

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D

Government of the District of Columbia



September 2, 2026

Mr. Anthony J. Hood
Chairperson
District of Columbia Zoning Commission
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 200-South
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 727-6311
dcoz@dc.gov

Re: Zoning Commission Case Number 16-18J
Georgetown University's Hilltop Campus Plan
Application for Modification – Fall 2026 Enrollment Adjustments

Dear Chair Hood and Members of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission:

At its meeting on September 2, 2026, Advisory Neighborhood Commission voted 7-0-0 to advise you that it has no objection to Georgetown University's modification to its Campus Plan and to provide the following comments to you related to student behavior issues.

During the consideration of Georgetown's proposed amendment to its Campus Plan, ANC3D Commissioner J.P. Szymkowicz brought forcefully to this Commission's attention a case where a neighbor was seriously and adversely impacted by off-campus student behavior. The details of Commissioner Szymkowicz's concerns are provided in the Attachment to this letter.

In this case, a neighbor was forced to move out of their home temporarily, because of the behavior of a Georgetown student who was clearly in violation of the student code provisions related to the smoking of marijuana off campus. While the University representatives were responsive to the serious concerns raised by the neighbor, the impacts continued as the student remained in the off-campus residence for multiple weeks until the end of the semester. The University did act to move the student's residence at the start of the next semester, but this action was not prompt enough to prevent the need for the neighbor to temporarily relocate.

When asked about this particular student's behavior and the University's action with regard to them, the University has declined to discuss the matter out of concern for the student's privacy. Our Commission respects the University's protection of the student's privacy. However, based on the issues and concerns set forth in the Attachment from Commissioner Szymkowicz, the Commission must conclude that this

case represents a failure to act promptly as required by the Campus Plan so as to prevent serious harm to neighbors and seriously undermines the trust that has otherwise been built between the University and its neighbors with respect to the implementation of the Campus Plan.

For its part, a senior University official has stated that they do not want such situations to happen again, and the Commission appreciates this assertion because the provisions of the University's campus plan that deal with relations with neighbors are of utmost importance to our Commission. As a University located in the midst of the neighborhoods we represent, the potential for adverse impacts on its neighbors is very real. The campus plan has been fashioned, with input from ANCs and neighbors, in order to prevent such impacts, and should they occur, to ensure that the University corrects them promptly. Such promptness is an essential part of the University's commitment in its campus plan.

At this point in time, ANC3D can do nothing to remedy the harm that has already occurred in this specific case. However, our Commission feels a strong commitment to try to ensure, as the University has indicated, that this kind of situation does not happen again. Therefore, in that regard, ANC3D has asked the University to re-commit itself to a rigorous implementation of condition 15.d. of the Campus Plan, which states, "...the University shall investigate reports of improper off-campus student conduct and respond to behavior found to violate the Student Code of Conduct promptly with appropriate sanctions. Egregious or repeat violations of the Code of Conduct shall be subject to serious sanctions up to and including separation from the University." ANC3D also asks the university to re-commit to enforce the code promptly and without regard to the relationship of the student to the University (e.g. the child of a major donor, the president of the student body).

We have also asked the University to re-commit itself that if allegations of delayed or ineffective intervention by the University are brought to its attention by ANC3D or others that it will proactively seek the reasons why such a delay or ineffective response may have occurred or been thought to have occurred, and take corrective actions, as appropriate, to prevent any reoccurrence. The university has agreed on the record to all of these requests

For its own part, ANC3D re-commits to inform the neighborhood that ANC3D will be watching proactively for any incidents of this sort and that neighbors should notify ANC3D of any case where they have filed a complaint with the University regarding student behavior and the University has, in the view of the neighbor, not responded promptly or effectively. In those cases, ANC3D will raise the matter with the Georgetown Community Partnership and seek identification of any procedural or policy matters that may have stood in the way of a prompt and effective response by the University.

Should ANC3D's intervention fail to elicit a satisfactory response from the University, ANC3D will, as appropriate, bring such a failure of the campus plan implementation to the attention of the Zoning Commission with the expectation that

appropriate correction action will be taken by the Zoning Commission to help prevent any reoccurrence of such situations.

With these re-commitments on the part of both the University and ANC3D, our Commission advises that it has no objection to the approval by the Zoning Commission of the amendment to the Campus Plan currently being proposed by the University.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bernie Horn". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Bernie Horn
Chairperson
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D

Attachment

The following paragraphs provided by Commissioner Szymkowicz summarize the situations involving a family affected by the conduct of a Georgetown student and also highlight the University's failures to take prompt action against this student by investigating the neighbors' complaints and bringing disciplinary charges against the student pursuant to the Code of Student Conduct since the student unambiguously told the University that she would not stop smoking marijuana. The family affected was Commissioner Szymkowicz and his wife:

1. The University's Code of Student Conduct prevents students from smoking marijuana even if they live off-campus and even if they have some sort of "medical" reason to smoke marijuana.
2. There was a Georgetown student who lived in a rowhouse in Foxhall Village during the 2020-2021 academic year who frequently smoked marijuana. The student's house was known in the neighborhood as the "Marijuana House" because secondhand smoke regularly migrated into neighboring houses and even into the public street.
3. At the beginning of the Fall 2021 semester, the student moved into the rowhouse next-door to the family who were affected by the student's marijuana smoking. This fact is important because the Campus Plan does not permit students to reside off campus more than one year. There were two Georgetown students already living there (one male and one female) when the landlord (who rented rooms in her home "by the room" and who owned both houses in which the student lived in Foxhall Village) relocated the student into the new townhouse.
4. Due to the family's travel schedule, they did not notice any marijuana intrusion in their townhouse until late-October 2021. The first time that the family noticed the secondhand marijuana smoke, it was as if someone was smoking inside of their house. Secondhand smoke entered their home because the walls separating the family's basement from student's basement (where the student's bedroom was located) are porous. Therefore, if someone smoked inside one basement, the smoke would naturally migrate into the basement of the other home and eventually migrate throughout the rest of the other home.
5. Since the family knew from student's roommates (who were excellent neighbors) that the student smoked marijuana, the wife went to the student's home, knocked, and politely informed the student that she had asthma and that the student's marijuana smoke was making it hard for her to breathe and asked the student to stop smoking inside her home. The student told the wife in no uncertain terms that she "could not help her" and slammed the door in her face.
6. Since the student would not agree to stop smoking marijuana, the husband called Cory Peterson, who was, at the time, the Director of Neighborhood Life at Georgetown University, and asked him to initiate a formal

complaint against her for violations of the Code of Student Conduct. The first call was in or around late-October 2021.

7. During the time that the family lived in Foxhall Village, there have been over twenty young people (not necessarily all Georgetown students) living in the “group house” next-door and they all have been respectful neighbors – except for the student at issue.

8. During November 2021, the student’s marijuana smoking became more frequent and more regular – almost every night. On a typical night, the family would go to bed on the second floor of their home (the home has a basement, an entry level floor where the living rooms and kitchen are located and a second floor where the bedrooms are located). On many occasions, during the middle of the night, the student would start smoking marijuana inside of her room in the basement of her home (her roommates did not permit her to smoke upstairs), and the family would wake up feeling as if someone was strangling them. The husband called Georgetown University’s Campus Police but were told that the Campus Police could not do anything since the student lived off campus. The husband then called Georgetown University’s SNAP service (which is the University’s department that neighbors are told to call if they have a problem with a student). Again, the SNAP operator would sometimes send an official to talk to the student at issue, but the student at issue refused to discuss the matter with the SNAP official, except to yell at the SNAP official for disturbing her. On one occasion, the husband heard the student at issue refer to his family in a racially derogatory manner when confronted by a SNAP official (referring to someone in a racially derogatory name is itself a violation of the Code of Student Conduct as is refusing to discuss a complaint with a SNAP official). The family even called the Metropolitan Police Department for their help in stopping the student from smoking marijuana, but the police officers who responded said that could not do anything since marijuana smoking has been decriminalized in the District of Columbia.

9. Finally, after several sleepless nights due to the presence of secondhand marijuana smoke inside our bedroom (the family was forced to sleep with the windows open to clear the smoke even though it was November and very cold at night outside), the family began calling Georgetown’s Director of Neighborhood Life, Cory Peterson, on his personal mobile telephone. To his credit, Mr. Peterson, came over to the family’s house on several occasions in the middle of the night and smelled the marijuana inside, and then attempted to speak to the student at issue inside her house (he was let in by the male roommate, who, by this time, was frustrated with the student for smoking marijuana and disturbing his neighbors with whom he had an excellent relationship). The male roommate told the family that the student yelled at Mr. Peterson for entering the house. The student’s male roommate also told the family that the student screamed at him for letting Mr. Peterson into their house. Right before Thanksgiving that year, the husband called Mr. Peterson about the marijuana smoking and Mr. Peterson told him that he was already on his way out of town for the holiday but felt it necessary to turn around and come back to address the situation (The husband

told Mr. Peterson that he did not want him to do this, but as a professional, Mr. Peterson felt that he needed to come over right away, which he did).

10. In order to have third-party support for the family's complaints, the husband asked two different neighbors whom he only knew in passing, to verify that the smoke was really bad inside the family's house. One neighbor said that once the husband opened the front door of his house, the marijuana smoke hit her like a brick wall. The other neighbor came inside the family's home, walked around and left saying, "it is bad." The next day, that neighbor said that he had breathing problems after leaving the family's house. So, the family had third-party support for their claims that the secondhand marijuana smoke was horrible.

11. In what might be the worst thing that the student did to the family, the husband learned from one of the student's roommates that the student blew smoke directly at the porous party wall separating the basements presumably in order to cause maximum pain and suffering to the family as retaliation for their complaints to Georgetown University.

12. The husband also asked officials of the Georgetown Community Partnership (the non-governmental entity established under the Campus Plan to address issues between the University and the surrounding neighbors) for assistance in persuading the University to take the steps necessary to bring the student before its disciplinary authorities for her multiple violations of the Code of Student Conduct, but this request did not result in any tangible results.

13. The family also asked an Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner in ANC 2E for help as well and this Commissioner failed to help the family.

14. Since the wife has asthma, she relocated during the day to the husband's parents' house nearby due to the fact that she worked from home. The family also decided to sleep overnight at the parents' house on at least one occasion since they were tired of waking up in the middle of the night feeling that they could not breathe. However, the husband was forced to work from his own house even though working there was difficult due to the presence of secondhand smoke since he did not have an appropriate workspace at his parents' house (or anywhere else).

15. Finally, in December 2021, which was at least five weeks after the family began complaining to Georgetown University about the student's conduct, the husband called Chris Murphy, who was, at the time, Georgetown University's Vice-President of Community Engagement, and asked him to begin the disciplinary process against the student under the Code of Student Conduct. The husband called Mr. Murphy since the family's complaints to the Campus Police, the Metropolitan Police Department, SNAP, the Georgetown Community Partnership, the Advisory Neighborhood Commission and Georgetown University itself did not result in any reduction in the student's marijuana smoking. By this time, the family already knew from the student's male roommate that the student refused to participate in any disciplinary process and had no intention of

participating in such proceedings in the future. The husband told Mr. Murphy that the fact that the student had not participated in any disciplinary proceeding was itself a violation of the Code of Student Conduct and that the University could impose an interim suspension on that basis alone.

16. The student smoked marijuana up until the last day that she was in Washington, DC at the end of the Fall 2021 Semester before heading to her home in another state. The husband placed one more call to Mr. Murphy, Georgetown University's Vice-President of Community Engagement, before Christmas 2021 and asked him to force the student to move out of the house (at pain of suspension or expulsion) since that is something that the Code of Student Conduct permitted the University to do. Mr. Murphy told the husband in no uncertain terms that the University would not force the student to move. Therefore, going into Christmas 2021, the family was dreading the day that the student would return the following semester. This feeling of dread kept the family from enjoying the Christmas and New Year's holidays that year.

17. Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D finds that that the University did not properly or promptly investigate the family's complaints about the student's smoking, even though Cory Peterson personally smelled the smoke inside the family's house and even though several people were willing and able to testify in a University disciplinary proceeding against the student at issue – the husband, the wife, the two roommates of the student at issue, and the "independent" neighbors that the husband asked to smell the marijuana inside his house.

18. As the Spring 2022 Semester began in early-February, the University ultimately moved the student to another house outside of Foxhall Village. However, this relocation was not "prompt" as required by the Campus Plan since the family had to endure the student's secondhand smoke for almost eight weeks and then had to endure another month and a half of anxiety over whether the student would return or not. Moreover, this relocation, in all likelihood, exposed other families to this student's marijuana smoking, but unlike either of the two families whose situations are set forth above, the student's new neighbors might not have had any knowledge that the student attended Georgetown University or that the new neighbors could complain about the student's conduct to the University.

19. Moreover, the University never informed the Steering Committee of the Georgetown Community Partnership of the family's complaints.

20. Finally, the student was listed in the 2022 Graduation Program as a graduate, even though she caused extensive harm to the neighbors.