

Woodley Park Community Association  
2929 Cathedral Avenue, Northwest  
Washington, D.C. 20008

January 7, 1988

Mr. Lindsley Williams, Chairman  
D.C. Zoning Commission  
District Building  
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Room 11  
Washington, D.C. 20004

RE: Z.C. Case No. 86-26  
Connecticut Avenue (Woodley Park)

1988 JAN - 7 PM 4:41  
ZONING SECRETARIAT,  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PRE-HEARING EXPANDED SUBMISSION

Dear Chairman Williams and Members of the Commission:

As Board Member and Chairman, Economic Development Committee, Woodley Park Community Association (WPCA), I am transmitting a further description of WPCA's testimony regarding Z.C. Case No. 86-26. The WPCA appreciates that its testimony will be presented subsequent to that presented by the Cleveland Park Historical Society (CPHS) to prevent repetition of testimony. The CPHS testimony includes presentationst that will be given on behalf of both WPCA and CPHS, and these will address common concerns, such as transportation and traffic. We further note that the Woodley Park Overlay Zone affects two Squares in Ward 1 and one Square in Ward 3.

I. List of Witnesses, Testimony Topic, Time Estimate

Dr. Cheryl Opacinch	Introduction/Issue Overview	8 min.
Mr. Brian Jones	Woodley Park - Pictorial	8 min.
Dr. Charles G. Field, Esq. and Dr. Cynthia R. Field	Historical Concerns	7 min.
Mr. Fred Pitts	Development Scenarios (Graphics)	5 min.
Mr. Charles Warr	Transportation and Traffic Concerns	7 min.
Ms. Ellen Burton	Residential Concerns	5 min.
Ms. Zina Green	Commercial Concerns	5 min.
Mr. Larry Aurbach, Esq. and Ms. Lee Grey	Federal Interest Concerns and Historic Scale	5 min.
ANC 3C Representative	ANC 3C Testimony	5 min.
WPCA Board Member	Summary and Conclusions on WP Overlay Zone	5 min.

Charles Warr, President  
Howard Friedman, Vice President  
Carol Chamberlain, Secretary  
Charles Lupton, Treasurer

ZONING COMMISSION

CASE No. 86-26

EXHIBIT No. 158  
ZONING COMMISSION  
District of Columbia  
CASE NO. 86-26  
EXHIBIT NO. 158

- II. Outline of Testimony - Major Points (Attached)
- III. Information, Reports and Other Materials to be Introduced at the Hearing (Partial Listing)
  - A. Pictorial Display of Selected Woodley Park Locations
  - B. Materials Related to the Historical Significance of Woodley Park Structures and the Community
  - C. Charts and Graphs of Current and Potential Development under Various Assumptions
  - D. Residential Concerns - Materials and Photographs
  - E. Materials Related to the Federal Interest
  - F. Preserving and Stabilizing Existing Neighborhoods - The Woodley Park Overlay Zone
  - G. Listing of Experts
  - H. Textual Changes to the Woodley Park Overlay Zone (Proposed)

If additional information or clarification of this submission would be useful, please contact me at 232-4338. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

WOODLEY PARK COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

BY: Cheryl Ann Opacinch /gk  
Cheryl Ann Opacinch

Attachment

DR. CHERYL OPACINCH  
Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission  
Z.C. Case 86-26  
Woodley Park Overlay Zone

INTRODUCTION AND ISSUE OVERVIEW  
(8 minutes)

- I. Three Part Testimony
  - A. WP Overview
  - B. WP Overlay Zone
    - 1. Support OP's WP Overlay Zone (Concurrence)
    - 2. Additions to WP Overlay Zone (Additions)
  - C. WP Testimony -- Organization
- II. WP Overview
  - A. Thank you re: testimony opportunity
  - B. WP -- a historically active community (WP Plan)
  - C. Connecticut Avenue Corridor Study -- a WP request
  - D. The Squares in question
  - E. Major concerns
    - 1. Preserving and stabilizing existing neighborhoods
    - 2. Comprehensive Plan consistency
    - 3. Traffic and parking; alley constraints/problems
    - 4. Metro and commercial use now; neighborhood heavily commercial; Metro heavily used; impact of zoo and two major hotels that are nonconforming uses in a residential zone
    - 5. Encroachment of commercial zone on a residential street (2610 and 2612 Woodley Place)
- III. WP Overlay Zone (Concurrence)
  - A. Mandatory retail use on ground floor
  - B. Prohibition on Connecticut Avenue curb cuts
  - C. BZA approval required for restaurants/bars after a set limit
  - D. Height limits
  - E. Prohibition on fast food restaurants (Square 2204)
  - F. Prohibitions on hotel use (new; Square 2204)
- IV. WP Overlay Zone (Additions)
  - A. Height limitations and differentials
  - B. Prohibition on transient housing
  - C. Commercial use limitations
  - D. Setbacks: Square 2204 -- 20 feet from alley with mandatory paved 10 foot pulloff unencumbered by walls; Square 2202 -- set back to preserve view of bridge
  - E. Strengthening of burden of proof requirements for exceptions by applicants
  - F. Prohibition on PUD's (which violate and defeat the purposes of an overlay zone)
    - 1. Problems
    - 2. Height/density limits
    - 3. Correct C-2-B zoning

- V. WP Testimony -- Organization
  - A. General outline for topics (what WP looks like, residential concerns, historical considerations, etc.)
  - B. WP testimony supports the proposed WP Overlay Zone and 6 additions; and supports a need to change zoning to residential from commercial on two WP townhouses.

MR. BRIAN JONES

Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission

Z.C. Case No. 86-26

Woodley Park Overlay Zone

WOODLEY PARK - PICTORIAL SLIDE PRESENTATION

(8 Minutes)

- I. Need for Woodley Park Overlay Zone to preserve aesthetics of this special street and to preserve the stabilization of an existing neighborhood.
- II. Support for height limitations, their relationship to present structures and consistency with Comprehensive Plan.
- III. Need for setbacks in Square 2202 to preserve views of bridge and ornamental/sculptural entrance.

DR. CHARLES G. FIELD and DR. CYNTHIA R. FIELD  
Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission  
Z.C. Case No. 86-26  
Woodley Park Overlay Zone

CONNECTICUT AVENUE AND WOODLEY PARK: RELATED HISTORICAL CONCERNS  
(7 Minutes)

- I. Woodley Park neighborhood has from its beginnings been viewed as an integrated unit of high density, in-town attached housing units served by commercial activities along Connecticut Avenue.
  - A. Original maps designate area as Woodley Park.
  - B. Unlike other outlying areas of Washington, D.C., at the turn of the century, Woodley Park was intended to be a residential community of primary residences whose owners worked in the downtown area.
  - C. Original buildings along Connecticut Avenue in the 2202, 2203, 2204 squares were residential, sharing the same architectural features as the townhouses built off of Connecticut Avenue.
  - D. Mass and size of buildings in the squares in question share the same general height features as townhouses - elsewhere in the Woodley Park neighborhood.
- II. Overlay requirements would preserve the harmonious relationships between the residential fabric and commercial activities.
  - A. The height limitations would preserve the general relationships between the three-story townhouses and commercial buildings.
  - B. Land uses consistent with the types found in local neighborhood centers, as called for in the Comprehensive Plan, would reinforce the community's historic sense of relationship whereby residents utilize the commercial facilities along Connecticut Avenue.
  - C. Need provisions that would require some architectural/stylistic relationship between development within the overlay area and the adjacent areas of Woodley Park, thereby preserving the visual and integrated relationship between the commercial and residential areas.

MR. FRED PITTS

Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission

Z.C. Case No. 86-26

Woodley Park Overlay Zone

DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS - GRAPHICS

(5 Minutes)

Woodley Park Commercial Areas - Visual Presentation

- I. Present commercial development in Woodley Park
- II. Support for WP Overlay height and related requirements
  - A. Graphics of present structural heights
  - B. Graphics of height permitted under present zoning
  - C. Graphics of proposed height limitations

DR. CHARLES WARR  
Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission  
Z.C. Case No. 86-26  
Woodley Park Overlay Zone

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC CONCERNS  
(7 Minutes)

I. Metrorail Use. The District receives an excellent return on its investment in the Woodley Park Metrorail station.

II. Pedestrian Issues. Lack of pedestrian underpasses present at most other Metrorail stations.

III. Special Traffic and Parking Problems associated with the two convention hotels and the National Zoo. Peak day zoo attendance of 25,000 visitors in one day. Peak meeting attendance of 23,000 conventioners.

IV. Operational Problems associated with alleys. There are no alleys serving Squares 2202 and 2203. There are severe operational problems in the alley serving Square 2204.

V. Relationship between increased commercial density and "friction" effects. The slowing and turning traffic associated with local commercial uses effectively reduces the capacity of Connecticut and Calvert to accomodate through traffic.

MS. ELLEN BURTON  
Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission  
Z.C. Case No. 86-26  
Woodley Park Overlay Zone

RESIDENTIAL CONCERNS  
(5 Minutes)

- I. Woodley Park. The need to protect an established neighborhood as a desirable place to live, work and visit.
- II. The WP Overlay Zone and proposed additions concerning Square/2204.
  - A. Essential to preserve Woodley Park consistent with Comprehensive Plan goals.
  - B. Current severe alley constraints preclude increased usage -- problems of congestion, lack of adequate access by emergency vehicles, increased noise and trash, and safety matters.
  - C. Height limits support maintenance of residential quality of life
  - D. Commercial zoned properties (2610 and 2612 Woodley Place) on a residential street are in error and pose threats of residential street deterioration if developed, e.g., traffic congestion, noise, lack of privacy.
  - E. Need to preserve neighborhood-oriented services in commercial squares.
- III. The WP Overlay Zone and proposed additions concerning Squares/2202 and 2203.
  - A. Essential to preserve an existing, stable neighborhood.
  - B. Precludes intolerable expansion of existing problems, e.g., density, noise, increased traffic on residential streets, illegal and unsafe parking, decreased pedestrian safety.
- IV. Woodley Park can be a model urban residential-commercial neighborhood with the adoption of the WP Overlay Zone and the additions proposed by WPCA.

MS. ZINA GREEN

Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission

Z.C. Case No. 86-26

Woodley Park Overlay Zone

COMMERCIAL CONCERNS

(5 Minutes)

- I. Commercial zoning in excess of what "exists" is antithetical to the stability of a neighborhood.
  - A. Perspective from building owner (IBEX)
  - B. Perspective from business owner (Park Place)
  - C. Why Chevy Chase works
  - D. Why Woodley Park doesn't work
- II. City-wide economic development goals are hurt by commercial/office redevelopment west of the park
  - A. Positive economic impact of D.C.'s original zoning overlay-height limit
  - B. No controls on low-density office space -- intense pressures west of the Park siphon off economic development in three-fourths of city
  - C. City-wide overlay zoning for commercial use of development districts
- III. Conclusion: Overlay zoning sufficient to encourage rehabilitation and retention of existing structures will stabilize commercial area with positive impact on neighborhood and further true city-wide economic development

MR. LARRY AURBACH, ESQ. and MS. LEE GREY  
Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission  
Z.C. Case No. 86-26  
Woodley Park Overlay Zone

FEDERAL INTEREST CONCERNS AND HISTORIC SCALE  
(5 Minutes)

- I. The WP Overlay Zone and proposed additions are responsive to the needed scale concerns.
  - A. Area established during the first quarter of this century, approximately 1900-1930. The essential four-story townhouse character of the Woodley Park commercial area was established as well.
  - B. Because of the relationship between Woodley Park and Rock Creek Park, there is a federal interest in the scale of the Woodley Park commercial area, which borders and is visible from the Park.
  - C. Although Fine Arts Commission has mandatory review under the Shipstead-Luce Act, this occurs only when a proposal for construction is submitted.
  - D. Meanwhile, the Zoning Commission will establish density and height limitations.
- II. We urge the Zoning Commission to maintain the historic scale of the Woodley Park commercial areas by adopting the WP Overlay Zone and the proposed additions.

ANC 3C REPRESENTATIVE

Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission

Z.C. Case No. 86-26

Woodley Park Overlay Zone

ANC 3C COMMENTS

(5 Minutes)

- I. Development concerns in Woodley Park
  - A. Relationship to ward development
  - B. Need to maintain consistency with Comprehensive Plan
  - C. The WP Overlay Zone and the Comprehensive Plan designation of WP as a local neighborhood center as it relates to zoning
  - D. Need to preserve and stabilize existing neighborhoods through, in part, reasonable commercial development
  - E. Related concerns, e.g., traffic impact on residential neighborhoods, etc.
  - F. Prohibition on PUD's
- II. Support for WP Overlay Zone and proposed addition

WOODLEY PARK COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION BOARD MEMBER  
Outline of Testimony before the D.C. Zoning Commission  
Z.C. Case No. 86-26  
Woodley Park Overlay Zone

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION - THE WOODLEY PARK OVERLAY ZONE  
(5 Minutes)

- I. Summary of major points to support WP Overlay Zone and proposed additions
- II. Expression of appreciation to Zoning Commission
- III. Formal transmittal of supporting documents
- IV. Transmittal of revised WP Overlay Zone language to include proposed additions