	B	Daniel Schramm Comments	10/28/2013	use	Supports the inclusion of residential agriculture use group, but would like to see "raising poultry" in Agriculture, Residential.	Poultry is regulated by Health codes; OP does not recommend it be included in zoning.
146	B	Amanda Frayer Comments	10/28/2013	use	After reading the proposed 08-06A, it appears that the definition of residential agricultural use includes the keeping of non-pet animals for personal use. That would seem to include the keeping of poultry. However, it is unclear whether chicken coops would be classified as stables. Stables are only allowed by special exception, and have minimum set-back requirements that make it impossible for most residents to keep stabled animals. Please do not include chicken coops as stables and clarify the language in the proposed regulation. I would like to keep several quiet hens for eggs. I would share fresh eggs with my neighbors, which will build our community and appreciation for local-raised food.	Department of Health (DOH) regulates animal control, domestic animals, animal hobbies, even animal drives. The DOH regulations include licensing, hygiene, spacing from residential uses and property lines, and enforcement provisions, through titles 24 and 16.
220	B	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/5/2013	use	CHRS supports OP's proposed change in the draft use group definition for Section 201.10 Eating and Drinking Establishments. CHRS also recommends that community garden be removed from Section 201.1(b) and added to Section 201.2. Community gardens are a more residential function. CHRS also recommends that the eventual sale of animals in Section 201.2 be removed and the type of domestic animals be modified to be small animals only. As written, a cow or llama would be allowed.	Thank you for your comments. OP will review the use permissions for community gardens. OP will review the definition of Residential Agriculture.
492	B, C, D, E	ANC 3C Nancy MacWood Testimony	1/30/2014	use	Home Occupations and Garages/Accessory Structures - We do not support increasing the height of garages or expanding home occupation categories or location as proposed.	Thank you for your comments.
557	B, D	Commissioner Carolyn Cook ANC SMD 3/4G01 Comments	2/12/2014	use	Monitor and approve certain types of home based businesses. Certain types of Home-based businesses as external units where clients/customers/inventory delivery trucks etc.... come and go should not be allowed in single family residential zones. Or if they are, it should still require BZA approval including ANC involvement to allow neighbors to discuss concerns and either negotiate a more workable arrangement upfront or reject the application. There should not be multiple accessory dwellings or home based businesses on a single lot. There is a reason why surrounding jurisdictions have strict limits on the number and location of external ADUs.	OP is not proposing changes to the matter-of-right accessory uses in residential zones. Home occupations will continue to require home occupation permits. Multiple accessory dwellings would not be permitted and the owner would be required to live on-site in either the principal or accessory dwelling unit.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
499, 529	B, G	ANC 6B05 Brian Pate Testimony	1/30/2014 2/7/14	use	Fast food establishments are allowed in C-2-A areas only with a special exception. The existing regulations define "fast food establishments" using standards more suitable for the fast food industry as it was in the 1970's. Further, the Zoning Administrator's interpretation of fast food (vs. prepared food, etc.) can, at times, appear to be subjective. These two factors make it difficult to manage the inevitable tensions that arise when restaurants in commercial corridors abut residential corridors. The new regulations prohibit fast food restaurants in the M-25 and M-27 mixed use areas on Capitol Hill. However, it appears to me from the text of Subtitle G, Section 1414.2, that a fast food establishment in M-26 would be a by right use. ANC6B is on the record requesting that all three areas, M-25, M-26 and M-27 have the same policy regarding fast food establishments. Further, while the proposed regulations provide an updated definition of "fast food establishment" (Subtitle B, Section 100.3), it is not clear if an establishment needs to meet one or more than one of these conditions to be considered a fast food establishment. Additional clarity and terms that take the subjectivity out of the assessment of what is and what is not a fast food establishment would be helpful and appreciated. The ANCs play an important role in balancing the interests of residents and businesses. This particular piece of the zoning code should ensure that ANC's have the leverage to do so, through the special exception process, in a thoughtful, constructive and consistent way.	OP will ensure that the fast food provisions for the Eighth Street overlay are preserved and carried forward in the draft proposed text.
108	C	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	use	The Consortium recommends that the proposed Regulations clearly acknowledge the well-established principle that a range of uses may take place on campuses, so long as such uses are customarily incidental and subordinate to the university use. Amend Subtitle C, Section 203 to permit accessory uses on college and university campuses, even if the accessory use is not permitted in the underlying zone, so long as the use is determined to be incidental and subordinate to the principal use and consistent with the institution's mission. Amend Subtitle D, Section 1611; Subtitle E, Section 1107; and Subtitle F, Section 1405 to permit accessory uses on college and university campuses, even if the accessory use is not otherwise permitted in the underlying zone, so long as the use is determined to be incidental and subordinate to the principal use and consistent with the institution's mission.	Agreed; ZC has given direction to keep proposal consistent with current practice.
125	C	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	use	Use group and use category used interchangeably (200.1(a)). Allows structural changes to non-conforming residential flats or apartment buildings (304.7). Allows a non-conforming use to be extended indefinitely (304.8). Allows a non-conforming use to be continued with a sp. ex., even if the use is not in the same use category as the existing non-conforming use (304.9). Removing sp. ex. req. to erect more than one principal building on a record lot that is not within a residential zone (402.3). Allows height measurement for theoretical subdivisions to be taken from finished grade (407.4(c)). Should add preserving scale and character to purpose statements for height regulations (500.1). Allows height measurement from finished grade in R zones vs. existing grade (503.4). Correct citation to purpose statement in the sp. ex. criteria for relief for height and roof structures (506.1). Unit density regulations should provide a variety of housing options, nit control the quantity of dwelling units (600). Allows 6 unrelated persons to live in an accessory unit in an accessory building, in an accessory apartment in the principal building, and in the principal building, if unrelated (601(c)). Allows height of an accessory building to be measured from finished grade versus existing grade (801.8). Include heading for purpose statement for side setbacks (1100.1). Need reference to comprehensive and citywide land use goals in purpose statement for tree protection regulations. Need rationale for new parking standard for private schools (1901.5). 50% parking reduction near bus/rail - reduction should be based on a study, area by area, that considers factors including potential to stimulate development in area where there is unmet transit capacity (1902.1). Sp. ex. review criteria for parking reduction should require applicant to demonstrate they can satisfy all factors (1903.2). New provision including penalties for providing more than the minimum required parking (1907). Definition of affordable housing should be consistent with IZ description (2200.1(a)). IZ purpose statements flawed 2200.1(f), in particular. Should not approve IZ exemption for downtown, until Subtitle I is approved (2201.4(a)). Allows sp. ex. from complying with IZ requirement (2207.1).	Thank you for the comments.
149	C	Norman Glasgow, Jr. Holland & Knight Comments	10/28/2013	use	§ 304.5 Discontinuance of a non-conforming use: This section requires a showing of "affirmative steps to resume the use," to rebut the discontinuance argument. However, there is a substantial body of case law and interpretation under the current Regulations, which require a showing of "no intention to abandon." The new language signals a change in the intent of the Regulations, and in the treatment of non-conforming uses that has existed for the past 55 years. What is the purpose of this change?	It was not OP's intent to modify the standard. OP will revise the proposal to ensure that it is consistent with existing practice.
308	C	Jim Schulman Testimony	11/12/2013	use	My primary interest is to see that the Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plans delineate our human settlement patterns as an organism with fully-integrated but differentiated uses and functions. The Zoning Code, even as proposed, is still very much about segregating rather than integrating uses- and this is essentially why it protects vested property interests pretty much as they existed in the 1940's. But this criticism pertains more to the map than it does to the code. Changing the name of existing Commercial zones to "Mixed Use" zones is a toe in the water. Preserving (by right) & encouraging more locally-owned corner stores providing fresh food and other health-supportive products and services in residential areas in the zoning code is also a welcome move. It does not, however, significantly move the full spectrum of community services into residential neighborhoods, except along overly-long commercial corridors that could have more flourishing nodes of mixed-use activity, through careful zoning, or even form-based zoning, as has been used successfully along Columbia Pike in Arlington County.	Thank you for your comment.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	use	The actual density controls as proposed in Sec. 201(c) are not expressed correctly and need to be revised to restrict unrelated occupancy to six persons total on a lot. That is what OP has said repeatedly is their intention.	The conditions found in the Land Use Subtitles are intended to be more restrictive than the general provisions found in the remaining Subtitles. Therefore, the restriction regarding no more than 6 unrelated persons on a lot can be found in Subtitle D.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013	use	There are three (3) proposals to change treatment of non-conformities. All three should be rejected. One would allow an expansion of a non-conforming flats or apartment buildings in residential or residential flat zones. The non-conformity could be caused by height, setback or lot occupancy violations and each of these could be made worse by an addition. Surely it's not too much to ask to require a hearing process. The other two proposals provide new ways to continue a non-conforming use indefinitely. If the authorized use rules are to have any purpose why would we want to allow these new permissions that would permit someone with, for example, a non-conforming PDR business substitute another PDR use by right? The range of intensity of uses within a broad category could be enormous. Similarly, why would we want to allow, even by special exception, the owner of the PDR business to switch to a sex-oriented business? Isn't the goal to work toward replacing the inappropriate businesses with ones that are good for the zone? Why would we provide every means to encourage a business owner to keep using property for one inappropriate business after another?	Thank you for the comments. The Zoning Commission will determine whether to bring forward the proposed language.
67	D	ANC 3C Comments	10/24/2013	use	Institutional uses in low and moderate density residential zones by special exception should not be approved.	General institutional uses are defined as a non-governmental use involving the public assembly of people or provision of services for social or cultural purposes and which may include uses of a public, nonprofit, or charitable nature generally providing local service on-site to people of a local community. General institutional uses are proposed to be permitted by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for neighbors and the community to weigh in before the BZA.
123	D	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	use	Home occupation should be limited to the principal residence and should only be permitted by special exception if in a garage or accessory building.	See the proposed conditions restricting home occupations found at Subtitle D Section 1610.
132	D	Neighbors United Trust Comments	10/28/2013	use	Home occupations can occupy the main home or the accessory building. The list of allowable uses has been expanded and may lack sufficient limitations on intensity of use or numbers of visitors coming to the site on a daily basis. This potential intensity of use is contrary to the purpose of low density residential zones.	Home Occupations are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202) and the draft text proposes basically the same provisions and condition; the uses have been updated to reflect general changes in how people work and technology.
158	D	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	use	BZA approval should be required whenever more than one accessory use is to be located on a single-family residential lot. This should include residential and home business uses.	OP is proposing that an accessory building that houses an apartment shall not be used simultaneously for any accessory use other than as a private vehicle garage for a dwelling unit on the lot.
158	D	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	use	Permitted home occupations should be restricted to businesses that generate less than three customers per day in total. The provisions in Chapter 3 that permit "no more than eight clients or customers on the premises in any one (1) hour" are excessive and effectively convert a residential use into a business use with the resulting negative impact on neighboring homes.	This provision is being carried forward from the existing code and OP is not proposing a change.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	use	This proposed guidance appears to greatly expand the non-residential uses. Under this a medical facility with 300 people could move in next door. In the R zones, non-residential businesses may be permitted as "home occupations; and a "home occupation" is an accessory use. Community Based Institutional Facilities could house 15 people, and that does not include the resident supervisors	OP's intent is not to greatly expand the non-residential uses. Medical care facilities are limited to 6 persons or 7 to 8 persons (with proximity restrictions). A larger medical care use would be permitted only by special exception. CBIFs are permitted only by special exception.
232	D	ANC 4A Comments	11/6/2013	use	We disagree with the concept of permitting Boarding houses and that is what this could lead to. We already have a problem with the unauthorized use of residential properties. This could make it worse.	A Boarding House is a permitted use in the existing code.
249	D	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/6/2013	use	Among the positive recommendations are measurement of height from the existing grade, (although this should be extended to accessory structures), by right accessory dwellings created in the home, and limits on rooming house occupation.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
500	D	Virginia Daley (Lanier Heights) comments	1/29/2014	use	Keep businesses on commercial corridor and disallow new business (for ex. pawn shops, real estate or travel agencies, carry-outs, grocery, dry cleaner) on residential streets: prevent one-size-fits-all commercialization of our neighborhoods by opposing new commercial zoning changes and authorize neighborhoods (not city-wide code) to initiate changes in non-residential uses. Ensure that buffering between residential neighborhoods and commercial/industrial uses is adequate.	OP is proposing that grocery stores be permitted by right subject to conditions. Other corner store uses would be by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for the neighborhood to weigh in on the application, which could include suggesting conditions to address design issues. The OP proposal includes location criteria that limits the placement of corner stores in close proximity (500 feet) to existing commercially-zoned areas.
501	D	Bonnie Roberts-Burke Comments	1/29/2014	use	We support the small businesses in the Adams Morgan commercial corridors. However, we do not want new commercial businesses to operate on the residential streets of Lanier Heights.	The corner store proposal would apply only in the current R-3 and R-4 zones. Corner stores would not be permitted in R-5, which is the predominate residential zone in Adams Morgan. OP is proposing to bring forward, without modification, the commercial adjunct provisions.
502	D	David Burke (Lanier Heights) Comments	1/29/2014	use	We support the small businesses in the Adams Morgan commercial corridors. However, we do not want new commercial businesses to operate on the residential streets of Lanier Heights.	OP is proposing that grocery stores be permitted by right subject to conditions. Other corner store uses would be by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for the neighborhood to weigh in on the application, which could include suggesting conditions to address design issues. The OP proposal includes location criteria that limits the placement of corner stores in close proximity (500 feet) to existing commercially-zoned areas. The corner store proposal applies only to properties currently zoned R-3 or R-4 (residential rowhouse zones).
705	D	Justine Kingham Dexter Street Coalition Testimony	4/24/2014	use	Dexter Street Coalition is concerned with three aspects of the ZRR. The community risks being further undermined by the proposed non-residential uses that are to be allowed without ANC review or special exceptions.	Home Occupations are currently allowed in the existing code (Section 202) and the draft text proposes basically the same provisions and condition; the uses have been updated to reflect general changes in how people work and technology.
483	D, E	ANC 1C Comments	1/30/2014	use	Encourage the Zoning Commission to further limit increased commercial uses in residential zones. In particular, many residents in Adams Morgan would like to see the corner store and nonprofit office uses removed from the proposed row house zones, RF-4 and RF-5. Residents have also expressed concern that revisions in the ZRR to mixed use zones could foster a move towards just commercial uses. Refers to Adams Morgan's Kalorama Citizen's Association resolution calling for changes in the ZRR to mixed use zones to restore the requirements for (1) 60% lot occupancy maximum, (2) rear set back, and (3) current FAR limits.	OP is proposing that grocery stores be permitted by right subject to conditions. Other corner store uses would be by special exception, which would provide an opportunity for the neighborhood to weigh in on the application, which could include suggesting conditions to address design issues. The OP proposal includes location criteria that limits the placement of corner stores in close proximity (500 feet) to existing commercially-zoned areas.
174	D, E, F	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	use	Allow live theatrical performance use in all residential zones by special exception where today they require a variance.	OP is not proposing to permit theaters in the R zones because these uses can be invasive in residential neighborhoods. OP proposes that existing theaters could remain and these uses would be permitted in apartment zones.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
488	E	ANC 6C Mark Eckenwiler Testimony	1/30/2014	use	Opposes the proposal in section 1101.2(e) to allow certain corner stores as a matter-of-right use. Substantial concern over the potential impacts of such uses on adjacent properties, and urge instead that a special exception be required in order to enable resident input through the public hearing process.	Thank you for your comments. The Zoning Commission will determine whether to bring forward the matter-of-right provision for corner grocery stores.
121	F	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	use	The Committee of 100 does not support the following proposed text amendments and finds that they are either vague, missing important existing standards, or inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan or intent of current zoning proposals. Institutional uses and office uses (Sec. 1102.9 and 1102.10) in a residential zone have the potential to alter the quality of the neighborhood. These uses, if allowed at all, should have concentration limits not by square but by feet. There should not be one per block and two per block may be too much housing converted for non-residential use. The use should be incidental. Again, if the goal is to preserve the residential quality and encourage appropriate residential development in RF zones, these proposals are contrary to that goal.	These are permitted uses and OP has not seen a rush to convert.
704	F	Frank Staroba Testimony	4/24/2014	use	Urge you to reinstate Section 353 of the current zoning regulations into Subtitle F, Chapter 2: Apartment Zone - Group 1 of the ZRR. This provision would retain the requirement to get a special exemption from the BZA for a change of land use from single family to multi family. This provision works to the benefit of both single family home owners and developers. It achieves two essential benefits. First it promotes communication between the parties to make sure that proposals do not have a negative impact on neighboring properties. Second it promotes harmony of land use and architecture in the neighborhood.	OP is not proposing to eliminate the provisions contained in Section 353 of the current zoning regulations.
708	F, G	Rick Bush Dupont Circle Citizens Association Testimony	4/24/2014	use	Concern about loss of housing in Dupont Circle. Clarify the confusion in arts uses in R-5 zones in order to preserve housing. Promote, not eliminate housing. Promote light, air, grass, flowers, trees in back yards in row house, apartment zones.	OP will review the provisions related to arts uses in the R-5 zones.
188	G	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	use	ANC 4D proposes that the DC government begin real on-the-ground implementation of the plans to establish and upgrade groceries and other businesses along Kennedy Street and the Petworth sections of Georgia Avenue in accordance with the Kennedy Street Revitalization Plan and the Georgia Avenue Great Streets Plan.	Plan implementation for Kennedy Street and Georgia Avenue is ongoing.
274	G	Meg Maguire Comments	11/8/2013	use	Concern that the proposals introduce substantial new commercial uses into residential neighborhoods.	The zones in Subtitle G are mixed-use zones, where the intent is to provide for a varied mix of residential, employment, retail, service, and (b)other related uses at appropriate densities and scale.
316	G	Denis James Testimony	11/13/2013	use	Section 303.2 would allow 25% additional commercial use for buildings of 10,000 sq. ft. or less, in the C-2-B and C-2-A strips of Adams Morgan on 18th Street, Columbia Road, Adams Mill Road, Kalorama Road, and Florida Avenue. Allowing by-right expansion of up to 25% of the on-premise ABC use, by increasing the over-concentration, will have serious negative impacts on the community, including more public drunkenness, more disturbance of the peace, order and quiet, and add more stress on residential parking needs and vehicular and pedestrian safety problems. This provision is inconsistent with the DC Comprehensive Plan, Policy MC-2.4.2, which calls for encouraging small businesses that meet the needs of local residents rather than...concentrations of liquor-licensed establishments.	The proposed provision would apply only to existing buildings, and only for by right for lots less than 10,000 square feet in area. Under current regulations it can be difficult for property owners to use the second floor of these buildings because of the 1.5 FAR ;imitation and the building codes which require separate entrances and fire code standards for residential uses. The extra 0.5 OP can look at use related issues, as well as how this provision functions in practice in those zones where it exists today.
316	G	Denis James Testimony	11/13/2013	use	Section 903.2 - I note that the uses banned by the Reed Cooke Overlay are deleted in the OP proposal. This is a serious mistake, obscuring the purpose of the existence of the zone in the first place. For the Reed-Cooke Overlay, 903.2 allows for a larger development from 1.5 to 2.0 FAR, which is in one of the uses that the overlay was originally instituted to guard against, would have negative effects upon nearby residences. The lot occupancy and rear yard requirements should remain unchanged.	OP is not proposing to modify the provisions of the overlay and will review Reed Cooke to ensure consistency between the existing and proposed code.
317	G	Cary Kadlecck DCBIA Testimony	11/13/2013	use	Regarding the special exception standards in Section 811.1 of Subtitle G, we propose that more specificity be added or that certain standards be eliminated. For example, subsection (b) requires that the design of the project enhance the urban features of its immediate vicinity. This is an overly general standard that forces the BZA to evaluate design without any standards by which to do so. The result is that applicants will have no benchmark by which to prove this standard, and the BZA will have no ability to adequately evaluate it. This standard should be eliminated to avoid an open-ended design debate. Any concerns about the design appropriateness may be imposed by the Board as requirements under subsection (d). However, this subsection should be refined to limit the BZA's ability to impose such requirements only as they pertain to the relief being sought. For example, front facade material requirements may not be appropriate for relief from the rear setback requirement. We make this recommendation generally for all subtitles, such as section 1200 in subtitle H, where similar special exception criteria apply.	The special exception criteria are specific to uses in the Uptown Arts overlay and the criteria are being carried forward from the existing regulations.
685	G	S. Jean Stewart Comments	4/2/2014	use	The application of the proposed zoning regulations in Subtitle G to the mixed residential/nonresidential areas (mixed use or M zones) would also cause problems for Adams Morgan, principally by tipping the mixed areas toward becoming predominantly commercial. It would also create massing of buildings, loss of light and air, and more hard and impermeable surfaces that prevent environmentally sound rainwater absorption by soil and plants. This is because the draft regulations eliminate the requirement that no more than 60 to 80 percent of a lot can be occupied, and specify that the 15-foot rear setback is to be measured from the center of public alleys, not the edge. The result is that a building could occupy an entire lot, closing out light and air to residences, adding to alley congestion, and as mentioned, increase the area of impermeable surfaces.	The proposal is: " <i>an <u>existing</u> building on a lot with an area ten thousand (10,000) square feet or less, may have a maximum floor area ratio of 2.0 for non-residential uses, provided the uses are located in the ground story and the story directly above the ground story</i> ". The rear yards and lot occupancy requirements are not proposed for any changes. Any new construction is limited to the standard 1.5 FAR non-residential restriction. The 2.0 non-residential use is an increase of 0.5 FAR of use only.
703	G	Abigail Nichols Testimony	4/24/2014	use	Opposed to allowing "drinking" in the new M-2 and M-16 zones. Do not make it easier through zoning for there to be alcohol licenses in new areas of the city.	OP will check these uses to make sure they accurately reflect the restrictions of the existing SP zones. It is was not the intention to allow new uses in the SP zones.
159	H	ANC 4B Comments	10/29/2013	use	Pawn shops and check cashing businesses should be permitted only by special exception.	Pawn Shops are not permitted in the GA overlay and that restriction has been reflected in the ZZR new Nghd Comm zones N-7 (C-2-A/GA) and N-8 (C-3-A/GA). OP is not proposing to revise the use permissions for pawn shops. Check Cashing Services are not considered "preferred" uses in the H Street Residential Sub-district; OP is not proposing any change to the uses in teh Nghd commercial zones.
344	I	Jo-Ann Neuhaus Penn Quarter Neighborhood Association Testimony	11/14/2013	use	Commends the Office of Planning staff for removing a number of non-arts uses such as bars and day care centers that were part of the original Downtown Arts Overlay - though they were designated as related arts uses, no one thought of them as such.	Thank you for your supportive comment. A child development center contiues to be a permitted use in the D zones.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
332	K	Ramsey Meiser Forest City Washington Testimony	11/14/2013	use	Enthusiastically support the SEFC text amendments. Request that a proposed SEFC text amendment pertaining to "animal care and boarding" be adopted as a separate, interim text amendment on an emergency or expedited basis. To allow a veterinary hospital at the Twelve 12 Building.	This issue has been addressed through an independent text amendment.
335	K	Jim Schulman Testimony	11/14/2013	use	Allow health care uses as a matter of right in Hill East.	The Hill East uses are established in the existng Code which permits clinics as a matter of right use and other medical uses by special exception. The ZRR propopsed text refelcts those same uses.
106	X	DCBIA Comments	10/28/2013	use	Concern about the requirement for special exception approval for a college/university use in a low density commercial zone (C-1 and C-2-A).	OP will continue to refine the draft proposal to more accurately reflect the intent to provide a review process for university uses that could have adverse impacts on a surrounding community or would not otherwise be permitted in a commercial zone such as semi-industrial uses like university mail sorting facilities or university vehicle maintenance.
109	X	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	use	The Consortium also recommends that the Commission clarify that colleges and universities are permitted to use residential buildings (e.g. single family house, rowhouse, or apartment) for residential purposes as a matter-of-right in the appropriate zone district, just as any other property owner or tenant.	Thank you for the comment. OP will provide clarifying language, as appropriate.
109	X	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	use	The Consortium recommends that the Commission relax the language regarding commercial uses on University campuses to allow the Commission to consider the relationship of such commercial uses not only to the university's operation and academic mission but also to the student experience and to the surrounding neighborhood.	ZC has given direction to OP to look at this issue.
499, 529	C	ANC 6B05 Brian Pate Testimony	1/30/2014	waterfront	Unzoned area of Capitol Hill - Squares 1080 S and 1067 S, which consist of waterfront property along the Anacostia River south of the former SE freeway between Barney Circle (16th ST) and 12th ST SE are currently unzoned. Almost 4 years ago, OP undertook a land use study of the area, yet the area remains uncategorized. This is important because the squares are adjacent to a proposed replacement for the SE Freeway dubbed SE Boulevard. Initial proposals for the Boulevard appear to be devoid of any consideration for contextual urban planning, much less future land use in the area. Though presumably the General Waterfront provisions in Subtitle C-4, Chapter 23, Section 2302 would apply, finalizing for this area, either through the ZRR or a follow on activity, will improve the City and Community's ability to plan for this area.	The Office of Planning is conducting a rapid response planning effort to look at the potential uses within and surrounding the proposed Southeast Boulevard right of way.
107	A	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	ZA authority	Amend A § 304 to give the Zoning Administrator authority to approve modification on institutional campuses required for structural, building code compliance, or operational reasons that do not exceed 2% of gross floor area or lot occupancy of the building, subject to finding by the Zoning Administrator that the change is consistent with the approved special exception. Similar to PUDs, these determinations would be reported to the Zoning Commission to confirm that they are minor.	OP will draft language that will provide Zoning Administrator authority for the approval of minor modifications to campus plans, similar to PUDs.
107	A	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	ZA authority	Amend Subtitle A, Section 304 to give the Zoning Administrator the authority to approve modifications on institutional campuses required for structural, building code compliance, or operational reasons that do not exceed 2% of gross floor area or lot occupancy of the building, subject to finding by the Zoning Administrator that the change is consistent with the approved special exception. Similar to PUDs, these determinations would be reported to the Zoning Commission to confirm that they are minor.	OP will draft language that will provide Zoning Administrator authority for the approval of minor modifications to campus plans, similar to PUDs.
107	A	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	ZA authority	The Consortium recommends that the Commission authorize such minor modifications to existing buildings or structures that have de minimus impact and are needed for building code compliance or operational reasons to modernize existing buildings.	OP will draft language that will provide Zoning Administrator authority for the approval of minor modifications to campus plans, similar to PUDs.
700	B, D, E	Bill Crews Save DC Zoning Comments	4/24/2014	ZA authority	Concerns about uses and Zoning Administrator's duty to interpret and enforce regulations.	OP is not proposing to modify the Zoning Administrator's authority to interpret the Zoning Regulations. The shift from a use list to use groups is in response to Zoning Commission direction provided, including final action taken on February 7, 2011.
109	X	Consortium of Universities Comments	10/28/2013	ZA authority	Amend Subtitle X, Section 101.18 to parallel Subtitle A, Section 304 and permit small additions needed for code compliance without campus plan amendment within 2% of the existing building or structure.	OP will draft language that will provide Zoning Administrator authority for the approval of minor modifications to campus plans, similar to PUDs.
212	Y	Renee Bowser ANC 4D Testimony	11/4/2013	ZC	ANC 4D urges the Zoning Commission to change what is currently DCMR Title 11-3012.3 to provide that written reports by the Director of the Office of Planning and other agencies must be filed at least 60 days in advance of public hearing.	OP is proposing to increase the time by which agency reports must be filed from 7 days to 10 days.
58	Z	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	ZC	WECA does not support the change from "shall" to "may" in Z § 405.2.	Thank you for your comment.
58	Z	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	ZC	WECA requests that the Zoning Commission require public hearings for all "modifications of consequence to Zoning Orders, including for Campus Plans.	Sub X § 312.6 establishes that the ZC shall determine the level of a requested modification to a PUD and when a public hearing is warranted. There is no proposed similar flexibility for an approved campus plan.
58	Z	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	ZC	WECA supports the new maximum extension provision for PUDs and thinks that no more than two extensions should apply to ZC approvals.	Thank you for your comment.
58	Z	West End Citizens Association Comments	10/23/2013	ZC	WECA supports the requirement in Z §§ 405.5(e) and 405.6(b).	Thank you for your comment.
111	Z	Friendship Neighborhood Association	10/28/2013	ZC	ZC should benefit from info. that neighbors and neighborhood organizations can provide prior to setdown (400.8 and 400.9). Relevant agency reports shall (not may) be included in the setdown report (405.2).	OP is proposing that relevant agency reports "may" be included in the setdown report. OP can not control whether other District agencies provide reports in a timely manner.
119	Z	Committee of 100 Comments	10/28/2013	ZC	Subt. Z, Sec. 406.1 is overly restrictive of an ANC's ability to testify before the Zoning Commission. The phrase "wishes to orally recite its written report" should be replaced with "wishes to testify based on its written report." The Office of Planning, which also receives great weight, is not limited in this fashion. Also, ANCs are automatic parties in contested case and the value of ANC participation should be clear. The proposed limitation on the ANC's testimony is inappropriate given its authorized role in these proceedings and the fact that it is likely the only elected representative of the effected District residents participating.	Thank you for your comment. The Office of Zoning is reviewing this subtitle with OAG.

ZC Exhibit #	Subtitle	Name	Date	Issue	Comment/Testimony	OP Response
541	Z	Judi Jones Testimony	2/11/2014	ZC	The new zoning regulations have lowered the standard of residential/voter input for many of the new regs. Many more issues are a matter of right but still intrude on community character and should be special exceptions not a matter of right. I am asking the ZC to consider all the issues that are germane to maintaining residential character such as parking, ADUs, corner stores and affordable housing ought to be special exceptions rather than matter of right.	OP will provide an analysis of use permissions with respect to matter-of-right, special exception, and variance requirements.
207, 208	Z	Gary Peterson Capitol Hill Restoration Society Comments	11/4/2013	ZC	Both subtitles have a section regarding Requesting Party Status that do not address problems that CHRS has encountered in past cases. The required statement applies only to persons and not organizations. Such things as what property you own and the distance from the subject property don't apply to an organization such as CHRS. CHRS is concerned that it will not qualify for party status under these conditions. The second problem is the timing of party status. Party status should be decided weeks prior to the hearing. The third problem is that service on a party should be amended to require service on someone requesting party status.	OP will work with OAG to review the party status provisions.
404	C	Committee of 100 Comments	11/20/2013		The theme of eliminating special exceptions continues with the proposal to permit more than one principal building on a single lot. The existing requirement would be removed in every zone except residential zones. What happens to parking or loading requirements? Is this a way to avoid complying by constructing two smaller buildings that don't reach square footage triggers? If there isn't a clear reason, without potential for unintended consequences, for dropping the special exception, the Zoning Commission should maintain the existing rule and only allow more than one principal building based on persuasive reasons during a hearing process.	OP will review this provision.
690	C, D	Letter from ANC 3D	4/8/2014	general comment	On December 4, 2013, ANC 3D approved resolutions on the following sections of the zoning rewrite: Subtitle C, Chapter 19 – Vehicle Parking; Subtitle D, Chapter 3 – Residential House Zones, Group 2, Chain Bridge Road/University Terrace; Subtitle D, Chapter 8 – Residential House Zones, Group 7, Wesley Heights; Subtitle D, Chapter 13 – Accessory Building Regulations for R Zones; and Subtitle D, Chapter 16 – User Permissions R Zones – Corner Stores. ANC 3D communicated our positions on these issues in a letter to the Zoning Commission dated December 9, 2013 and testified before the Zoning Commission on January 30, 2014.	Thank you for providing ANC 3D's resolutions.
257	D	Riordan Frost Testimony	11/6/2013	general support	Express strong support for the DC Zoning Code update. Will improve the city by making it a more accessible, affordable, and welcoming place.	Thank you for your supportive comment.
177	X	David Alpert Greater Greater Washington Comments	11/1/2013	general comment	No comments specific to Subtitle X.	
183	X	ANC 4D Comments	11/4/2013	general comment	No comments specific to Subtitle X.	
215	X	Alma Gates Neighbors United Trust Testimony	11/4/2013	parking	See comments Exhibit #134.	
214	Z	Nancy MacWood Committee of 100 Testimony	11/4/2013	general comment	No comments specific to Subtitle Z.	