Foxhall Community
Citizens Association
Tuesday 25th July 2000

D.C. Zoning Commission,
Board of Zoning Adjustment
and D.C. Office of Planning

'00 JUL 26 P2:27

Subject: How the Zoning Regulations Pertaining to Campus Plans Should or Should Not be Altered?

The Foxhall Community Citizens Association was founded in 1928, and represents residents in that area bounded by Glover-Archbold Park, Canal Road and Whitehaven Parkway. As such, it is already involved as of right in campus planning issues for Georgetown University and in traffic impact and comprehensive plan issues at Mt. Vernon College, now purchased by George Washington University as a satellite campus.

Attached is our testimony to be presented at the 27th July 2000 roundtable to address the issues you have requested testimony on: regarding just who should hear campus plans, whether as Special Exception or PUD, and what additional language should be added to the Zoning regulations.

Additional information relevant to D.C. campus planning issues may be found on our website at
http://www.foxhall.org/#campus

Robert D. Andrew
President of FCCA

SUBMISSION TO ROUNDTABLE ON CAMPUS PLAN JURISDICTION & REGULATIONS

The present campus plan process is not working properly, neither in process nor regulatory basis. It allows universities to only address impacts of a subset of their students (full-time undergrads, with a number of exceptions), does not address expansion outside their campus plan boundaries, and lacks enforcement mechanisms and control measures in the 10-year period between plans.

Let me illustrate this using the example of a campus plan that is NOT in front to the BZA, having been already mediated and issued, namely the Mount Vernon College campus. As a signatory to the mediated joint conditions submitted, I'm in position to address what worked and what didn't.

The GWU/MVC campus plan as first proposed, used only a classical FTE counting of students, which simply did not address neighborhood concerns over the total impact of student activity, such as shuttle students between this site and the main campus, and impact of sports practices, games and audiences. The mediation process got MVC to tabulate these, and to the relief of the neighbors were not as high as they had feared – full disclosure absolutely helped, but to this date the Consortium of Universities persists in using the FTE formula.

As far as expansion outside their boundary, MVC numbers as an independent single-sex college had fallen to uneconomic levels, and the projection for the next 10 years still keeps them under the original maximum proposed decades ago. However, there are still yet two large undeveloped estates on Foxhall Rd, and GWU's attorney has declared they will not be bound from purchasing property they are legally entitled to.

As far as conditions agreed to, BZA set up a quarterly process that lacks enforceability. At the first meeting since the new plan was approved, MVC found it self in hot water over the choice of a synthetic soccer field turf rather than the natural grass specified in the plan. It was not so much the turf selection itself as the lack of consultation when a process was in place for it. I was intrigued that MVC invited the mediation facilitator appointed by OP to return, but where was the Zoning Administrator? Under what conditions is his office meant to step in? This is not clear.

In order to ensure that campus planning addresses the whole community around a university and not just development inside a "campus boundary" FCCA recommends that all campus plans be treated as PUD's – Planned Unit Developments. As such, the body clearly responsible for PUDs should handle campus plans, namely the Zoning Commission. This would also ensure that the BZA concentrate more on the routine variances they were set up to do – we are not convinced they handle well their current mix of responsibilities of large campus plans with their other role.

Also 11 DCMR 210 should be amended to more fully address student impacts: undergraduate and graduate, traditional and non-traditional, on-campus and commuters. It should also address enforcement mechanisms for the period in between campus plan approvals, and address the fiscal and economic impacts from off-campus development by universities with the loss of tax revenue. If you agree, it might be necessary to suspend pending plan approvals, or at least limit their term.

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
Case 99-10
Exhibit 9

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.99-10
EXHIBIT NO.9