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CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a continuation of the public hearing of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia for Tuesday, November 19th.

My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice Chair Cohen and Commissioner Turnbull. Commissioners Miller and May are in the National Capital Planning Commission. They have a hearing over there. They hope to join us shortly or soon. I'm not sure what the status is.

Anyway, we are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Director Bardin, Ms. Sharon Schellin, Ms. Esther Bushman, and Ms. Zee Hill. And the Office of Planning Staff will join us shortly: Ms. Steingasser, Ms. Lawson. I believe we are expected to be joined by Director Tregoning and Ms. Vitale. And also District Department of
Transportation, we have Mr. Rogers.

This proceeding is being recorded by a Court Reporter and is also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room, including the display of any signs or objects.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission case number 08-06A. This is a request by the Office of Planning for comprehensive revisions and amendments to the zoning regulations titled 11 DCMR. The specific subject of tonight's hearing is proposed new subtitle C.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on September 20, 2013. And copies of that announcement are available to the left on the wall near the door.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with provisions of 11 DCMR 30.21 as follows. Tonight we will take preliminary
matters and testimony from the public only.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing: organizations five minutes, individuals three minutes. The Commission intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary. No time shall be ceded.

As noted in the notice of public hearing, I will be calling witnesses in the order in which the Office of Zoning received their notice of intent to testify. After those witnesses have been called, tonight I will ask others who have registered to testify this evening and then ask others in the audience if they wish to testify. And I will tell you tonight will be our last. Hopefully we will get through the list. And when I do that, tonight will be our last night of asking for others who would like to
testify. Tomorrow night we are expected to just ask our questions of Office of Planning and DDOT.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table.

When presenting information to the Commission, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off so that your microphone is no longer picking up sound or background noise.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the
Commission in conversation during any recess or at any time.

As noted, testimony this evening will be limited to proposed new subtitle C. If you have testimony on any other subtitles that we have heard previously and cannot come back on the scheduled hearing nights for those subtitles, you may hand in your written testimony or submit it before the hearing date, before we close the record now. We will read it.

I would also ask that you not repeat testimony that has already been given. Rather than repeating the same comments, I would suggest that you state that you agree with the testimony that has already been given and add any additional comments that we have not yet heard. We have a lot of people on the list to get through tonight. So, please, if testimony has already been given, do not repeat it.

When you hear the first buzzer,
you will have one minute to wrap up your testimony. When you hear the second buzzer, you need to stop your testimony. If you continue to talk after the second buzzer sounds, we will cut you off. We're not trying to be rude. We just need to hear from everyone. In order to do so, we need to stick to the time limits.

And let me just say I know a number of you testified at the NCPC today, and I actually watched some of that. And I will tell you, at least while I watched it I didn't hear the chairman have to cut anybody off. So I want to be like him. I'm going to call him to see what he does.

Anyway, please turn off all beepers.

PARTICIPANT: (From an unmiked location)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh. Is that what it was? Well, maybe I don't want to. Thank you. Okay. Well, it's different when you're
streaming. Maybe I need to keep my mouth closed, then. Okay.

Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time so not to disrupt these proceedings.

At this time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters. Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you all for correcting me. Anyway, let's move on with the agenda. Maybe I should have left that alone. Okay. Let's begin with Megan McConville, Larry Hargrove.

PARTICIPANT: (From an unmiked location)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, not tonight. We will see. We have a number of people who want to -- you can submit. Mr. Hargrove, you can submit something in writing for the record. Okay?

Louise Brodnitz, Jordan Bishop,
Ryan Donahue, Brian O’Looney, Courtney Tolbert, Darnell Grisby. Well, maybe we will finish earlier tonight, actually. Myles Smith, Jalal Greene. Did I miss somebody? Marge Maceda, Jalal Greene, Cheryl Cott. Okay, let me see. Ivan Frishberg.

MS. McCONVILLE: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Megan McConville. I live on Capitol Hill at 806 North Carolina Avenue, Southeast. I am here to express my strong support for the proposed update to the D.C. zoning code, specifically the reduction of minimum parking requirements. Ten years ago, I moved to D.C. for a job and was immediately captivated by
city living. I love the vibrant walkable neighborhoods, the convenience of having stores and restaurants blocks from home, and the historic character. Having grown up in an auto-dependent suburban community, I particularly enjoyed the newfound freedom of being able to live easily and affordably without a car.

I still appreciate D.C.'s high quality of life every day. Our rich variety of transportation options remains one of my favorite aspects of living here.

I own a car now, but I get around primarily on foot, by bike, and Metro, and sometimes by car share. My husband and I want to stay in the city and raise our family, but we're concerned about the high cost of housing, especially in the transit-accessible neighborhoods in which we would like to live.

Reasonable parking requirements are critical to supporting the transportation
options I value and improving housing affordability. Current parking requirements are based on 1950s assumptions of an automobile-oriented city with no Metro, separated uses, and cheap energy. They incentivize the provision of parking, whether it's needed or not, adding tens of thousands of dollars per space to the cost of development. These costs are passed on to homeowners, renters, and customers, regardless of whether they own a car. And almost 40 percent of D.C. households do not own a car.

Removing parking requirements in downtown and easing them in areas well-served by transit makes sense in today's D.C., a city with world-class transportation choices but badly in need of affordable housing, especially near transit, allowing developers to build the amount of parking that the market demands, rather than forcing them to meet artificial requirements will reduce the
costs that get passed on to homeowners and renters while promoting transit use and decreasing congestion.

Additionally, allowing shared parking, encouraging the provision of car share spaces, and requiring that projects with excess parking provide elements like capital bike share stations, tree planting, and electric car charging all support city goals of increasing sustainability and livability.

D.C.'s future prosperity depends on its ability to preserve and strengthen its assets, including its walkability, its public transit system, its vibrant mixed-use neighborhoods, and to continue to be a place of opportunity for people of all ages and backgrounds.

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.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MS. BRODNITZ: Good evening. My name is Louise Brodnitz. I live at 1525 29th Street, Northwest in D.C.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak out in support of the changes before you tonight, which I believe will move D.C. toward a more sustainable future.

I am a Georgetown resident, 57 years old, a mother of 2 children. I am probably typical of folks facing the time pressures and parking pressures that you might have heard about during these zoning hearings.

I live in the city because I don't want to be dependent on a car to get where I am going. We have ten bus routes which run pretty frequently during rush hour. We have the Circulator on M Street every eight minutes or so and two Metro stations
within a 15-minute walk. The city's resources are being spent on a system that I think is underused.

What does this have to do with zoning or parking? It's about that crucial decision whether to drive and how zoning regulations manipulate people into driving when they actually have more choice.

For too long, zoning required -- I don't know what I'm saying here. For too long, zoning made available so much parking that buses, Metro, and walking aren't even considered by some. More people driving that could have been taking transit clog streets and make buses slower. Empty buses have to run less frequently so as to have enough riders to make them worthwhile. Slow and infrequent buses and the promise of parking literally forces people into driving, rather than walking or taking transit. It's a classic vicious cycle.

In that car-centric situation
that we find ourselves in, I see houses for sale without parking in Georgetown languish on the market while those with a driveway fly into contract. Developers of housing don't need to be told to provide parking. They know that's what buyers in some areas want, and they will provide it.

Also, in this car-centric situation, I see two prime lots with open space along pedestrian-oriented Wisconsin Avenue becoming banks with parking dead zones. Neighborhoods serving businesses that could have turned that parking space into great foot traffic generating street life lost out because parking won out. Property owners don't need to be told to provide parking. They go for parking over street life. The challenge is not to get developers to provide enough parking. The challenge is to change the parameters that push developers to provide so much parking.

Removing parking minimum starts
to break the cycle of car dependency and gets people on the transit. And guess what. Like my husband, a diehard driver, said, "Okay. You're right. Taking the bus is easier than driving. And I can actually get stuff done."

What I wish we had more of was --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. We have your testimony.

Next?

MR. BISHOP: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Make sure your mike is on.

MR. BISHOP: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the Zoning Commission. Thank you very much for giving me and my fellow residents the opportunity to testify tonight to support the proposed zoning regulations review.

My name is Jordan Bishop. I am a native Washingtonian, a small business owners, and Ward 2 resident. I live at 1721 T Street, Northwest. My passion for my
hometown and my concerns for its future are
my principal reasons for appearing before you
tonight.

While my beloved Redskins have
not seen much, if any, improvement in their
win totals over the past decade or two, the
landowners in our fair city have enjoyed
tremendous success. Their success is
attributable to a variety of factors that
carries with it some undesirable outcomes for
Washington residents of modest means.

I will not spend too much time
tonight explaining or illustrating the
undeniable fact that housing in the District
of Columbia has become more unaffordable than
ever before. Low and moderate income workers
and families are being priced out of this
town at alarming rate.

There are many dedicated
professionals working in a variety of
capacities to help solve this issue, but they
cannot do it alone. Through this process,
this Commission has a critical opportunity to help reduce this troubling phenomenon. By revisiting the current mandatory minimum parking requirements, the Zoning Commission will be supporting good public policy that will expand the supply of housing in Washington, D.C. and make producing affordable housing less costly for the various organizations charged with this critical mission.

The fact is that less and less of my fellow Washingtonians need or even desire to own a car. There are many alternative options for transportation these days, all of which are less costly and more environmentally friendly.

The cost of excavating unused and underutilized parking spaces is always passed on to tenants in the form of higher rents. Additionally, many buildings in under-served areas of town are never built because the rents in those areas cannot cover the costs
of all the excavation associated with zoning-mandated parking minimums.

Please consider these factors and help make D.C. more affordable for those of modest means using all the tools at your disposal, including a reduction in mandatory parking minimums.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. DONAHUE: Good evening. My name is Ryan Donahue. And I live in the Langdon neighborhood at 1719 Franklin Street, Northeast. I am here to express my general support for the zoning update and specifically for its reduction or elimination of parking minimums wherever possible.

I would like to make three points about how current 1950s-era parking requirements fail to accommodate the needs of current and future D.C. residents. The first
is that current requirements simply cause far
too much parking to be built. Almost 40
percent of D.C. households do not own cars.
And the share is significantly higher in
transit-accessible neighborhoods.

I live in a house with three
people that, despite being a mile from the
nearest Metro station, has six bikes, one
Zipcar membership, and one car. That's
indicative of the way that more and more
people want to get around.

The current regulations require
development that runs completely counter to
this trend. The oversupply of parking is
abundantly evident at the Rhode Island Avenue
shopping center to take one example near my
house. The site, which sits on extremely
valuable land directly adjacent to the Metro,
has nearly 1,100 parking spaces, which cover
almost 15 of the parcel's 21 acres. At any
given time, most of these spaces sit empty,
constituting an enormous waste of space that
could otherwise support more transit-accessible housing or businesses. It also creates an unpleasant or even hostile environment for walking and cycling. That is an isolated example, but it has much broader implications for a large portion of Northeast D.C.

The D.C. Office of Planning has shown that nearby sections of Rhode Island and New York Avenues contain a significant portion of the city's total stock of developable land over the next 30 years. The parking changes put forth in the zoning update will help ensure that future development is walkable, high-quality, and sensitive to the needs of residents.

Secondly, current parking requirements have huge implications for the urgent issue of housing affordability. With current average monthly rents at nearly $1,600 and more and more people moving in, current parking regulations are helping to
drive part of the unaffordable housing issue. They make it harder to build enough housing. And the housing that does get built costs more as underground parking spaces can cost upwards of $20,000. These costs are passed on to renters, adding 6 to 12 percent of the price of an apartment.

In a city with one of the country's highest costs of living, the zoning code should do all it can to enable more affordable housing options. Ultimately, the parking changes and the zoning update are modest ones. They only remove parking minimums so that places that truly need parking can provide it. Other cities are currently taking similar steps.

As more and more people choose to walk; bike; use transit; and share, rather than own, cars, it is good news for the whole city, including those who do need to drive. I support the zoning code update because it recognizes and encourages these trends.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great. Thank you.

Next?

MS. MACEDA: My name is Marge Maceda. I live at 475 K Street, Northwest in the Mount Vernon Triangle area. I speak to you wearing a number of hats: as a private citizen, the president of the K at City Vista Condo Board, and ANC commissioner, 6E-05. I thank the Zoning Committee for allowing me to speak and share my thoughts with you.

I support the changes that are being suggested for parking obligations. I have lived in the District for more than 20 years, both in Southwest and now in Northwest. I moved to Mount Vernon Triangle and City Vista because I like the idea that while working, I could park my car on Friday evening and not use it again until Monday morning. Now as a retired person, I am so glad I made that move. In my neighborhood, I
have a supermarket, pharmacy, hardware store, restaurants, and I can walk to all of them. I am a bus ride, taxi ride away from the theatre, and can walk down to the National Mall for my favorite concerts and events.

My building has underground parking, more than 400 spaces. The spaces are designated for the supermarket, retail, and privately owned spaces for the two condo buildings and rental building that make up our complex. The spaces for the residential parking cost $35,000 each and can be owned only by residents in the complex.

As the building filled and the neighborhood started to develop, residents have found that owning a car is not necessary. So they rid themselves of a car and begin using Metro with two stations being within two, three blocks and buses right in the area: the Circulator and regular bus. And in the not-too-distant future, the streetcar system will be coming to our
neighborhood.

In the K and L portion of parking, there were some unsold spaces, less than ten, but many of the other spaces were rented out as owners no longer needed them. As all of the spaces were privately owned, the city loses tax revenue on unsold spots.

In the rental portion of the garage, there are quite a few unused spaces. I also wonder how much money was added to the cost of my condo unit to help pay for the construction of the spaces that are now unused. My concern is that we have a level for parking that was put in for retailers, for them to offer their customers the ability to park.

The owners of the retail space did not want the extra costs for parking. And so the parking lot with more than 50 spaces has remained closed and unused for 5 years. I inquired and was told that each of these spaces cost the developers around
$50,000 each, money that seems wasteful to me. Buildings that are so near Metro or above Metro should not be required to provide parking.

In a city where I see Bikeshare, Zipcar, and Smart car readily available, I see less and less the need for buildings to provide more than minimum parking.

Thank you for your time this evening as well as the long hours you put in for the District of Columbia.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. O'LOONEY: Hello. I'm Brian O'Looney. I am an architect with Torti Gallas and Partners and the architect of City Vista. So I can't tell you how pleased I was to hear that last bit of testimony there.

I want to take this opportunity to also support the changes in the parking requirements that are being put forth by the Office of Planning, but given that this
meeting was advertised as sort of an open hearing of overflow from previous meetings, there's a couple of other minor points in the code I would like to touch upon.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: This was not advertised as that, no, no.

MR. O'LOONEY: It's on your website.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No.

MR. O'LOONEY: If you want, it's in page 21 that I gave you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MR. O'LOONEY: Your website shows that it says, "Overflow" --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Were you here --

MR. O'LOONEY: -- "Reserved overflow from previous hearings."

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We've got a lot of stuff going on. We might have made an error, but tonight is about subtitle C. If you have anything else? You're not going to come down and do something different. Mr.
Hargrove went home. He's going to supply stuff in testimony. If you have something you want to talk about other than subtitle C, you can submit it in writing.

MR. O'LOONEY: Okay. Well, it's right in front of you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, thank you. Sorry for the mistake.

MR. O'LOONEY: Okay. Well, some of these things --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: This is subtitle C.

MR. O'LOONEY: -- are in subtitle C. So we'll go with that, then. For example, the requirements, the changes to architectural embellishments, which no longer allow pergolas at the perimeter of the building, I do not think that -- that is something that is historically lovely in buildings of longstanding history as well as buildings that we have done that have been award-winning in the District. That's
C-505.1. I believe that's subtitle C. Is that correct? Okay.

Also, the requirement that alleys get up to 24 feet is wider than some of the suburbs require. I think that's a little strange. I think that in the heart of the city, we can do with tighter alleys than some of the suburban jurisdictions. And so I would suggest that you relook at that.

There is also a minimum lot requirement of 1,800 square feet for tighter projects. And I'm sorry. This is in A. So I will skip that. But I do think that's -- and these are in other sections. So I will skip that as well. Let's talk about parking requirements.

I am in great support of the changes to parking requirements because it will allow us to increase the value of the commercial property by 15 to 20 percent; lower the cost of urban housing by 30 percent; decrease the average cost of
development by 20 to 25 percent; and greatly increase the profitability of parking facilities, as was just testified to regarding City Vista.

Two spaces of underground parking can cost anywhere from 50 to 110 thousand dollars per unit. We design bathrooms at 5 to 7 thousand dollars a unit and kitchens at 12 to 17 thousand dollars per unit. So the most experience part of units being designed in certain jurisdictions around here, not the District, is the parking.

When you build underground, parking becomes the most expensive part of that housing. It's unnecessary. It is also the greatest element that increases the cost of residential construction today. If you add parking requirements, it makes residential construction much more expensive, as shown on my comparative cost sheet, which I wish I could have projected. Units go from what used to be in 2007 numbers 102,000 per...
unit to 130,000 per unit just by adding the parking load to that.

We can decrease the average cost of development. You all probably know the story of Columbia Heights, which we were involved in, where retail was parked at 3 per 1,000. Code required 4 per 1,000. We fought for the 3 per 1,000 in this very room. But actual use, as you should know, is 1.25 per 1,000. That lowest level of the D.C. USA project is not used or doesn't need to be used, the employee's part there, even on the peak day, the day after Thanksgiving. You go there at 2:00 o'clock that weekend. There's hardly anyone down there. It was unnecessarily built.

So if you look at my fourth sheet, you will see the big holes we built in Columbia Heights that went down two stories too low that basically spent $26 million of money on parking spaces that aren't used in Columbia Heights. That dollar value could
equate to 200 units of housing if we had spent it in a different way.

A couple of more points on parking. There is no statistical basis for parking requirements except for suburban offices and suburban regional shopping centers. The math is not there to support any of the numbers that are used in zoning codes across the United States. And we ask you to take that into consideration when you are reconsidering the zoning codes for the District of Columbia.

Finally, I will just give you a list of mistakes in parking policy, which, you know, bundling was one that she just mentioned. We should try to keep people from bundling parking. Keep curb parking free or cheap is a mistake. You should try to get market pricing for curb parking. Requiring lots of off-street parking, obviously a mistake. Allowing unscreened storage uses and parking to devalue the land. That is
going to be changed in the zoning code. That is a wonderful improvement. Not resolving spillover neighborhood parking, that's resolved in many neighborhoods here with permits adjacent to shopping districts. Not limiting parking square footage as a floor area of the District is a leader in that. Thank you to the Planning Office for that.

I will leave my testimony at that, oral testimony at that. And you have other testimony in writing.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MR. FRISHBERG: Mr. Chairman and Commission members, my name is Ivan Frishberg. I am the commissioner for ANC 6B02 and the Vice Chair of commission ANC 6B.

I appear today on behalf of ANC 6B to provide our commission's comments and recommendations on the proposed rewrites of the city's zoning code. In my testimony
today, I'll speak to the parking-related issues covered in section C. These were adopted by a vote of 7:2 at our October 8th regularly scheduled meeting.

ANC 6B's full statement of all recommendations was provided to the Commission on October 21st. And I believe you have heard from some of the other ANC 6B commissioners regarding our commission views on the zoning regulations.

ANC 6B supports the Office of Planning's original proposal that there be no parking minimums required for new construction of single family housing or residential developments of at least ten units.

ANC 6B also supports the Office of Planning's proposal that there be no parking minimums in apartment commercial mixed-use zones within a half mile of Metro stops or a quarter mile of high-service bus corridors, the so-called transit zones. The
original vote on this position was 8:2.

As our commission evaluated this policy, 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. It was in that context that we supported this vision for the direction that we believe the city should be headed in. Many of us noted the positive trend of late that the growing population of the District has not led to an increase in auto ownership.

Our commission also noted the current policy providing easy access to essentially unlimited supply of residential parking permits along with providing untold numbers of temporary visitor passes for a wide variety of uses. The availability of such on-street parking in most segments of ANC 6B is already under substantial pressure.
And ANC 6B finds that DDOT's residential parking policy has and will continue to have a negative impact on the Office of Planning's stated objective of encouraging the production of additional housing in the city without the expensive burden of producing a minimum number of parking spaces.

ANC 6B is concerned that the absence of a more well-articulated policy framework and implementation plan by DDOT, elimination of parking minimums alone may only serve to shift some of the burden of parking, providing parking spaces, from developers onto scarce public parking resources with the potential to adversely impact neighborhoods in the process.

Our commission urged the Office of Planning to use its authority under the comprehensive plan to guide DDOT towards a revised residential permit parking policy. Elimination of parking minimums alone may not achieve the desired effect of reducing the
number of cars on city streets, but the commission ultimately voted that taking this step for the future of development is an important step in the long-term development of the city.

Thank you for providing ANC 6B the opportunity to testify tonight.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MS. CORT: Good evening, commissioners. My name is Cheryl Cort with the Coalition for Smarter Growth. And we are here to express our support for the proposed reductions and removal of parking minimums proposed in subtitle C.

The current proposal is a compromise from what has been considered and revised repeatedly since 2008 due to extensive public input along the way. While we disagree that parking minimums serve a compelling public purpose and believe that they can be harmful, however, we do support
the compromise proposed in subtitle C as a greatly improved policy over the status quo.

I also wanted to note my thanks to the Zoning Commission regarding inclusionary zoning, which is also in subtitle C. It's had a rocky start administratively, but we have sold one unit and a number of them are under contract and more than a dozen are leased. So it's getting on track. And it was put in place with a robust policy that I think is going to serve us well into the future that we do need to look at income targeting.

Despite the many compromises that the proposal for parking, we do believe that it is going to help make our city more walkable, sustainable, and inclusive. And it will help relieve housing of unnecessary costs in most cases. It will support the more sustainable and neighborhood-friendly transportation choices of the nearly 40 percent of all D.C. households who do not own
a car and the more than half of all D.C. renters who are car-free. This is especially important for the high share of lower-income households who do not own a car because they cannot afford it.

I want to highlight a couple of things in the rest of my testimony. I have submitted rather extensive testimony. And I collected -- I know that you wanted as many numbers as possible. So I have been talking to a lot of developers. Most of them are shy in terms of sharing information with me, but I just wanted to highlight that parking minimums are costly and drive up the cost of housing and commercial space for everyone and can displace more productive uses. We have heard that from testimony here as well. And I just wanted again to cite JBG shared with me numbers that it costs about $480 per space per month for an unleased parking space and the market price for parking in their 2012 study for U Street was $221. Even if the
cost of parking were half that, the market price would not even pay the cost to build the parking space. That is a huge cost. And that means that everybody is paying for that through overall increased rents.

For the case of affordable housing, where you have capped rents or sales price, what you can pay, those expenses either make the affordable housing an unfeasible project or they make the developer have to find additional subsidy. And is that how we should be subsidizing? We're subsidizing housing for cars, rather than using these resources to ensure that people have decent homes, especially near transit.

One of the main arguments of the opponents to reduce parking minimums is citing the increased number of registered vehicles in the District of Columbia. Census shows that occupied housing units grew by about 7.4 percent from 2000 to 2012. The number of registered vehicles grew by 3.7
percent with the number, the rate of carless houses remaining stable at about 38 percent or maybe growing slightly, despite, actually, the affluence of the city growing, meaning wealthier households, who are more able to have a car, have moved into the city.

We have sufficient evidence to show that off-street parking is generally oversupplied. And so there's a lot of opportunity to take advantage of existing oversupply of parking to meet any of the needs that car-owning households might have. But the growth that we have seen in the city is a strong trend towards people wanting to live close to transit in walkable neighborhoods. And we should support this by relieving some of the costly burdens of parking minimums to foster this kind of development.

D.C. is in a unique position, having one of the largest share of car-free households in the country. It is a higher
share than almost any city in the country except for New York City; Newark, New Jersey; and Jersey City.

And, lastly, we wanted to explain that what we need is more walkable neighborhoods. Ten years ago, people would not have called U Street a walker's paradise, which it is called today according to Walkscore. We need to make all of our neighborhoods and our cities and all of our business districts walkers' paradises.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
We thank you all for your testimony. Hold your seats. We may have some questions.

Any questions, Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to extend my thanks for all of you coming here tonight.
Ms. Cort, how many people do you have here tonight?

MS. CORT: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How many people in your organization are here tonight?

MS. CORT: Oh. My managing director, Alex Pesorske, is in the back. He already testified.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I am being a little bit facetious, but normally we have had a lot of nights where there's a lot of people from the Coalition for Smarter Growth here.

MS. CORT: Well, we have a staff of five or six people who are paid. We have -- a lot of people --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

MS. CORT: -- are interested in living in walkable neighborhoods. And I think that is why they come to --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I don't --
MS. CORT: -- our walking tours.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And we appreciate --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I want to chime in on that. I think one of the things that I have noticed is that you all have done a good job getting people out.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I mentioned that --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- a couple of nights ago. Regardless of where I am on the issue or where we are on the issue or where anybody is on the issue, you all have done a good job getting people out. And I don't know if that is where you were going.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, yes. No. We're very appreciative to your efforts of getting everybody out.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, let me ask a different question, Mr. Turnbull. I don't
know if you are finished. How many have you recruited to come out? I'm going to ask it a different way.

MS. CORT: We have certainly asked, educated people about the issues and asked them --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: They raised their hands. So that's fine. I'm just curious.

MS. CORT: -- asked them to testify. I mean, the challenge is that it's a huge ask. People, most folks, have not testified before the Zoning Commission. This is not something that people understand or feel comfortable doing. So we really appreciate there are some people who have never testified before the Zoning Commission before.

I know you see a lot of the same people for all of your hearings. But, you know, we are really fortunate to have had a lot of people come out and really want to express how they feel about living in the
city and policies that are important to them. So we appreciate them, you know, who might not have ever testified before the Zoning Commission before.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull, do you have any other questions?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I have --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Excuse me for interrupting.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No. That's okay.

The ANC commissioner. Yes, Mr. Frishberg?

MR. FRISHBERG: I just want to add from our perspective as a commission because we dealt with this over several meetings that in three years of being on the commission, I had never seen, I think, a more thoughtful and robust dialogue within our commission. It was very fact-based. We had more people coming out for our meetings on this case, this issue, than on probably many
other issues other than, you know, a single, like, you know, a development case, such as Hine or something, in the District.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Eastern Market?

MR. FRISHBERG: But, as a matter of policy, we never have people coming out to address policy issues, with this being a notable exception. And it was notable not just because of the turnout but also because of I think the thoughtfulness of the debate. And so I was really impressed with the conversation we had at our neighborhood that resulted in the position we took.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's good to hear. That's good to hear.

I just have for Mr. O'Looney, the picture you submitted, it would appear --

MR. O'LOONEY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- that the pergolas you are showing are within the height limit for the zone. And if you read
this, this is talking about structures that go above the height limit for the zone.

MR. O'LOONEY: Well, first of all, The Envoy was built before there were zones. But the --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm just talking about your picture --

MR. O'LOONEY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- with the pergolas would appear to be structures that are built within the height limit that's required.

MR. O'LOONEY: The building in Columbia Heights, that would not be the case, the one in the upper right-hand corner, where there's a -- the point I'm trying to make is that the requirements of C-505, for one, would not allow you to have at the top of a building a pergola at the edge of the building. And you may be correct on the Ellington. Both of these are PUDs, by the way. So that's how they got pergolas, --
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

MR. O'LOONEY: -- but the point being that we --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That is part of the process.

MR. O'LOONEY: Yes. We believe that pergolas augment the quality of our community, that they are part of our historical heritage that should be something that should be allowed by right for architects to add character to the building.

Frankly, my developer clients are not going to come in here to ask you just for a pergola. And you won't get them.

And there is nothing wrong with having them at -- you allow for architectural embellishments at the perimeter of the building. This should be one that is also allowed.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

And during the PUD process, we review that. We look at all embellishment. And we
carefully look at the character of the neighborhood and how they fit in and what the adjacent character is and if it does work. So that is all part of the PUD process.

MR. O'LOONEY: Right. But the problem is you would have to go through a PUD to do this. And that is not --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, I am sure the Office of Planning will comment on this.

MR. O'LOONEY: Yes. We think this --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: We can ask that when we --

MR. O'LOONEY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: -- ask our questions.

MR. O'LOONEY: There are other architectural embellishments that are allowed by right. We believe this should be one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

Mr. Frishberg, you state in your testimony that we should encourage DDOT to revise the residential parking permit policy. Can you give me an idea or several ideas how we should -- I mean, not how we should do it. We can do it -- but what you would suggest?

MR. FRISHBERG: For about the last year and a half or almost two years, we have been in an ongoing pursuit to have the ballpark performance parking pilot area, which has authority to extend out to East Capitol but is only in operation up to Pennsylvania Avenue. So we have been trying to get it extended to the north up to East Capitol.

Especially around the Eastern Market area, there is, you know, a significant crush on parking, especially on the weekends, when the market serves, essentially, as our own ballpark. I mean, it is that kind of a magnet.
And so we have tried for, as I say, almost two years to try and get that parking relief expanded so that we can provide some measure of -- we have a particular proposal that had greater protection for residents. On one side of the street was Zone 6 only parking. And on the other side of the street, it maintained traditional no parking limits on weekends. And that was a balance that we crafted with the Eastern Market business community and with the neighborhood there. And it's been -- we have had no joy in trying to get that through the Department of Transportation, despite endless meetings.

So I think there's a lot that they could do. It was notable that the city sort of pulled back the DDOT's ability to expand the visitor parking program. I think, you know, there is a lot of work that could be done around those sort of visitor passes.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: What was
DDOT's pushback on that?

MR. FRISHBERG: Well, I think they're reviewing -- I think -- I'm not going to speak for DDOT, but in the meetings that we have had, they felt like --

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Your perception.

MR. FRISHBERG: -- they had a good proposal. And I think a lot of it was that they had not communicated what that proposal was to neighborhoods. So the city just wasn't ready for whatever it was they were providing.

I do know that one of the problems we have in our neighborhood is that MPD now hands out guest passes like confetti and there's no check on that. And so that leads to basically, in essence, an unregulated parking environment, which undermines a lot of the policies that we do have.

So I think that one of the
problems we see is that DDOT doesn't have a really comprehensive look at parking in the District. They have different programs, some of which they are having trouble implementing, but collectively it does represent a comprehensive policy.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

Ms. Cort, I don't think I have as much enthusiasm on the success of IZ as you may be experiencing. So I'd like to know, how do we get IZ to be more effective in actually meeting the demand for housing, as opposed to -- I mean, I'm not saying any housing isn't good, but it is not getting down to the real need. There's a total mismatch.

MS. CORT: In terms of income targeting?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Income targeting, yes. I'm sorry.

MS. CORT: Yes. I mean, the original proposal, the campaign for
inclusionary zoning, was we originally talked about doing like 60-65 percent of AMI income targeting, like Montgomery County, and then working with ACORN. Actually, ACORN wanted to make sure that we were getting into a lower income group. So we said, "Well, why don't we split the income targeting between 50 percent AMI and 80 percent AMI?"

We brought that to the Zoning Commission. And the Zoning Commission said, "Well, let's split out high-rise construction from low-rise construction and eliminate 50 percent AMI in high-rise construction." So, starting with that, we lost a tremendous amount of 50 percent AMI income targeting that we had originally anticipated getting.

Looking at the certificates for compliance right now, it's about 15 percent is 50 percent AMI, which isn't terrible, but it's not what we wanted. I think that, you know, after the zoning update is done, I think that it would be really helpful for the
Zoning Commission to really look into this issue in terms of what kinds of ways can we strengthen inclusionary zoning to make sure that we retain the amount of set-aside that we're getting, the eight to ten percent set-aside, and also examine how we can realize the most from that in terms of providing for lower-income targeting.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

Mr. O'Looney, you were speaking very quickly and you had a lot of data. So I presume it's in your presentation, on cost especially. Is it an assumption that we can make that if we reduce the requirement on parking minimums, will that translate into greater affordability of units? Do you really believe that can be achieved or is it just a bonus that we'll end up giving to the development community?

MR. O'LOONEY: I can pretty much guess that certain sites today that are not developable will, all of a sudden, become
developable because the threshold for those projects to pencil and get financed will be crossed. I think that is something you can guarantee when the parking loads come down because it is a substantial sizeable cost to projects happening and more likely in neighborhoods that aren't getting development right now over the ones that have been seeing lots of development.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I just want to ask one quick question because I want to hear from the public. Ryan Donahue, let me ask you, how long have you been living in Langdon? You said ten years.

MR. DONAHUE: No. Actually, I have been in Northeast for three years and Langdon for about one.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: About what time do you see all of this empty parking space? I am just curious. Are you talking about where the Giant and the Home Depot is and all
that?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes, exactly. Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Now, you know -- were you there before -- the bank at one time was built. So some of that parking is now starting to be built on up.

MR. DONAHUE: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You weren't talking about the Metro lot or the other lot.

MR. DONAHUE: No. I am just talking about the area between the Giant and the Home Depot.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.

MR. DONAHUE: And typically the parking directly facing maybe five spots out from those might be full, but there's a huge sea of parking on the side closest to Rhode Island Avenue that is typically empty around the bank. People just drive through there. And, really, that whole center section is just a sea of asphalt.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So that leaves a
potential to be developed, then?

MR. DONAHUE: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it's still room to develop?

MR. DONAHUE: Right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I thought you were talking about the Metro lot and the other lot. I wanted to get clear on that.

MR. DONAHUE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Because I was going to ask you what time were they empty? All right. Thank you.

We appreciate all of your testimony. Okay. Thank you very much.

And let me just say this for the record. The overflow was for anything that we missed. Now, I don't know if you are aware, but our first meeting on subtitle C, we had 48 or 50, 50-some odd witnesses. We couldn't have heard 120 a night. So the overflow was whatever we needed. It might not have been that clear, but if you were
here -- I don't mean to be bashing, but if you knew we were trying to do that because we didn't want to go until 2:00 and 3:00 o'clock in the morning because the subway were closed and then, you know, the bicycles, you know, all of that stuff. So anyway --

MR. O'LOONEY: We understand, and we're happy that the record is open --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And you can comment.

MR. O'LOONEY: -- so additional testimony can be submitted.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MR. O'LOONEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Tad Baldwin, Nancy MacWood, Chris Otten, Mitchell Chrispell, Patricia Penny, Maisie Hughes, Chris Furlong, Kelly Blynn, Jo-Ann Nehaus. And, again, if I pronounced it incorrectly, you can correct me when you come up. Okay. Is this all we have out of all those names? Okay. Darren Flusche, Elina Bravve, Jonathan
Tomer, Susan Taylor, Brian Cohen, Hannah Martin, William Condell, Rick Rybeck. Okay. I think we have eight. Also, we have been joined a long time ago by Office of Planning. I actually mentioned your all's name earlier. Is NCPC still gone? Okay. Okay. We're going to start to my right, your left. You may begin. Identify yourself.

MR. CRISPELL: Thank you very much.

My name is Mitchell Crispell. I live in Logan Circle, at 1416 R Street, Northwest. I'm speaking on behalf of Jews United For Justice. I have five minutes of comments.

I am a livelong Washington, D.C. resident, and I am also speaking based on my own personal experiences. I wish to express our support for lowering off-street parking minimum requirements. The parking minimum
policies you set will affect whether our city
can effectively address our affordable
housing crisis.

In my previous work as a housing
counselor, I met with tenants all over town
helping them understand their rights, improve
housing conditions, and pursue the tenant
purchase process. Top on the minds of my
clients was affordability. Many of them
lived in rapidly changing neighborhoods, like
Columbia Heights, where we have a serious
shortage of affordable units. Even in less
gentrified areas, in recent years we have
lost many more affordable units than we have
gained. Rents go up, but workers' paychecks
stay the same. And, increasingly, renters
face falling behind on their rent,
displacement, or even homelessness.

Part of the solution to our
affordable housing crisis is to lower off-
street parking minimum requirements. These
requirements raise the cost of housing by
forcing developers to build more parking than people want to buy. The dollars spent building unnecessary parking spaces could go toward building more housing units or towards creating more affordable units. Lower minimums allow developers to build what is actually demanded by the market and not waste money and space on unneeded parking spots.

These regulations are particularly crucial for affordable housing developers, who are trying to maximize the number of units they build. Each dollar spent on parking takes away from money that could go towards more units. Few of my former clients owned cars. What they needed was a decent home they could afford.

We know that low-income city residents are less likely to own cars. Middle-income people are also choosing to go carless in increasing numbers. Today, as you know, 38 percent of D.C. households are car-free. Our zoning regulations should
recognize this.

The proposed regulations allow true parking demand to be met, lower housing costs, and encourage what we need most of all: affordable housing units.

I am also here representing Jews United for Justice. Our over 6,000 local members joined together to pursue justice and equality in our city and region. Embedded in our Jewish tradition is the concept of tikkun olam, or repairing the world, which teaches us that, as Jews, we have a responsibility to lift us the concerns of marginalized people, both within and outside our community. We work on campaigns such as in recent years marriage equality in the DREAM Act in Maryland and paid sick days for all and a higher minimum wage in the District of Columbia.

My previous comments reflect the values and positions of Jews United for Justice. Additionally, we believe the city...
should allow new housing developments to right size the parking supply to meet demand, rather than build a government-mandated minimum.

The zoning code should support a mix of accessible affordable ways to get around town, things like transit, car sharing, bike sharing, walking, and other new transportation options, as well as appropriate infrastructure for cars. When more people go car-free, driving and parking are easier for drivers of all income levels who truly need cars because they have mobility issues or difficult commutes. High parking minimums move us in the opposite direction by encouraging and subsidizing more cars that are not needed.

In these hearings, I am sure you will hear about the effects of the proposed zoning changes on on-street parking. I encourage you to leave that issue up to its appropriate regulator: the District
Department of Transportation. The economics is straightforward. Even as new developments have built more parking than residents want to rent or buy, street parking remains tight in popular neighborhoods. This is because on-street parking is practically free. Free on-street parking lowers the market price for off-street parking because building managers must offer parking spots at a price that appeals to drivers who might otherwise get street parking for free. The off-street spots are then priced lower than their costs. And developers make up the difference in rent levels. As you know, this means that other residents of the building, who may not even own a car, are subsidizing a car owner.

The only way to address competition around street parking is to manage it, which is DDOT's job. You should not seek to solve the problem of a lack of sufficient on-street parking by writing a zoning code that creates off-street parking.
spots that drivers don't want to pay for. Pass zoning regulations that make sense for the city we are trying to create and leave the issue of on-street parking to DDOT to manage.

I am here to stay. The D.C. area has always been my home. And I intend for it to be the place I get married, buy a home, raise children, and retire. I want to live in a city where high-paid lobbyists and the minimum wage worker who prepares her lunch can both live with dignity. I want to live in a city free of traffic jams and free of air pollution. I want to hop on the bus for a quick ride because most people are doing that and fewer need to drive and create traffic that holds up the bus. Parking minimums are not the silver bullet to creating such a place, but they are key.

The proposal before you, the product of five years of dialogue between planning and residents from every ward and
neighborhood of the city, is a solid compromise that will retain but reduce marked parking minimums. It is an important part of ensuring a vibrant and inclusive city in the years to come.

On behalf of the Jews United for Justice community and as a proud Washingtonian, I encourage you to adopt the proposed changes to the parking regulations.

Thank you so much for your time and all of your hard work.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. FURLONG: Hi, commissioners. My name is Chris Furlong. I work for City Interests, a local multifamily developer. I am actually here, though, today to testify on behalf of myself. And my views do not reflect those of my organization, and they are mine personally.

I am testifying tonight in favor of lowering the off-street parking minimum
requirements. As a lifelong resident of Arlington County who attended high school in the District and now proudly calls D.C. my home, I have been afforded a unique perspective on the evolution of the city and its transformation from a once sleepy government town to the bustling, lively, diverse community it has grown to become. D.C. has not always maintained a sense of place like its suburban neighbors have enjoyed, but changing demographics, evidenced in the city skyline and accelerating commercial development, have begun to create the District that our progressive Office of Planning had envisioned.

A new era demands new thinking. And the Office of Planning has done an excellent job thus far responding to current and future needs of the city's residents. No city ever grew or progressed and improved without visionary leaders and strong, resolute decisions.
I would like to focus a couple of minutes on the economic realities of the rewrite, which I find central to this discussion. Just a couple of thoughts. So, first of all, parking is a vitally important issue. Cars aren't going anywhere. We all know that. And no one is really waging a war on cars, as some would have you believe.

Preferences are changing, though. And, as Ms. Cort pointed out earlier, there is a growing number of non-car-dependent households and people are choosing to live without cars for whatever reason, whether it's affordability or they just prefer to live in the city, use buses, use public transit.

Second of all, parking is not a public good. And it demands investment. Adam Smith's invisible hand has proven incredibly effective at allocating the resources efficiently. And such is the case with parking. Developers, including my firm,
which I have seen it from my own experience professionally, understand the demographics of realistic development and the demands of parking better than perhaps anyone besides parking experts and DDOT and yourselves probably, too.

If the market demands parking, the bottom line is it will be billed. Who among us can break the future, though? How can you know what people's preferences will be ten years from now? I didn't when I grew up here. I never saw Arlington becoming this transit hub in terms of development like it did.

A couple of recent projects in Northeast, in H Street, in particular, are very overparked. And the reason for it is because developers built parking that they felt was necessary for the area. It had nothing to do with the zoning regulations, but they built to the market. That's going to continue to happen. And allowing the
market to dictate the level of parking is really the logical and progressive way forward since neither myself nor you nor OP really knows what parking is going to be like in two to five or ten years.

Obviously this debate is not going to end tonight. We have a long way to go. But when making your decision with regards to zoning rewrites, parking reforms, please think long and hard about where your city is heading. If you believe the next generation, my generation in many respects, will revert to the same preferences as our parents, who fled to suburban schools and lifestyles, then, by all means, reducing funding for both transit, cut transportation finance, expand local highway systems. You can do it.

However, if you think that, as I think many people do, that the next generation will continue to operate cars with far less reliance than previous generations,
then I have confidence that you will make the right decision and push the zoning rewrite forward.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you.

MR. FURLONG: And bring the 'Skins back to D.C., please.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next? Oh, do we have any 'Skins fans? Chicago? The Giants?

MR. FURLONG: Oh, no.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, we've got Giants and 'Skins fans. So that didn't work. Next?

MS. HUGHES: Good evening. Casey Trees is a nonprofit organization with the mission to restore, enhance, and protect the tree canopy of Washington, D.C.

Since 1950, Washington, D.C.'s tree canopy has declined from about 50 percent to its current 36 percent. To reverse this trend, the District has adopted
a 40 percent tree canopy goal to be reached by 2032. And it has included this goal as part of its Sustainable DC plan. So we, of course, applaud the District's efforts to create a more sustainable city by implementing the Green Area Ratio as part of the zoning code. This helps to mitigate the negative environmental impacts of intensive development.

We also applaud the District's efforts to include trees in the Green Area Ratio, subtitle C, chapter 17, page 50. This is a clear recognition that trees are environmentally beneficial and powerful storm water managers and help to reduce urban heat island effects and air pollution.

However, the Green Area Ratio has a critical flaw. The best way I can explain this flaw is with the following analogy. If you were recruiting for a football team, would you recruit your members based on their size at birth? I don't think so because if
you were to do that, you wouldn't take into account their future growth or their performance. So why would the Green Area Ratio incentivize trees that are larger at their size at planting than when they are at maturity?

Here is the challenge with that. We think that the District should incentivize planting trees that will grow large because those are the trees that deliver the most environmental benefits. However, the Green Area Ratio gets five times the credit for planting a 6-inch tree than it does for planting a 2.5-inch tree, even though the survival rates for planting trees at larger sizes are significantly reduced.

Also, regional and nurseries don't even provide trees that are over three inches in caliper. So you couldn't buy them if you wanted to.

We believe the intent of the Green Area Ratio is to value green elements
based on their environmental benefits. The environmental benefits of large canopy trees are exponentially greater than those of smaller trees. For example, a mature oak tree provides far greater environmental benefits than a small apple tree. So in this example here, you can see that a mature oak tree will grow to be 75 feet; whereas, a mature apple tree would only be 25 feet. So the difference in gallons of storm water is the difference between 16,000 gallons of storm water a year versus 2,287 gallons of storm water a year.

But in the Green Area Ratio, if I planted a six-inch Yoshino cherry or a six-inch apple tree, I would get six times the credit than I would for planting an oak tree.

So we have simple language that we would like for you to substitute in the Green Area Ratio that would indeed make the policy make sense. Just like the Seattle green factor, upon which the Green Area Ratio
was based, we want you to prioritize planting
of trees that grow large. And to do this is
really simple. All you have to do is to
change two lines in the scorecard of the
Green Area Ratio. By simply changing the
language in lines B-3 and B-4 of the
scorecard, the District can create smart
regulation that will work for trees.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Before I get to you, sir, let me
just acknowledge — and I know this happens
when people come late. I asked in my opening
statement that you not display any signs or
objects. So those who are sitting on the
front row who have those signs, 8 and a half
by 11, I would ask that you put those away
and not display them. If you keep displaying
them, we'll go back in the back and take a
break. And I will call security and ask them
to escort you out.

So if you cannot support that
with those signs, we greatly appreciate --
the people behind you would appreciate it
more than we would so that we don't have to
stop and they don't have to come back
tomorrow night to testify on subtitle C.
Okay. Everybody has seen them. Okay? We
all know where you are. So if you can put
those up, that would be good. Thank you for
being cooperative.

You may begin. You get five
minutes. He's representing an organization?
Okay.

MR. B. COHEN: Thank you. Good
evening, commissioners. My name is Brian
Cohen. I live at 3908 Benton Street in the
Glover Park neighborhood. I have lived in
the District of Columbia for over 20 years.
I am married to a District of Columbia
native. And my two children attend D.C.
public schools. I intend to stay here for a
long time.

In addition to those roles, I
also serve as the chair of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3B representing the communities of Glover Park and Cathedral Heights. And it's in that capacity that I urge you to approve the draft revisions to the zoning code.

ANC 3B has been monitoring the ongoing discussion of these revisions and has provided numerous opportunities for our constituents to learn about and comment on the proposed changes to the code.

We hosted a representative from the Office of Planning in a public meeting in December 2012. And then in February 2013, the five ANC 3B commissioners unanimously supported a resolution in support of the zoning rewrite. I have attached a copy of this resolution to my testimony.

Each ANC meeting was announced in advance. Each was heavily publicized. And each meeting provided ample opportunity for commissioners and the public to ask
questions, learn about the proposed changes, and provide input.

You will hear later today from one of my commissioners, who has revised her views on the ANC resolution, but I am here to tell you that the ANC position as a whole, memorialized in our February 2013 resolution, has not changed. We continue to support the rewrite.

The five-year process has allowed for ample community input and education. Representatives from the Office of Planning and Office of Zoning have visited communities, heard from residents, and addressed concerns. It's time to move forward to update the District's out-of-date zoning code.

In particular, I would like to take some time on the changes in parking minimums in the proposed code. Current parking minimums undermine market forces, increase housing costs, reduce incentives to
use mass transit, and damage a 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. 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 Avenue in Glover Park and Cathedral Heights, which is served by numerous bus lines. We support these proposed changes because they would be good for our communities. I want to provide you two examples of how the market is able to -- how it can or should be able to set parking minimums.

We have two new buildings going up in Glover Park. One is an 81-unit development. And the developers voluntarily
decided that they are going to build more than the minimum required parking. They believe that the market is there and it can sell. In this case, there is no need for the minimum.

There is another neighborhood long vacant in Glover Park where a developer has been trying to build an eight-unit development. This would be good for our community, eliminate an eyesore, and provide new residents to shop in our stores, walk our streets, and attend our schools. This developer was stymied for several months because the lot location simply would not allow the minimum required number of parking spaces.

There’s no reason why we should prevent this kind of development. The developer could easily develop it without the minimum required number of parking spaces, but he was unable to do so. This was finally resolved by an exemption, but this is an
example of how the minimum parking requirements inhibit development in our communities. There is no reason why we should prevent this kind of development. The developer could easily develop it without the minimum required number of parking spaces, but he was unable to do so. This was finally resolved by an exemption, but this is an example of how the minimum parking requirements inhibit development in our communities.

Commissioners, I want to very briefly bring to your attention -- it's in my written testimony -- our support for other changes in the zoning code with regard to accessory dwelling units and corner stores. Both would apply to Glover Park. Both would make our community a better place to live. I hope you will support those two.

I know that you are under heavy pressure to maintain the status quo and delay further. And I hope you will resist that
The proposed changes to the zoning code are not radical. They are long overdue modifications to an out-of-date 1950s 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 in the years ahead.

On behalf of ANC 3B, representing the communities of Glover Park and Cathedral Heights, I hope you will approve these changes in an expeditious fashion.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MS. TAYLOR: Good evening. My name is Susan Taylor. And I am President of the Cleveland Park Citizens Association. I am here to tell you about the association's concerns with the proposed changes to parking requirements in subtitle C.

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. D.C.'s neighborhoods have unique characteristics that dictate a need for different treatment. And I'll tell you some of Cleveland Park's.

First, we have an unusually steep hill just to the east and west of Connecticut Avenue that affects mobility. Second, a lack of on and off-street parking is already a serious problem in some of our areas. Third, Cleveland Park has an unusually high number of private schools mixed in with its residential areas. This high number of schools is the unique characteristic I wish to focus on tonight.

The abundance of neighborhood choices for education is a huge benefit for families living in Cleveland Park, but that benefit comes with a cost. And the cost is the traffic generated by these schools and the corresponding strain on parking.
Currently the zoning regulations' minimum parking requirements for educational institutions are calculated by a formula that includes numbers for teachers, staff, and student population as well as auditoriums and gymnasiums available for public assembly. Further, it divides educational institutions into four categories: college or other institutions of higher learning, elementary and junior high school, high school and accessory uses, pre-elementary and pre-kindergarten.

The proposed subtitle C 1901.5 has two categories: education, private; and education, public. Additionally, it proposes the following formulas for calculating required parking spaces for educational institutions: education, private, 1.25 per 1,000 square feet; education, public, .25 per 1,000 square feet. It eliminates the descriptive categories. And, more importantly, it changes the minimum parking
space formula from a population to a square footage calculation.

This ignores the real impact of a school's parking needs: the number of people arriving at the school each day. For example, I live two doors away from a private early childhood development center and pre-K school. These institutions are required to provide a minimum ratio of teachers to students, which is substantially higher than that of high schools or even elementary schools. The square footage of the school bears little resemblance to the number of people driving and parking at the school every day. This school enrolls children with special needs. This brings even more people to the school each day, including physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, mental health counselors, and private aides. Parents are extremely active with the school. And the campus visits are expected. There are several such
institutions in Cleveland Park. And the proposed new formula fails to recognize the different impact of this type of institution on a neighborhood's public parking availability.

This is but one example of how a school's population should be taken into account when determining the number of required parking spaces. Cleveland Park has 15 schools in its very small area. The impact of traffic and parking is substantial. The fact that the proposed parking policy is applied equally across the city fails to recognize the different circumstances in different neighborhoods. And we urge you to require best practices regarding parking policy and insist on separate analyses of and parking policy treatment for each of D.C.'s distinct neighborhoods.

I am certain you have also heard repeated testimony expressing concern that a blanket reduction and in some cases
elimination of minimum parking requirements is premature, particularly given the sorry state of Metro's performance, DDOT's failure to complete its yearlong study of parking pressures and recommendations, and a critical need to review and update residential parking policy. We concur and have adopted a resolution outlining a complete list of concerns last May, 2013. I have attached the resolution to my testimony.

Thank you for your consideration and attention.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. PENNY: Good evening. My name is Patricia Penny. I was born and raised in Washington, D.C. I live in Ward 5. I have been working for ONE DC, which is Organized Neighborhood Equity, since 1998.

I am here tonight because what ONE DC do, we organize around low-income working poor residents who demand to be
included in the new D.C. ONE DC organized to ensure that the new housing development proposed for the parcel located at 7th and R Street have affordable units for households making less than $50,000 a year. ONE DC also call for units that were affordable for households making or earning less than $25,000 a year. We target this income group because we saw a new development in affordable targeting household making 60 percent of the AMI, currently about $100,000 a year for a household of 4.

ONE DC has tried to change the definition of affordable before the D.C. Council in 2009. And we are still trying to do that. We are the only organization in D.C. targeting the low-income units for the AMI.

As you can see, Commissioner, the new affordable housing actually applies to the upper class and not to the lower class. We have been fighting this battle with the
AMI for several years.

And, also, the average income for the African American and Washingtonians in Washington, D.C. is only $35,000 a year.

We need a clear definition of affordability for the AMI to meet the income of African Americans and working poor in Washington, D.C. They're being misplaced and being priced out of the city. It's time for change. And we demand change for the AMI in the Washington, D.C. area.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MS. MARTIN: Hi. My name is Hannah Martin. I live in the Petworth neighborhood, at 5122 New Hampshire. And I am actually not here to talk about car parking. I am here to talk about bicycle parking. I am one of my few friends who bikes around. My significant other does as well. We have four bicycles and one car in
our apartment.

And it's almost laughable when you try to go places and find bicycle parking. I know people who drive cars talk about having to walk around and look for spaces, but I frequently lock my bike to park meters or to signs telling me when you can park a car, even though I haven't driven my car there. So it would be really nice to see additional bike parking. So I do support the increases in required bike parking that are in the proposed rules.

And I also appreciate the stipulation that places that go over 1.5 times the minimum of car parking spaces are required to have additional bike parking as well.

I try to convince my friends to bike. I have friends who drive two miles to work from a house in the District to an office in the District because parking is free at his work and cheap in the street.
And so it is really hard for me to convince him to start biking and to reduce the congestion in D.C. when he can't even find a bike rack outside his office and he got his bike stolen from the street from where he lives.

People lock them to signs all the time. I see poor bicycles that couldn't be properly locked. I go to yoga, and I have to lock it to a railing. It's just absurd how few bike parking spaces there are. So I'm really glad to see that you have increased the minimums.

And, even for some of the table -- I think it's 2004, section C -- some of those even look a little low to me. I was calculating. For any of you who have been to Trader Joe's over in GW area, based on that metric, it would only require them to have like six or seven bike parking spaces, but I think there were about 60 bikes there one time when I went. They have chosen to put in
additional parking, but a lot of places haven't. And it's crazy. You know, you are going to be walking with your grocery bags to your bike. How far are you going to walk?

So I think it would really encourage people. If we want people to continue to go car-free or have fewer cars per household, we need to make it convenient for them to actually lock up their bike within view of where they are going because I know I certainly don't want to ride a less-than-quality bike around, and I don't want to park a quality bike where I can't see it. So, if anything, I would support more bike parking requirements, especially for retail.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. RYBECK: Good evening. My name is Rick Rybeck. I am the Director of Just Economics, a firm that advises communities about creating incentives for job
creation, affordable housing, transportation efficiency, and sustainable development. I wish to lend my support tonight to the zoning update in general and to provisions related to inclusionary zoning and reducing parking requirements in particular.

With regard to inclusionary zoning, I commend the Commission for creating this program. The program has had some challenges, both in terms of administrative issues and the recession, but these challenges are being addressed and overcome.

According to officials at the Department of Housing and Community Development, some of the first units built under this program are now being delivered. And there are about 1,000 units in the pipeline.

Inclusionary zoning is built on a sound policy framework. Public subsidies are used to create permanently affordable rental or homeownership housing opportunities, in
both condo buildings and single family homes, using a shared equity approach. Shared equity allows for wealth creation for individual homeowners while sustaining affordability for subsequent owners of the same home. This shared equity model has been the basis for successful programs around the country with years of experience in providing long-term affordable homeownership.

On October 31st, just a few weeks ago, the Metropolitan Council of Governments hosted a workshop on shared equity homeownership to facilitate increased utilization of this approach for affordable housing in the region.

As you know, real estate prices have reached or exceeded their pre-recession levels and are heading up. There is a danger that people of low and even moderate income are going to be priced out of the District. Inclusionary zoning will not solve this problem, but it certain can help establish a
stock of affordable housing that will remain affordable into the future. Thank you again for establishing this affordable housing program in D.C.

With regard to parking, the automobile is an amazing invention that greatly enhances personal mobility. However, automobiles require an enormous amount of space, both when they are moving and when they are parked.

Requirements for parking at employment, retail, entertainment, educational, and residential developments provide each car with multiple dedicated parking spaces, even though only one can be utilized at any one time. Based on minimum parking regulations, it would appear that we are more concerned with preventing homelessness for cars than for people.

While mobility is an important capability, cities thrive not on mobility but on accessibility. Accessibility relates to a
parcel's proximity to desirable places to live, work, shop, learn, and play. And that is a key factor in determining the location of the value of land.

As I mentioned, parking requires a lot of space. And the space devoted to parking reduces the proximity of urban destinations and activities, thereby reducing the accessibility that makes urban areas attractive and valuable in the first place.

While a typical parking space individually only takes up 144 to 200 square feet, when you add lanes for travel and turning, that space requirement balloons to more like 300 to 350 square feet per space. And that's about half the size of an efficiency apartment for a human being.

Parking lots exacerbate the heat island and storm water runoff effects, as has been mentioned by others. And in areas where there are high demands for residential and commercial space, such as in Washington,
D.C., urban parking requirements deprive some people of the opportunity for living, working, or shopping in prime locations, pushing development into outlying areas.

The costs for parking spaces can approach $5,000 for surface lots, 15 to 20 thousand for structured lots. And in D.C., we regularly hear people talk about 40 to 50 thousand dollars per space for underground parking spaces. And while we focus on these construction costs, which are important, we often ignore the operating and maintenance costs, which need to be factored in as well. And I have listed those in my testimony.

According to the Victoria Transport Institute, these costs can approach $300 per space per year unless, of course, you have a cashier, in which case that cost goes up to up to $500 per space per year.

Parking requirements increase the cost of housing on average between 12 and a half and 25 percent depending on the
requirement, depending on the type of housing. When parking spaces are required, their costs are included in the cost of residential units and in the cost of goods and services sold at that location. In many instances, some of these costs are paid by households or customers who do not own or use cars. Thus, walkers, cyclists, and transit users end up subsidizing the driving of others. This is --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much. I'm going to have to cut you off. Thank you very much. I know they didn't do that over at NCPC. I can find out in a few minutes. But over here because we have so many people --

MR. RYBECK: Sure. I understand.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We want to finish. So I appreciate that.

MR. RYBECK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have your testimony.
MR. RYBECK: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just acknowledge that we have been joined by our colleagues Commissioner Miller and Commissioner May, who had a long day and I know Commissioner Miller especially, BZA, NCPC, and now with us. Welcome, Commissioner May. Pass some of that down this way. But, anyway, and also Director Tregoning from the Office of Planning. Did I miss anyone who joined us lately? And also those in the audience who were at the National Capital Planning Commission's hearing today. So welcome.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner May and I will be reviewing the hour and whatever minute-plus that we missed.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Great. Okay. Let's see if we have -- first of all, let me thank each and every one of you for your testimony, very helpful. And we
appreciate you providing us testimony. Let's see if we have any questions. Any questions, Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Hughes, your trees?

MS. HUGHES: Yes?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I wonder if you could expand a little bit more about the two changes that you are talking about. I know you were talking about the height of maturity. And somehow I think you were saying that the way the language is now, OP is giving bonus for a tree that when it's fully mature isn't that substantial, even though we maybe planted at a bigger size originally.

MS. HUGHES: Right. So let's say you have two trees, right? The way the GAR is written currently, if you plant a tree, that is six inches in caliper, right, you get more credit than if you plant a tree that is
two inches in caliper. It doesn't matter what kind of tree it is. It just matters the size of the tree.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Just the caliper?

MS. HUGHES: Just the caliper of the tree. So we're saying, hey, if one of those trees is an oak, why does it matter what size you plant it at because it is still going to be an oak? However, if one of those trees is an oak and the other tree is an apple tree, which one should you give more credit for? Well, you should give more credit for the oak tree, but if you plant a six-inch apple tree, you will get more credit than you will if you plant a two-inch oak tree. And that doesn't make any sense.

And it's particularly confusing because the GAR is supposed to be based on the Seattle's Green Factor, which does rate trees at the size of maturity. It is also confusing because the GAR gives -- if you
plant a larger shrub, you get more credit than if you plant a smaller shrub. So why wouldn't you get more credit for a larger tree at maturity than you would for a smaller tree at maturity?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. And you were also mentioning that you think the six-inch caliper should be reduced to a five-inch caliper?

MS. HUGHES: No. I think that the six-inch caliper shouldn't even be a consideration. It should all be based on the size of maturity. So we think that you should have 2 categories: tree canopy for all new trees 40 feet or less at maturity calculated at 50 square feet per tree. And the other category would be tree canopy for all new trees greater than 40 feet at maturity calculated at 250 square feet per tree.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And not concern ourselves with the caliper?
MS. HUGHES: You don't want to concern yourself with the caliper because there are several things wrong with it, the first being the size of maturity issue. The other is that a tree survivability is compromised if you plant it at a larger size. It is kind of counterintuitive, which is why I didn't mention it when I was first trying to explain the flaw.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

MS. HUGHES: So if you got a balled and burlapped tree that was two inches, it would take two years for the tree's roots to regrow.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

MS. HUGHES: But if you got that same tree at six inches, it would take maybe seven years for the tree's roots to start to establish. So your smaller tree could end up growing faster because it starts its growth at a sooner time than the tree at a larger size. So, even if you could find a six-inch
caliper tree, it would still be the same size for several years before it started to regenerate its roots and start to grow.

So the International Society of Arboriculture doesn't recommend planting a tree that is over five inches at all. And so I am an arborist, and that is the society of arborists who look at these scientific issues as it relates to trees.

And so the GAR is recommending practices that scientists believe are not smart.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Well, thank you for clarifying that. I appreciate it.

Ms. Taylor, I think we have heard some comments similar to what you are talking about a week ago. And I think OP is aware of that. But we will bring it up again when we ask our questions of them.

MS. TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So thank
you again for your comments, and thank all of
you for your comments.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And, Ms.
Martin, you can always let the air out of
someone's tire.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You
didn't hear that here, though. I will deny
that.

MS. MARTIN: That doesn't let me
take their space, though. That just means
that --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

MS. MARTIN: -- there is a
bicycle with a popped tire.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any other
questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Again, we
want to thank this panel. We appreciate you
coming down and providing testimony.

Let's take a break, five-minute
break.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 7:29 p.m. and went back on the record at 7:35 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We would like to go back on the record. I think we are all straight. We are going to call a few names. I think it's Jalal Greene, Richard Layman, Renee Bowser, Lindsley Williams, Holly Chase, Sara Green, Sonia Conly, Brenna Barber, Delores Bushong. Okay. I'll keep moving. I don't think I have -- Scott Hall. Let me see. One more person. Oh, okay. Okay. Sarah Scruggs. Okay. I think we have eight. We're going to start to my left, your right. Mr. Greene, if you could begin? Make sure your light is lit up.

MR. GREENE: Thank you.

Good evening. And thank you for the opportunity to present my testimony tonight. My name is Jay Greene. I am a
resident of Ward 5. I have been involved in building and financing of affordable housing for the past 15 years in the region. I am a former Director of Housing and Community Development in both D.C. and Prince George's County. I have worked for a national not-for-profit developer of affordable housing focusing on development of affordable housing in the Mid-Atlantic region. I have worked for private developers whose mission was the development and financing of affordable housing in D.C. And I am currently the Chief of Housing Division for the Department of Housing and Community Affairs in Montgomery County. I am here tonight to support reducing parking requirements for the development of affordable housing.

Various studies show a strong correlation between household income and vehicle ownership. Residents with lower incomes, enabling them to qualify for affordable housing, typically have lower
automobile ownership rates than the population at large and, therefore, have less need for parking.

If the affordable housing is located near public transportation or in walking distance of a commercial center, that will further reduce the demand for parking. It is becoming increasingly more effective to locate affordable housing near mass transportation in order to reduce both housing and transportation costs to lower-income families.

Parking is an expensive component to affordable housing projects. For surface parking, the cost can range from two to five thousand dollars per space. For one level of underground parking, the range can be 25,000 to 40,000 dollars. And for a second level of underground parking, the cost can be $45,000 or greater.

At a time when our community is struggling to meet the demand for affordable
housing, minimum parking requirements that do not reflect actual need can increase the cost for housing and be a determining factor in making affordable housing projects infeasible because of the amount of GAAP financing required. And that is low-income interest rates from local government is just too great.

As an example, I am currently working on an affordable housing project within four blocks of a Metro station. The project is for 149 units of housing, of which 139 units are affordable housing, including 15 units affordable to people at 30 percent of varying median incomes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. All right. Yes, we do have it.

Next?

MS. CONLY: My name is Sonia Conly. I have been a resident of Capitol Hill. My husband and I have been a resident
of Capitol Hill for nearly 40 years. I am here to express our support of the compromised requirement reducing the minimum parking requirements in new multi-unit buildings in transit-rich neighborhoods by 50 percent.

The District has a major competitive advantage in its already rich transportation options. Reducing parking requirements will stimulate further innovative transportation options and potentially reduce housing costs for those who choose to go car ownership-free.

Although we believe that the market will, at least in the near future, typically provide parking above the minimum requirements, the proposal will allow developers to provide innovative options. We believe that the proposal will enable additional current and future residents to take advantage of auto ownership-free life and, thus, spend their consumption dollars on
other residential or non-residential goods
and services.

    My husband and I anticipate that
when we decide to move from our rowhouse to
an apartment, we will not own a vehicle.
Thus, we would prefer not to subsidize
parking spaces for other residents.

    The growth of alternatives to own
car transportation will be critical to our
ability to access the community. We believe
that density is key to more efficient
transportation options and also to the
necessary growth of this city. Providing
city services to the entire population and
special housing, medical, and other services
to the many low-income residents of this city
requires additional revenue. Additional
revenue requires additional population as the
city tax rates are already higher than
neighboring jurisdictions.

    Thank you for your time.

    CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank
Next?

MS. BUSHONG: Good evening. My name is Delores Bushong. I live at 2030 Hamlin Street, Northeast. I am here this evening to discuss concerns I have about the proposed Green Area Ratio, GAR.

First, I want to commend the Zoning Commission for including regulations that will contribute to a green D.C. as development increases in the city. However, I am concerned that the regulations as written do not give enough weight to the planting of large canopy trees. As proposed, trees are given a GAR score based on their size at planting, not their size at maturity. Thus, a dogwood, which reaches a mature height of about 30 feet, would receive the same score as a white oak, which reaches a height of over 150 feet at maturity.

I am also concerned that green roofs are given equal value to large-diameter
trees in the proposed regulations. Note that an intensively vegetative roof would earn a multiplier of .8, the same as an existing 24-inch or greater in diameter tree. Green roofs certainly do aid in storm water management, improve air quality, mitigate temperature, thus providing cooling and heating savings to the owner, but they do not provide some of the important aspects that trees do.

When I am walking down the street, I can't see the plants on the roof. I can't walk in the shade the tree would provide. I can't hear and see the birds that the trees provide home to.

One of the purposes of GAR according to the regulations is to "promote attractive and functional landscapes." Trees can provide that. Green roofs are functional, but, as attractive as they may be, they cannot be viewed by those of us at the street level. The pedestrian experience
needs to be considered.

If we want developers to plant large canopy trees, then we must provide the incentive of a larger value on the GAR scorecard for planting them.

I have always appreciated the large canopy trees in the neighborhoods where I have lived. As a resident of D.C. for over 40 years, I have seen many of these older trees die. We must protect those that we have and encourage builders to plant more. Revising the GAR scoring to give greater value to planting large canopy trees will provide that incentive. Large canopy trees not only make the city more beautiful. They will substantially improve our air quality, act as air conditioners for our hot city, and reduce storm water runoff.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. SCRUGGS: Good evening. And
thank you for this opportunity to testify and the many hours you spend serving residents in this city.

My name is Sarah Scruggs, and I am the Director of Advocacy and Outreach at Manna, Incorporated. I would like to speak tonight about the ownership side of inclusionary zoning regulations, which are similar to affordable dwelling units with long-term resale restrictions that have been integrated into market-rate condo buildings all over the city.

I am not speaking about the rental side. Manna supports including affordable rental units in market-rate condo buildings and believe rental units can and should target even lower income levels than they do now. The ownership side could serve more residents and lower-income families but only after certain regulatory and administrative issues are addressed.

Since the Zoning Commission
oversees issues regarding inclusionary zoning, I think you need to understand the economics involved in mixing a smaller percentage of affordable units into a market-rate building need to be taken seriously.

D.C., along with other high-priced markets across the United States, had some serious regulatory/administrative issues that need to be addressed. And D.C. should look to changes that other cities, with longer-running inclusionary housing programs, have made and continue to grapple with.

I will speak about the findings of a study that Manna did on inclusionary housing programs in comparable cities, like Boston, San Francisco, and San Jose. I will also submit the study along with my testimony. And I hope the Commission will take seriously the findings and the experiences of owners here and elsewhere.

Rising condo fees threaten to and have economically forced out affordable
owners living in market-rate buildings. Boston covered fees in one building for a short period of time. And San Francisco is grappling with how to help owners facing fee hikes. These issues are also being faced by surrounding jurisdictions, like Montgomery County.

Currently condo fees are the only uncapped housing expense for affordable buyers. If we want to continue to integrate affordable units into market-rate condo buildings, then the District needs to cap or somehow reduce the potential increase of condominium fees and include this information in all condo documents.

In the interest of creating larger units for families in economically viable living situations, we believe the District should keep in mind boosting up a robust in lieu fee system for off-site construction. With on-site development, unit sizes are determined by the makeup of market-
rate units in a given development and are typically studios, one-bedrooms, and a fewer number of two-bedroom units. If the District wants to provide longer-term ownership opportunities for families or individuals and couples planning to have children, then it should consider available avenues to build larger units.

Finally, the economics and administration of long-term or permanently restricted ownership units need to be evaluated. Other jurisdictions are spending a lot of money buying back units that affordable owners cannot find a buyer for or are allowing owners to sell at the market after a period of time.

During the resale-restricted period, if an affordable owner is unable to find a buyer in their income category after taking off realtor and closing costs, if they are able to find a buyer, the owner usually leaves the sale without enough to purchase
elsewhere. This is especially the case for
owners who have already used a home purchase
assistance loan in the District.

Especially with smaller units, we
are setting up a system where affordable
owners are funneled back into an affordable
rental or out of the District entirely. San
Jose's subsidy recapture program ensures both
a future funding source for its affordable
housing programs as well as the ability for
affordable owners to have access to the
appreciation of their homes and more easily
move into the open market if they need to
sell at some point.

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.

Thank you.
(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MS. CHASE: My name is Holly Chase. I live in Ward 3. I'd like to testify in support of the proposed zoning code update, specifically the reduction in minimum parking requirements.

Reducing parking minimums is very important to me, both professionally and personally. I am a transportation planner as well as one of the many D.C. households that do not own a car. Biking is my primary form of transportation, in addition to walking, transit, and occasionally car share.

I value the amenity of living in a neighborhood where car ownership is unnecessary for my day-to-day. In fact, I work in Maryland, but I choose to live in D.C. and reverse-commute by bike exactly because this is so important to me.

Although I would prefer to see
all parking minimums removed, the zoning code update as proposed is a critical step in the right direction. It will support sustainable active transportation options. In contrast, mandating arbitrary amounts of off-street parking in excess of market demand incentivizes driving.

The oversupply of parking influences travel behavior over time, leading to congestion, pollution, and streetscapes that are hostile to anyone not insulated by a car.

Not updating the zoning code is in direct conflict with D.C.'s goal to achieve a more balanced mode share of 75 percent non-auto commute trips.

Although I am a relatively new D.C. resident, I care about the future of the District. And I hope to become a homeowner here in the future. However, that opportunity will only become more difficult for me and for many others if D.C. continues
to bundle the cost of housing with the cost of constructing and maintaining parking spaces. Reducing parking minimums is one way to help keep D.C. affordable and inclusive for residents spanning the age and economic spectrum.

I feel very strongly that abundant free off-street parking is an outdated and unsustainable expectation. Reducing parking minimums will offer D.C. residents more, not less, transportation choice.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MR. HALL: Hello. My name is Scott Hall. I am the General Manager of Zipcar for the greater Washington, D.C. area. And I want to thank the commissioners for what I know is a very passionate topic for everyone here and at all the hearings.

I am here to speak in support of
the proposed zoning updates to reduce the parking minimums. To give you a sense of how
we sit on this issue, Zipcar is currently one of the largest private lessors of parking spaces in the greater Washington, D.C. area with close to 1,000 spaces under lease at any time. So from a purely economic issue, by reducing the parking minimums, we're, in effect, increasing our own fixed costs. We recognize that it is a better way of life in the District and it is the right way to go.

We currently negotiate with a variety of private and public entities as well as speak to a number of advisory neighborhood commissions for on-street locations. And we see the passion from the citizens as well as from the local government entities regarding parking minimums.

As parking has been reduced, we have seen our own impact as well, too. So lots where we formerly were able to serve our members better disappeared. Again, we still
stand in support of the reduced parking minimums.

More than 25 percent of our members own one or more vehicles. So we recognize there is a percentage of our membership that still takes advantage and utilizes vehicles on a somewhat regular or regular basis. Again, we still stand in support of the reduced minimums. We're very sensitive to these parking limitations.

We understand that to people, losing parking is a way of giving up their security. And they're using alternate forms of transit, whether it be biking, walking, using a bus, or all sorts of other different ways of getting around. It is a form of trust, whether it is car sharing, bike sharing. That is what people have to feel comfortable doing. So when one of our largest expenses is parking as an organization and we're saying it's worth it to reduce those minimums, it's a faith that
we have in the public to endorse and continue
to use those alternate forms of
transportation.

And when they do take the plunge,
when our residential partners tell us that
the reason that their residents select where
they are is because of the transportation
alternatives, this is what we find: 61
percent of our members had postponed a
vehicle purchase because of their
transportation alternatives; 71 percent of
members make more multipurpose trips as a
result of multi-transit options; and,
finally, 23 percent of our entire membership
was able to sell their vehicle as a result of
having other transportation options. These
are very powerful statistics that speak to
the need for a more sustainable transit
alternative set in the community.

So I would like to thank the
Zoning Commission for their time. Thank you
for having me here tonight.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. BOWSER: Good evening, commissioners and Chair Hood. I thank you for holding these hearings and hope that you will hold additional hearings so as to provide thorough consideration of the many issues raised by the proposed rewrite.

My name is Renee Bowser. And I am ANC 4D's vice chair and commissioner of ANC 4D02. I am testifying this evening on behalf of ANC 4D in support of our resolution urging the Zoning Commission to adopt regulations now to allow D.C.'s real low and moderate-income population to rent and own units in new or substantially rehabilitated multi-unit housing under the inclusionary zoning law.

I am also testifying in support of ANC 4D's resolution urging retention of parking minimums for multi-unit housing bordering fully residential blocks in our...
neighborhoods.

D.C.'s severe poverty rate goes hand in hand with the acute housing crisis our city's poor and moderate-income residents suffer. In 2012, according to D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute, over 18 percent of D.C. residents lived below the poverty line. And one in four D.C.'s children lived below the poverty line. In 2012, according to the Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless, a worker earning a minimum wage of $8.25 per hour would have to work 132 hours all 52 weeks of the year to afford a 2-bedroom apartment at fair market rent, which would be $1,412 per month.

There is a severe homelessness crisis. And according to the 2013 report by National Low-Income Coalition, D.C. is the least affordable housing jurisdiction when compared to other states. D.C.'s inclusionary zoning law was developed to help address this existing crisis. Ironically,
D.C.'s law does not help residents most in need of affordable housing. That is because D.C. currently defines low and moderate-income households by considering incomes of far wealthier suburban jurisdictions whose residents don't even live in D.C. and provides inclusionary zoning units for families that earn 50 percent to 80 percent of median income of the metropolitan area.

ANC 4D urges the Zoning Commission to adopt now realistic definitions of low and moderate-income households that are based solely on the median income of D.C. residents, which is just 66,000, although, unfortunately, it is rising very fast. The definition of low-income households should be zero to 30 percent of D.C.'s median income and that of moderate-income households should be 30 to 50 percent of D.C.'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 to 20 percent of
affordable units.

ANC 4D also opposes a reduction
in the 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 are required to construct.

The proposed change I believe is
shortsighted, our commission believes, for,
as the City of Portland, Oregon found,
residents who move into multi-unit housing
own cars at the same rate as residents in
other housing. Therefore, residents of
multi-unit buildings without parking will
compete with existing residents in the
bordering blocks, including those residents,
housemates, friends, and relatives who visit
them for the same limited number of spaces.

Additionally, the proposed change
ignores the fact that residents' transportation needs change as their families and work conditions change. At various stages, families may need to transport children and/or seniors in their care, accommodate nontraditional hours of work. And such activities likely require use of cars.

For example, now that many children in D.C. cannot attend neighborhood public schools, residents must transport their children out of their neighborhoods to schools at greater distances. It is not feasible to regularly transport young children by car sharing or biking.

Further, the Office of Planning has proposed buy right accessory dwelling units, which will only increase the density and competition for limited parking.

At the January 2013 meeting of the Office of Planning in Ward 4, where I live, at Takoma School, residents near Silver...
Spring, D.C. residents near the Silver Spring line, told Ms. Tregoning of their experience of having Silver Spring residents who live in nearby apartments with no parking spaces park on residential streets in D.C. neighborhoods.

I urge the Commission to consider these practical impacts of this proposed zoning change and not merely focus on the attractive slogan of a "walkable city." Low and moderate-income people are carless but not by choice. If they could afford cars, they would have cars and have greater flexibility for school, work, --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank you.

MS. BOWSER: -- and other community issues.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say a lot of people are clapping. I know, you
know, you were at another hearing, but I read
a statement about no demonstrations in the
hearing. I read all of that earlier. So
let's do like we did over at NCPC because I
watched it. It went very well. So let's do
like we did over there, at least from what I
saw streaming, with the exception of one
mistake.

But, anyway, next?

MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening, Mr.
Hood, members of the Commission. My name is
Lindsley Williams. And I am appearing here	onight as a substitute witness for Parking
Development Solutions, a group that's
organized with Fred Gorove, Stylianos
Christofides, and Marc Slavin, who have
already contributed to this process at the
definition tonight.

The point of our being here
tonight is to simply ask that we focus a
little bit on the provisions of subtitle C at
1911.4 and 1912.2. Both of those are
citations to the proposed regulations where the term "mechanized parking" is used. To us, "mechanized parking" is a term that is now outdated. And we're suggesting that the term "automated parking" substitute for it but not just for semantic reasons but because it's a really whole different system.

And you may remember, members of the Commission, the picture that Mr. Gorove showed you the other day of -- and it's in the record -- of the warehouse-like situation, which is basically what automated parking is. You can think of automated parking -- this is for the benefit of the audience at least -- as filing cabinets on steroids. Then you have very large corridors and systems that exist to pick put the car and put it into a module of one sort or another. And it works out so that it can take a larger number of cars in a smaller volume and area of space. It saves money. It provides economic benefits. It provides
environmental benefits and so on and so forth.

So the point here is to make some slight adjustments to the terminology and also to ask you to look at another part of the submission that we made earlier, which has to do with the way in which we count the space in gross floor area. That gets really into the geeky side of zoning. I apologize for that, but there are things in the regulation about GFA, about excluding ramps leading to a parking garage. But it doesn't really quite pick up the nuance on how it needs to be reworked to deal with the automated portions of garages. I don't want to take you through our suggestions, but I would like to have an opening to talk with OP about this some more so that they can provide final recommendations to you that will we think best implement this.

The second thing we wanted to do this evening is to ask, in the event that you
determine that there needs to be further study, whatever that means, for the parking provisions, we would like to take this, which we believe has been in the plan all along. There has been no testimony that we know of against it. And if the parking side is going to be delayed for any extraordinary period of time, we would like to have an opening to request that it go into the current body of regulations so that the benefits can begin to flow to the entire city for this option, which people need to know about in the development process at the beginning.

When you're designing a building, basements sort of are the bottom of the building. And the shape of basements, columns, and all that kind of stuff varies if you're going to take conventional spaces with ramps and aisles or whether you have something that can work its way around other parts, such as the automated systems can. You need to know this. You don't want to
come in and ask the BZA for a variance just
on this and then decide. It will just stop
it.

So we would like to see this go
in to go forward as soon as possible,
possibly through an amendment to the current
regulations, but we welcome it in ZRR. And
congratulations for getting this far in the
overall ZRR process.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. We
really appreciate everyone's testimony, some
very good points.

Let me see if we have any
questions. Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

Ms. Scruggs, you referred to a
particular study that you have done that you
will be submitting as part of your testimony.
But obviously we're looking for best
practices on shared equity. There's been a
lot of studies in the industry. And I just
would hope that you would spend just a couple
of minutes telling us what is the best way of
acknowledging homeownership but without
giving undue rewards for people who have been
subsidized and fortunate enough to have
gotten that help in purchasing a unit or a
home.

MS. SCRUGGS: I think shared
equity is a particularly difficult model in
high-priced markets, like D.C., and in high-
priced areas, like the Northwest part of
D.C., as well. And that is what I found in
looking at different cities, like Boston, San
Francisco, and San Jose, some of those issues
that they were dealing with.

So as far as providing people a
benefit but not allowing them to take too
much from the subsidy and flip properties and
lose units, again, I do think that San Jose
has a very interesting model. It's less
administratively difficult to put into
action. So basically what it does is it looks at the unit, what it was worth on the market when someone actually purchased it. And you place a lien on that deed. So the difference between what the unit is sold for to the owner and what it was worth on the market, that is recorded as a lien on the property. Whenever it is sold in the future, that lien will be paid back to the city for -- in some areas, they use it for increased home purchase assistance so that people are more competitive on the market in higher-priced parts of the city or for more production.

The owner has access to any equity appreciation. So they're put on an equal footing with their market-rate neighbors. But that lien, that subsidy, which sometimes the District didn't even put in to begin with, it's just that funny money that exists between a contract sales price and what it was worth on the market, that
would come back to the city. And it could be used in a variety of ways.

So I think that in high-priced markets, this is particularly something that should be considered, just because of the economics that are at play here.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

What about condo fees?

MS. SCRUGGS: This is a really difficult one. And a lot of jurisdictions are grappling with what to do. San Francisco has been looking into dipping into their housing fund in order to provide people loans to pay for special assessments and fees, but how would people then pay back that money? And they're not sure how they would underwrite it either.

So if you want to, you would have to cap the increases. And it would have to be in the originating condo documents that every market rate and affordable owner would sign and agree to. So that would actually
create a subsidizing by the market rate
owners for the affordable owners.

Massachusetts tried to institute
statewide. They looked at legislation. It
was referred to a committee and then referred
favorably back to the legislature in the
beginning of 2012 but didn't go anywhere
after that.

I do know that New York has
looked at something similar, but it's an
issue that hasn't been dealt with by a lot of
different areas.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

MS. SCRUGGS: You're welcome.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I have a
question for Ms. Bowser. You have heard a
lot of testimony tonight and in former nights
about the cost of parking and how that
actually impacts on affordability. It really
adds to the cost of housing. Yet, you
believe otherwise. Can you reconcile
your -- you know, can you give me a little
bit more information as to how you came up
with your position because it's confusing to
me?

MS. BOWSER: I did not say
parking has no impact on affordability. I
did not say that or imply that. But what I
did say was that in existing neighborhoods,
particularly -- there is a development going
up on Georgia Avenue in Ward 4. And it's
bordering fully residential neighborhoods.
And to say that we're going to have a livable
and walkable city doesn't really recognize
the practical impacts of people who already
live in the neighborhood and people who come
to the neighborhood in the multi-unit
building with their own cars because also
having a car, having ability to bike or to
use car sharing, that is not something that a
parent that has to take a child to school
across the city is going to be using. First
of all, to do car sharing on a five-day basis
is expensive. That person would rather, that
family would rather, get a used car that was reliable.

So our zoning regs have to recognize that at different points in time and that people at different incomes have different needs. People who make 20, 30, and 40 thousand dollars would love to have a car so that they could do their shopping all at once and then take their child to school.

The notion that -- for example, just me. I go to meetings. I am an ANC commissioner. I go to do other things. I am a member of other organizations, such as Empower D.C. The notion that I am going to go to two or three meetings in a night and go on public transportation and get home at 10:00 o'clock doesn't make sense. Even if I were 26, I wouldn't do it that way. So it has to be the parking minimums have to recognize everybody.

And I think what we need to do with regard to affordable housing, there are
so many ways that this District of Columbia could increase the affordable housing, really put a dent in affordable housing, truly affordable housing, for low and moderate-income people, starting with changing the definition, but there are so many other issues in building affordable housing. I am not denying that parking, to build parking, makes a dent on it, but I don't know that --

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Well, I appreciate your explaining it. Just for, you know, your information and other people, the issue of using a metropolitan statistical area for housing income levels, it's a federal issue. And it does discriminate against inner cities overall. I don't think it's the District of Columbia that wouldn't change it. It's really HUD directing subsidy programs and trying to keep it as a nationwide-consistent program.

So I really don't argue with you. I understand what you are saying completely.
But I just didn't want you to think it's the District that solely can change it. It really is a federal issue. And it does discriminate against inner cities.

MS. BOWSER: But may I say that in that case, we really should -- that's even more important to really reduce the 50 percent and 80 percent because that is giving a subsidized apartment or a condo to someone who makes $80,000. Why not give some subsidies to a working-class person that really needs it, someone that makes -- for example, as I said, at the minimum wage --

VICE CHAIR COHEN: For purposes of time --

MS. BOWSER: Yes. I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: -- I don't disagree with you.

MS. BOWSER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other comments?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say, Ms. Bowser, I appreciate your testimony because that is a live situation. And that's what we grapple with.

I've heard a lot of the other way, but, you know, parking, coming over in the other neighborhoods, I mean, that's real. And we've got to find the upper bound. So I appreciate your testimony.

MS. BOWSER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Actually, I appreciate everyone's testimony. You bring a lot to us, and we appreciate it. Thank you.


MR. BOCKH: You got it right.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I got it right? I did one thing right today. Okay. Leslie
Steen, Larry Werner, Graham Jenkins, Samone Hoston, Gene Batiste, David Edmondson, Chip Glasgow. Did I call more than eight? One more. Joe Wisniewski. Okay. Samone Hoston, her name is here twice. We've got her. David Avitabile, I know you're here. Okay. We're going to start with you, Ms. Brenna, to my left.

MS. BARBER: Okey-doke. Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here tonight.

My name is Brenna Barber. I live and work on Capitol Hill. I am here tonight to let you all know that I strongly support easing off-street parking minimum requirements in the area with good transit and allowing accessory dwelling units and more corner stores.

When I first graduated from college and I was determining where to go, I chose to come to D.C., in part, because it's a vibrant walkable city and I knew it would
be very easy to live without a car.

I have lived in D.C. for five years now. And I absolutely love living here, in no small part, because of its dense walkable neighborhoods, many of which have the added benefit of being beautiful and historic.

For transportation, I commute by bike. I am a 15-minute walk to Union Station. I walk a lot. I regularly use the many different bus lines that service Capitol Hill and H Street: the X2, the 90s, and the D6.

My girlfriend and I live together. And she owns a car that I sometimes use as well. I say that because I would describe myself not as car-free but as car-light. I say this because sometimes of greater density and fewer parking minimums are portrayed as people who hate cars, who want to get rid of all of them, or just want to make life hard for car owners. And I want
to be clear that those aren't my views.

I am here tonight largely because
I want to express my support for the current
proposed updates to D.C.'s zoning code, which
are sorely overdue. I would like to see
parking minimums eased because they end up
requiring more parking than people need and
raise the cost of housing. Additionally,
parking minimums often damage the historic
and walkable form of many District
neighborhoods.

I really love living in D.C., but
I am negatively affected by the high cost of
housing. And I am worried that over the long
term, I may never be able to afford to buy a
house in a walkable transit-connected part of
the District.

I think we need more walkable,
vibrant neighborhoods, not fewer. Easing
parking requirements in certain areas will
help achieve those goals. My support for
affordable housing is also why I strongly
support accessory and dwelling units and allowing homeowners to create an ADU without undergoing a long and burdensome process. I am someone who would happily rent a carriage house or a renovated garage.

I also want to express my support for local corner stores in residential areas. I regularly patronize my local corner stores and find the ability to walk or bike just a few blocks to a neighborhood store enriches my quality of life and the social fabric of my neighborhood.

In sum, I strongly support the current proposed updates to D.C.'s zoning code that ease off-street parking minimum requirements in certain areas, allow accessory dwelling units and more corner stores.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MR. BLANCHARD: Good evening,
commissioners. My name is Lyle Blanchard of the law firm of Greenstein, DeLorme and Luchs. I am a Ward 4 resident. And I am testifying this evening on behalf of the D.C. Building Industry Association on subtitle C.

DCBIA is generally in support of subtitle C of the new zoning regulations as set forth in case 08-06C and generally supports the parking and loading requirements and revisions that have been made to these standards. We specifically support the following concepts, which are allowing the shared parking between different uses, allowing parking to be located off site, elimination of the minimum parking requirements within the downtown zones, updated compact parking standards, and the Metro and streetcar proximity requirements.

We suggest further consideration be given to the following concepts: reconsidering the elimination of parking minimums near transit zones. We appreciate
what OP has done as far as the 50 percent reduction, but we still are very much enamored with the elimination near the transit zones and suggest that that might be tried on a trial basis for 5 years, at which time the impacts could be reevaluated and refined; studying further the transportation demand management features proposed when excess spaces are provided. We were glad to hear monitoring the hearings last Tuesday that the Commission and OP are interested in raising that to two times the allowed amount. I think that is a step in the right direction.

Studying further the impact on development of landscaping requirements in section 1915, particularly with respect to the length of parking rows; consideration of gravel and other porous composites, such as recycled tire products, as allowable all-weather surfaces in section 1913.1; studying the relative minimum requirements for short-
term and long-term bicycle parking spaces in section 2002.1, especially where bike-sharing facilities are already located near a project, in close reasonable proximity; and reconsidering the queuing provisions, particularly the prohibition of a queuing aisle within 20 feet of a street lot line.

We also would like to provide a couple of comments on loading in subtitle C. We support the removal of the 55-foot truck bay requirements. We support allowing shared loading facilities between different uses and allowing loading to be shared by adjoining buildings.

We suggest further consideration be given to the following concepts in loading: allow for trash rooms to be located nearby but not immediately adjacent to a loading area in section 2107. In many instances, the layout of buildings -- and I've seen this with a variety of projects. It's just hard to put them right next to each
other. And, then, finally, clarifying the measurement of gross floor area provisions in section 2102 to include the provisions in the current zoning regulations for gasoline service stations, which are in 2205.2.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. WERNER: I'm Larry Werner. I'm a Ward 3 resident. And I am here tonight to talk primarily about parking. And, if I can, to paraphrase H. L. Mencken, Washington has a potential parking problem and the Office of Planning has a solution: neat; easy; and very, very wrong.

OP could not be more wrong in its parking recommendations. We need to increase the off-street parking requirements. Let me repeat that, please. We need to increase the off-street parking requirements. The burden of changes on those who propound it, yet, OP
has provided a lot of hope, a lot of faith, says we should believe them, but there is almost zero hard, empirical, validated information that demonstrates any causal relationship between OP's proposals and the outcomes that will occur by dramatically restructuring the city.

So, absent real data, let's look at what we do know. In round numbers, Washington has 260,000 curbside parking spaces; 285,000 vehicles, not cars, vehicles, registered; and hundreds of thousands of more from commuters, tourists, and service vehicles.

OP proposes to help this situation by reducing the number of off-street parking places and forcing cars onto city streets. OP expects 200,000 more people to live here in the relatively near future. If only half of them have vehicles, that means we need 100,000 more spaces. Where does OP think these people will park?
Much of the population growth is expected to be people with families. They're the people who get cars. They need them for the reasons you have heard so many people testify.

In the transit zones, we are already requiring the transit residents, city residents have special reserved parking because there isn't enough off-street parking. Then, fundamentally, OP is saying the developers are not smart enough to prove to the Zoning Commission or to anybody else that there is no demand for the parking that's required. If there were, they would be in here telling you, "These are our actual facts." The dog isn't barking.

There are a number of options before you. I have included them in my testimony. I would just like to conclude by saying that we just had our first 2014 mayoral debate. All 6 candidates talked about the progress our city has been making.
in the last 20 years with the existing zoning
code that the Office of Planning seeks to
change. Please don't choose to be remembered
as the five people who made a terrible
decision to stop what has been working quite
well in favor of something else.

    Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. BOCKH: Good evening. Thanks
for the opportunity to testify.

    I am Laszlo Bockh. I live in
Ward 3. I want to comment on the way the
Green Ratio, Green Area Ratio, is calculated,
specifically as it applies to trees. I
believe that the formula is tweaked right now
to where it is encouraging unsuccessful
trees. I think it should be changed to
encourage successful trees.

    You get six times as much credit
for planting a tree that is six-inch caliper
or more than you get for planting a tree that
is three-inch caliper or less. Other witnesses have stated the reasons why a smaller tree is a bigger investment. And I think that the formula should be revised to give credit to the planting of a smaller tree, which is much more likely than a bigger tree to grow up to be a sound adult, which would contribute to the canopy of the District of Columbia.

And that's all I have to say. I have submitted written testimony. The future successful trees is assured, as opposed to having something nice and fancy today which is bound to die soon. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MR. GLASGOW: Good evening, members of the Commission. I am Norman M. Glasgow, Jr. of the law firm of Holland and Knight. I will present some brief comments concerning the parking proposals in the new ZRR.
Once again I'd like to commend the Office of Planning for its efforts in this regard in modernizing the parking and loading regulations. And we will be submitting some more detailed comments for the record.

In the most recent census data that we have seen and requests that we have gotten for parking space information from our clients, we are seeing that in terms of multifamily high-rise construction that car ownership and demand for space is decreasing. And I have tried a number of cases before the Zoning Commission and before the Board of Zoning Adjustment where we have been going forward on that analysis. We are also seeing that in highly urban location, parking requirements for mixed-use projects and particularly retail projects should be reevaluated.

You have heard some testimony previously concerning the grid DC USA project
up in Columbia Heights. I worked on that project from start to finish. And we had parking analysis that said that that project was going to be grossly overparked. It ended up being that way, even though we got reductions in parking of several hundred parking spaces.

We also made sure that -- the District of Columbia essentially demanded through the Office of the Chief Financial Officer that the District own that parking garage. We then came down. My client, who was based in New York, we went back down to the City Council and said that was not our idea because we knew it was going to be a financial disaster because it was going to be just parking, empty parking, everywhere and the District was going to be the owner of it.

So we want to make sure that parking is right sized. The parking spaces cost about 40 to 50 thousand dollars per space all-in for your underground parking.
So it's a significant cost.

Our client will provide the parking if they believe that it is necessary and important for their projects to be successful. They do not want to undertake that expense if it's going to sit empty because it's a burden on the rest of the project, whether it's residential, commercial, whatever it is.

We have also looked at several residential cases where the data are given in neighborhoods that fully support the provision of either no or nominal parking. Those are sometimes on smaller sites but sometimes that are on sites that are right on top of Metro stations. Given unit sizes and other factors, that can be an appropriate response.

However, we do not support provisions which would make building owners provide free parking spaces to companies which provide car-sharing vehicle
alternatives to residents or occupants of a building. Providers of those types of services should be required to make market backed arrangements. We heard earlier tonight that someone, that they are a big leaser of spaces on streets. They certainly should not be in a position where they have any free parking within a building. We have already gone over. And you have heard a number of times how much those spaces cost.

We also have concern that in certain residential buildings, access to garages has to be entirely secure. We cannot have a situation where people can just go in and out of a residential garage.

The feedback that we have had from our clients in the marketplace is particularly that single females, in particular, are extremely concerned about having not secured parking spaces. We have seen if you don't and can't assure that, you may lose a part of that demographic in your
Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments concerning the zoning rewrite. And, as I said, we will be submitting a number of specific comments for the record.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. STEEN: Good evening. My name is Leslie Steen. I have been a resident of D.C. since the mid '70s. And I'm a developer of affordable housing in the region for most of those years. I am here tonight to say that I support reducing the parking minimums. It's a huge cost to affordable housing and can reduce or even destroy feasibility.

Car ownership is a huge expense. I can tell you that many low-income residents in areas that are close to transit don't own cars. They cannot afford it. In many instances, the cost of parking cannot be
passed along to low-income residents. In the structures under which I build affordable rental housing, the D.C. taxpayers through the government are bearing the burden because a low-income resident cannot. Parking requirements unnecessarily increase housing costs, making housing projects less feasible. If a parking spot costs $50,000 per parking space, as for an underground parking space, that cost translates into $316 of debt service alone. A tenant would have to earn over $12,000 a year to pay that debt service. That's not affordable.

I recommend that the Zoning -- I'm sorry. I would like to change gears and talk about the inclusionary zoning program. I commend the Zoning Commission for creating an inclusionary zoning program. I was Housing Chief of D.C. and shepherded the first version of the regulations of this new program. The program was slow to start due to the housing crash, and it has had
administrative challenges. All of these problems are being addressed by DHCD. And the pipeline is now doing very well.

While inclusionary zoning may be new to us, it is not a new approach. Our program was built on sound policy framework after much research of other programs that have been operating over longer terms across the country. It is critical that we realize that housing built under inclusionary zoning will be new production housing built in higher-cost locations. If this housing is lost, it will never be replaced.

Research shows that our program has been well-designed to sustain affordability for the next homeowner while optimizing wealth creation for individual homeowners. Other housing, usually in less expensive locations, other housing programs, offer more ways to create wealth, which is fine. One size does not fit all.

For the small number of
inclusionary zoning homeownership units being created in higher-cost locations, it is critical that they be preserved as affordable.

Thank you again for creating a farsighted affordable housing program. It promises to be the only way we will succeed in creating --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

MS. STEEN: -- new housing in --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much.

MS. STEEN: -- high-cost, resource-rich locations.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next? Thank you.

MS. HOSTON: Good evening. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify this evening. My name is Samone Hoston. And I am a resident of Ward 6.

I am a condominium owner at City Vista. This month makes four years since I
purchased my home. I first became aware of the development when a flyer was sent through the mail to my office at D.C. Fire and EMS Departments, Fire Prevention Division. The flyer advertised a new condo, high-rise development in the neighborhood in the HPAP EAHP incentive programs for firefighters, police, and teachers. Reading this information inspired me to want to become a homeowner.

I am here to 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 is important for the Zoning Commission to understand what I have experienced living in this type of unit. Along with ADU owners, I have been working with the Department of Housing and Community Development to come up with solutions for other situations and want to ensure future
affordable owners do not face the same issues.

One of my concerns as it relates to my ability to gain equity access in my condo are the resale restrictions that are in place. I did not have a clear understanding of refinancing and using my equity.

My ADU is located in downtown D.C. When I moved into my condo, there were meters outside of my building enforcing paid parking between 9:00 a.m. through 6:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. Months later, it was changed to 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday with no residential parking.

The residents spoke to Councilmember Tommy Wells regarding residential parking. Mr. Wells informed us that due to storefronts on the lower level of the building, we were not able to have residential parking on our street.

Because of this, I applied for an equity loan to purchase a parking space in my
building. I was told by multiple lenders and eventually by my own bank that they will not finance the loan because of my 20-year resale restrictions on my unit.

Even if I decided to sell my car and just take public transportation, I still have an added dilemma regarding my son going away to college. Without access to my equity, I am not able to assist him with college tuition and expenses, as I had planned on doing, not to mention that the condo board has raised our condo fees once a year every year since the condo owners took ownership three years ago, which has truly created a financial hardship for me and my son.

I have been a responsible homeowner with superb credit and have done everything that I am supposed to do to become a homeowner. However, to be denied the opportunity to access my own home's equity for something as slight as purchasing a
parking space or as --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

MS. HOSTON: -- essential --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

Next? We have your testimony. We have everybody's testimony I cut off for the most part.

MR. AVITABILE: Thank you. Good evening. For the record, my name is David Avitabile with the law firm of Goulston and Storrs. I am here tonight on behalf of Independent Education, the association of independent schools in the Washington, D.C. area, which includes over two dozen D.C. schools. Very, very short comments tonight.

We are continuing to review the proposed change in the parking requirements for private schools, which would change it from a standard based on the number of staff to a standard based on the area of the school. We're still verifying the impact of
that change on our schools. And once we have done that, we will better understand what our position is.

We'll submit comments in writing and in the near future. But I wanted to just get on the record that we're still looking at the issue. I know this came up when I was here two weeks ago on subtitle A.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you all very much. We greatly appreciate your testimony.

Any questions, colleagues? Any questions? Vice Chair Cohen?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: It's really just a comment for Ms. Hoston. Have you met with Manna, M-a-n-n-a, the woman who spoke: Sarah Scruggs?

MS. HOSTON: Yes.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure --
MS. HOSTON: Yes.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: -- that you knew that they're working on the issue.

MS. HOSTON: I'm a part of that team.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HOSTON: That doesn't help for now.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Commissioner Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to thank Ms. Steen for all the work you did to get inclusionary zoning and other housing programs working in the city. I remember working with you at that time, actually.

Mr. Glasgow, is it an urban myth that the big box retailer up there in Columbia Heights wanted to have all that parking there?
MR. GLASGOW: No. They wanted to have the parking. And we told everyone that there was way too much parking. There was just --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. So it was the retailer who was insisting on --

MR. GLASGOW: It was the retailer was --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: It wasn't the District as much as --

MR. GLASGOW: Well, the District, we --

COMMISSIONER MILLER: It doesn't get it, but it was the retailer that asked for it. I just wanted to make sure.

MR. GLASGOW: Retailer asked for parking. Our study showed that the parking was not necessary. We had at one point in time gotten the retailer down even further with the number of parking spaces, but that was not supported within the government. And we said, "Well, we're not going to go against
the government and briefing forward a case to reduce the parking."

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you. Thank you all for your testimony. I'll look forward to the Independent Education's analysis.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you all very much. We appreciate your testimony. By a show of hands, how many more people are here to testify?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So I'm going to still have to cut you off when the second buzzer goes because we want to make sure we -- we don't want you to have to come back tomorrow night. Okay.

Holly Muhammad, Kathryn Tinker, Debbie Smith Steiner, Kathy Henderson, Dave Paprocki, Sue Hemberger, Denis James, Melissa Kunstadter, Andrea Rosen, Carolyn Nichols,
Jonathan Wellemeyer. We've got two more.
Okay. One more. Laurel Halsey. Okay.
Okay. Steve Seelig. Okay. Now we've got eight. All right. We're going to start with you, Ms. Hemberger, and work our way down.

MS. HEMBERGER: Hi. My name is Sue Hemberger. I am here today mostly to testify about parking.

I have given you a packet of data, including census printouts, which will indicate that ownership rates have been constant since about 1990. And with constant ownership rates and increased population, what we're experiencing is an increase in the number of registered vehicles in D.C. It has increased about ten percent according to DMV's statistics between 2005 and 2012. There are citations for this in your packet. And in 2013, we're already seeing vehicle excise taxes collected at a rate ten percent higher than the previous year.

So yes, people in D.C. still own
cars. They own cars at the rate they always have. And they're continuing to buy cars.

On the question of affordability, if you would like a case study of whether eliminating parking minimums decrease housing prices in a city, I would suggest you look at London, which repealed parking minimums in 2004. The real estate market tanked throughout England thereafter. Only London's real estate prices, residential real estate prices, have increased in the double digits. It's about 28 percent since 2004 compared to single digits and negative property gains elsewhere. They got rid of the Height Act, too. Getting rid of the Height Act and getting rid of parking minimums didn't make London a more affordable city.

Now, I think the really interesting thing on affordability would be, instead of a wholesale elimination or reduction of minimums, let's make it quid pro quo. If you're getting rid of parking in
order to make housing more affordable, make that the deal. You can have parking requirements waived or eliminated if you provide affordable housing. See how many developers take you up on that deal. It is an interesting experiment, much better than a wholesale change.

But I specifically want to talk about downtown parking. And in that context, I want to talk more about residential than anything else. The first thing I want you to know about downtown parking is that in our central business district, less than one percent of our land is devoted to parking. And this is in stark contrast to other U.S. cities, where you see 20 and sometimes 35 percent of the land used for surface, above-ground parking or for lots.

The combination of the Height Act and our parking on-site requirements literally force our parking underground. And that has led to a lot of the walkability we
experience and the superior land use we see downtown.

While I agree that retail minimums might be too high and while I could see the argument that class A office building parking can be left to the market, when Covington and Burling negotiates with City Center, there is market power there. I don't think residential parking is in the same category downtown for two reasons. First, you know, Susie from Ohio is not Covington and Burling when she deals with the landlord. Secondly, I was Susie from Ohio. So I'm not disparaging Ohioans or Susies.

Secondly, there is a different logic to parking in a residential context than in a destination context. When you drive less in a residential context, your demand for parking increases. Drive less. Park more. And in our multi-modal citizenry, we have a lot of people who store their cars until the weekend. Let's do that off the
street downtown. And I think that you heard
in the last hearing that we need to make
downtown livable if we want more people to
live there. This is part of that.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Thank
you very much.

Next?

MS. HENDERSON: Good evening,
Chairman Hood, members of the Commission. My
name is Kathy Henderson. I am here on behalf
of ANC Commission 5D.

First let me begin by saying that
I support walkable neighborhoods. I have a
pair of tennis shoes. I used them today when
I walked over here from the Zoning
Commission. I also have a SmarTrip card that
is well funded at all times. I drive. I am
here to ask on behalf of ANC 5D that we be
given an additional opportunity to not only
weigh in on this section of the zoning
rewrite but the entire process.

We have not been afforded the
opportunity to have personal assistance with addressing these issues as some of our neighbors in Georgetown. I understand Ms. Steingasser has walked some of our neighbors through the process and taken their comments. We have not had that benefit. Our citizens deserve the opportunity to be fully heard.

Briefly with regard to the parking issue, I would ask you and your members not to be myopic in insisting that we do away with minimum requirements for parking. There is a need for parking. We have to include everyone in our community. Ward 5 has senior citizens, families, young women. We can't just simply say, "Oh, we're pushing everyone out into the streets. Oh, go walk. Go take a bike. Take Metro."

We have not fully explored safety avenues on Metro. Metro is not even fully funded with -- Metro police are not even fully funded. We still have safety issues.

We need parking. People need to
have access to parking. And any development needs to consider minimum numbers for parking. Doing away with parking is simply a mistake. It's absurd.

And I think if you extend this process, which we are asking, you will hear from a lot of citizens in 5D and Ward 5 in general that they want parking. They want to continue to enjoy parking. And parking certainly needs to be planned for.

The idea that developers should -- we should reduce the minimum required rent for parking is as absurd as saying, "Oh. Well, enrollment numbers are down for our schools. So let's sell off all of our public buildings."

These issues are cyclical. Today's millennial is tomorrow's, you know, family person. We have families that will have children, that will care for aging parents. We have senior citizens who have equity in their homes, large homes. They're
empty nesters. They may want to go move
downtown to a condominium. Should they now
give up a car that they enjoy for practical
mobility purposes? We have not fully
considered this.

There is a rush to judgment, you
know, in saying, "Hey, transit-aware
development. It sounds good." We need less
parking. That's ridiculous.

People, we need to be balanced in
our approach. People walk. We can make this
a more walkable city. We can make it safer.
We can certainly improve our transit options.
And we can encourage our citizens to enjoy a
diversity of transit options without saying
we don't need cars. We need to stop this war
on cars.

First of all, the Department of
Public Works has expanded their objective
regarding -- now, they used to be focused on
simply picking up our trash and picking it up
on time every time. Now we have had a
reprogramming of funding for environmental officers to parking enforcement attendants.
So every time you leave your car for five minutes, they will slap you with a ticket to beat you into submission. This is not the way to have a livable city, a city that is welcoming to all. We have to be balanced.

We want this process open, transparent, and we want to be fully heard. So we ask that you give us great weight into continuing this debate to allow the good citizens of 5D, ANC 5D, to be fully heard.

And thank you so much for your time and attention.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. MUHAMMAD: I have got a cold. So you've got to bear with me.

Good evening to Chairman Hood, members of the Commission, Director Bardin, and Office of Planning. I am Commissioner Holly Muhammad. I am here representing
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 8A. We are proud to be Ward 8 servants.

I am here again tonight to reiterate the importance of extending these proceedings and keeping the record open for a total of 180 days and providing additional hearings for these subtitles.

After speaking with the president of my own civic association and the president of the Federation of Civic Associations, I became more aware of the lack of outreach provided by the Office of Planning regarding this rewrite. I made a request to the president of the Federation of Civic Associations to also write a letter requesting that this process be extended.

I have to take my hat off to my fellow commissioner here because she did so well in representing what many, many feel in this community. And Ward 8 is seen as the last frontier. Development is ripe. And we know that they are coming. And we want to
have ample time, reasonable time, to review this rewrite, discuss it with our leadership and our community, consult with professionals if we need to, and then comment on the areas that are important to Ward 8 and to the Ward 8 residents. And I am here asking that again because I know that Chairman Hood said that you will be meeting on December the 9th. And I want you to really understand how important this is to us and to our residents.

And I purposely just did my own spot check with just people walking on the subway, passing me by in the store to ask people, "Did you know about the rewrite?" Do you know I did not get one "Yes," not one. So that shows you that there has to be more outreach in this community with something this massive.

In the words of one of the attorneys, it was a massive undertaking. And I agree. But there should also have been a massive advertising or notification process.
also. And that did not take place because
there are too many District of Columbia
residents that know nothing about this.

So I am just asking you again, respectfully, to weigh this. Give us great
weight. Give us the 180 days that we ask for.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. PAPROCKI: Hi. Good evening.

My name is Dave Paprocki, and I live at the
Kenyon Square condos. I've been there four
years. Thank you for letting me testify
tonight and taking the time to hear us.

I am here to speak about the
resale restriction ownership units, both
affordable dwelling units and inclusionary
zoning units, integrated into market-rate
condo buildings.

You may know that as an owner of
an ADU, I have severe restrictions placed on
me for when I can sell my unit at market
value, a full 20 years before I can do so.
And I knew this coming into the program.

However, I also have severe
restrictions placed on me if I can no longer
live there and need to rent my place out or
suffer losing it. There is a myriad of
situations that could arise in one's life to
make living 20 consecutive years in one place
rather difficult.

My fellow ADU owners and I have
been working several years with the
Department of Housing and Community
Development to find a solution for this
situation. However, we still have a long way
to go before there is something that is
workable for all of us. And we certainly
don't want to pass along these rules to
future ADU owners as well.

I bought an ADU as a way to make
an investment in my future. Everyone wants
to own a home and something we all hope for
as part of the American dream and a way to control costs and ensure having something to retire with. I wanted to make a wise investment.

However, I have experienced multiple special assessments worth over $2,000 in those 4 years. My condo fees were in the low 300s when I moved in. And they’re now almost 500 a month. Luckily I have been able to handle those costs, but I know my other ADU owners and colleagues in my building are suffering greatly from this.

The materials that are used to build the ADU units are also of the very lowest quality, especially in the bathrooms, but I won’t get into those issues. But the qualities of the units and the costs and so forth are really minor things in comparison to the restrictions of not being able to even rent out our units if we need to move for simply costs: mortgage payment, condo fees, and taxes. I am just hoping that we can get
this city to allow us to do that if we need to.

The restrictions have been a straightjacket. I know that the Zoning Commission does not enforce regulations attached to ADUs and IZ units, but I do know that you have a role in approving certain regulations.

Please consider current ADUs, the owners’ experiences, and at least make the renting rules more flexible so owners can still hold onto their investments, even with the normal changes of life circumstances that may arise. Without some flexibility, we could be stuck as renters for the rest of our lives, nullifying the investments and hard-earned money we have already put into our homes.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MR. JAMES: Good evening. I am
Denis James, President of Kalorama Citizens Association.

Tonight I am going to talk about the parking minimums. But before I get to that, the Kalorama Citizens also will be submitting further resolutions about roof structures, corner stores, and I just wanted to mention that we did pass a resolution in favor of extending the time for this Commission to hear comments for 180 days.

So before you, you have two resolutions. They are both from an Adams Morgan point of view. We have such challenges there: 7,000 seats of ABC occupancy, approximately 7,000 households in the neighborhood, which all have been given a visitor's pass. So we are intensely parked at all times, and we're not that close to a Metro stop, even though we are on the Woodley Park as a named destination. But it's a good little walk. So we don't really believe that the methodology that OP adopted applies to
Adams Morgan or should apply to it.

I've got some written comments, which I will get onto the record typed up in a few days.

OP does nothing to effectively encourage suburbanites from commuting downtown. After work, some of these commuters park in Adams Morgan for the nightlife. Creation of the residential parking permit program was a reaction to commuters parking in close-in neighborhoods, such as Adams Morgan, where I have been a homeowner for 42 years. Now there is a visitor's pass program that is said to introduce another 7,000 potential parkers into Adams Morgan.

Reducing parking minimums, at least in Adams Morgan and probably in numerous other fully built-up neighborhoods, is a very shortsighted idea. Adams Morgan is a community made up of rowhouses and many medium-sized, purpose-built apartment
buildings, be they rental, condo, or co-op.

Most of Adams Morgan was built between 1890 and 1920. And very few of the midsized apartment buildings have any parking attached. Some of the larger apartment buildings have a modest amount of parking underneath or on private surface spaces adjacent.

Adams Morgan's population remained virtually unchanged from the 2000 to the 2010 census, 16,400 or so. We have occasional in-field development, mostly in the Reed-Cooke section and occasionally in other commercial streets.

We also have -- let's see. I already covered that. On any given night and routinely on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday nights, many, many more visitors made descend on Adams Morgan, forcing residents who depend on street parking to circle endlessly and in ever-widening circles in the hope of finding a space. Keeping the current
minimum parking requirements for Adams Morgan
and other similar neighborhoods simply means
that those who move there, into these new or
renovated or expanded buildings, will not
provide further competition for the residents
who currently use street parking.

For those newer D.C. residents
testifying against the parking minimums,
heaven forbid that they should grow older or
infirm and be less able to get around without
cars. Wait until they start having children
and need to carpool their kids to school,
attend soccer practice and other after-school
activities, or perhaps their parents may
someday come to live with them, increasing
the likelihood that a car would become a
necessary convenience.

D.C. has had a few years of
population growth, but there is no certainty
that this will continue. We must welcome all
of those who come to live and enjoy our
neighborhoods and become engaged in the civic
life of the city. But long-term planning
must not overreact to a sudden, possibly
short-term period of population growth.

Many have lauded Metrobus and
Metrorail. And it is essential. But
Metrobus service is uneven and its planners
routinely attempt to cut lines. Metrorail is
at capacity. If OP was really serious about
planning how we get around and what we do
with our vehicles when we arrive, it would be
pressing for study of how Metro might expand
in D.C. to better serve its residents.

Yes. That's about it. The
methodology I already covered. I just don't
think it should apply to Adams Morgan or
other neighborhoods that are somewhat
distanced from Metrorail.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank
you.

Next?

MS. KUNSTADTER: Thank you for
the opportunity to testify on the D.C. zoning rewrite. I am here this evening to speak against the changes proposed by the Office of Planning to the city's zoning regulations as they pertain to parking requirements.

My name is Melissa Kunstadter. I am an officer of the Tenleytown Neighbors Association, but I am testifying as an individual today.

My family and I have lived in Tenleytown for 25 years, a block and a half east of Wisconsin Avenue. Our neighborhood is quiet, tree-lined. And all of my neighbors own at least one vehicle. The young couple next door has small twin boys. The single professional across the street works in Silver Spring. The elderly lady has a husband with Alzheimer's. There's a young guy on the corner who is into cars. And there is a family with a disabled child.

Most of these neighbors park on the street because they have no garages. As
of now, we can usually find a parking spot fairly close to our house, but we do compete with shoppers and restaurant goers and others who are attracted to the commerce on nearby Wisconsin Avenue.

Should parking requirements be diminished or removed due to our being defined as part of a major transit corridor, such would bring hardship to the families on our block. Convenient parking is a necessary benefit to having invested in a home in our area.

There are those who complain about the traffic in Tenleytown and claim that reducing or removing the number of parking spaces required for residential and commercial units would discourage the use of cars on our streets and, thus, open up Wisconsin Avenue to freer flowing traffic.

May I mention that the length of Wisconsin Avenue from Sidwell Friends to Friendship Heights has almost a dozen traffic
lights in almost as many blocks. To serve schools, businesses, American University, the post office, fire department, banks, food stores, public library, residential diplomatic office buildings, sufficient parking is needed to serve local residents in addition to those coming from other areas.

A closing statistic. Seventy-nine percent of Ward 3 households own one or more cars. The current zoning requirements for parking are already far below the statistics on car ownership in D.C. Current parking requirements should, therefore, be retained or increased.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much.

Next?

MS. ROSEN: Hello. My name is Andrea Rosen. I live in Chevy Chase.

I need to explain, first of all, that, like Ms. Bowser, I did not realize that
the use of metropolitan AMI was out of D.C.'s control. So my testimony about inclusionary zoning makes the same incorrect assumption and I am changing my testimony on the fly.

The District's inclusionary zoning program has enlightened purposes. However, last April, the District closed a waiting list of more than 70,000 names for housing assistance. To reach these residents, who are severely impacted by burgeoning market rate residential development, the IZ program must be expanded.

What is clear is that the Commission's definitions of moderate and low incomes do not mesh with the populations that most need assistance. And income defined as moderate by zoning regs corresponds at its lower end to the average income of the middle quintile of District earners and at its upper end to the average income of the fourth quintile. An income of 53,750, which is the cap for zoning's defined low-income
households, corresponds to the average income in the middle quintile of D.C. earners and far exceeds the average incomes earned by the working poor in the second and first quintiles.

I urge the Commission to align their definitions of low and moderate incomes with the lower two and a half quintiles of District earners by adjusting the percentages that are applied to the Metro AMI.

Second, I would urge the Commission to increase the set-asides for IZ units in residential developments from 10 percent and 8 percent to 20 percent and 18 percent, respectively, in order for developers to qualify for bonus development density.

The Townhomes on Capitol Hill, a model mixed-income housing development, devotes 50 percent of its units to affordable housing. Of its 134 units, 34 are dedicated to moderate-income households and 33 units
provide housing to low-income residents. This city should stop tinkering at the edges of the problem and strengthen inclusionary zoning to realize its salutary goals for citizens of the District of Columbia.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. SEELIG: I hope nobody moved my checks around so I have to flip around, too.

Chairman Hood and members of the Commission, thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight. I am Steve Seelig. And I am testifying on behalf of Ward 3 Vision, a grassroots campaign that supports the addition of vibrancy in opportunity to Ward 3.

Ward 3 Vision strives to maintain the high quality of life that currently exists while encouraging improvements along major transportation corridors, like
Wisconsin Avenue and Connecticut Avenue.

Through community engagement, we encourage sustainable urbanism by supporting affordable housing, multi-modal transportation options, appropriate mixed-use development, and walkable streetscapes that enhance everyone's quality of life. Our goal is to improve upon what is great about Ward 3. We don't want to lose that.

Chairman Hood mentioned last week he was concerned that he was not hearing from the "silent majority." And I am glad to report that Ward 3 Vision does represent the silent majority. Ward 3 Vision was created out of frustration that voices in support of sustainable growth and good urbanism were not being heard in issues relating to planning, development, and transportation of the ward over the past 20 years. And some of those voices are actually on the dais with me this evening.

We looked around the region and
the nation. And we saw other jurisdictions in apprising smart growth and saw not just environmentally more responsible growth but more livable and walkable neighborhoods grow up. They're in our own backyard. And we heard only opposition where we live. Unless, of course, we spoke to our neighbors, who in general are okay with the direction the District has taken, we would submit that the alphabet soup of neighborhood organizations from our ward that you repeatedly hear from in opposition to development is nothing more than the vocal minority.

Our members are Baby Boomers and Gen-Xers. Oh, we've got a millennial in our group. And we have one member of the Greatest Generation. Our members own cars and bicycles. We walk, cycle, run, ride buses, and we take Metro. And we have been active in previous zoning cases before you, including the Wisconsin Avenue Giant; Jamal's redevelopment of Babes; and the 5220, well,
the ill-fated 5220 Wisconsin Avenue acreage case. We believe our involvement has helped to craft better places for our ward. And we are proud to have been involved in the process. And we have participated in many discussions with you and the Office of Planning about the comprehensive plan and zoning code.

We believe the silent majority of residents desire a responsible, environmentally resilient solution to address the issues facing the District over the long term, but we don't believe that singling out any particular generation as representing a particular point of view is fair and hope that the Commission removes from this discussion old versus the young, me versus them statements about the process.

From a personal perspective, yes, I read Greater Greater Washington blog. And I learn a great deal of information about our city. But I also read information from
conservative sources, like the Heritage
Foundation. I am a member of WABA, and I am
also a member of AAA. I own four bicycles
and two cars. I ride my bike to work some
days. I drive to others. I am a Baby
Boomers, just on the cusp. And I have a
four-year-old child. So I hang out with
millennials. So which group am I a member
of? Let's move beyond these labels for the
city's sake. And let's really focus on the
important things for our city.

On the zoning rewrite itself,
it's time to move forward with this process.
It has been many years and hundreds of public
meetings. And there has been plenty of time
for all voices to be heard. It's time to
plan for the future of the District and no
longer live in the 1950s past.

On the parking minimum issue, the
subject of tonight's discussion, Ward 3
Vision supports lower or no parking minimums.
The proposal from the Office of Planning
begins the process of providing more flexibility and living choice and how much parking must be built, although we would have preferred the original iteration of the proposal with no minimums.

On-street parking management. That is something that has been talked about quite a bit on this dais this evening. I would urge that the Zoning Commission does not get mixed up in the issue of parking on street that is solely the subject of DDOT.

You have a once in a lifetime, once in, well, an every 50-year lifetime opportunity to do your work on this zoning rewrite. And we hope that you support the OP provisions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you all very much. We appreciate all of your testimony.

Let's see if we have any comments or questions of this panel. I am not seeing
any. Ms. Muhammad, let me just ask -- first, Commissioner Henderson, do we have your testimony?

MS. HENDERSON: No, you do not. You will have that by close of business tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. You have a little more time than that.

MS. HENDERSON: If I may add, we are asking for a minimum of the 180 days --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. HENDERSON: -- to extend this process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Commissioner Muhammad, let me just ask you a question. And I am going to do this because I do know the President of the Federation of Civic Associations --

MS. MUHAMMAD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- very well, Ms. Barbara Morgan, --

MS. MUHAMMAD: Right.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- very well. So if she is watching, she will get me later. She helped raise me. So I'm going to use her as the example.

MS. MUHAMMAD: She told me she did write the letter.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But I'm going to use her as the example.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Was it that she mentioned that she didn't know about the zoning rewrite or maybe I misunderstood your testimony.

MS. MUHAMMAD: No. I said I called her and requested her to write a letter for resolution on behalf of the Federation of Civic Associations. And I told her that the commissioners across the city were requesting more time. And she couldn't believe that we weren't getting more time. And she even called Chairman Mendelson's office with me on the phone because she could
not believe that we weren't being offered
more time for this process.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: But she knew
about the zoning rewrite, right? It's not
that --

MS. MUHAMMAD: Well, she knew
about it. She knew about it. But she
couldn't understand why we weren't being
given more time because she didn't know it
was 1,000 pages. Now, she didn't know that
is what she said.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

All right.

MS. MUHAMMAD: And then I went to
my own civic association tonight. I don't
know if you know Mr. Presbury. He didn't
know anything about it. And I gave him the
brochures that we had been given and just as
much information as I knew and told him that
we did request the resolution requesting more
time along with many other ANCs. And he
asked me had a decision been made. And I
told him no.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have heard you loud and clear. I am just glad that you didn't say that Ms. Morgan didn't know about the rewrite, though.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Oh, no. She knew about it, but she didn't know it was 1,000 pages.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because I actually --

MS. MUHAMMAD: So she did agree that we needed more time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I actually attended with the Office of Planning at her meeting about two years ago. So I know that -- and, plus, like I say, I can say that because she raised me. She may reprimand me later.

MS. MUHAMMAD: She raised a lot of people.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.

MS. MUHAMMAD: And I will say
this. There are some areas that had over hundreds and hundreds of meetings. They may have had that in Ward 3, but that did not happen in Ward 8. And it sure didn't happen in Ward 7, which is east of the river.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I'm not going to get into that.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Well, I just wanted to make that clear.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, this is about trying to get the information to balance. And the Commission will continue to do the best we can to make sure that we get it out there like we have done in the past.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I mean, that is why I always go to Ms. Cort. You know, people think I am being sarcastic, but it actually works bringing the smart growth people down here. Maybe we need to take again a page out of her book, but that is a whole other discussion, another argument. We
are looking forward to it.

And just stay tuned. Let me just say this to the commissioners at the table now. Just stay tuned.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay?

MS. MUHAMMAD: What time will your meeting be on the 9th, December the 9th?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: The meeting on the 9th, let me also help you with that. The meeting on the 9th is how we move forward. It's not setting any deadlines or anything at this point. We are going to have a discussion among ourselves. That is what the meeting on the 9th is about.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: It wasn't about we're going to make a decision on the 9th, no.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, no.

MS. MUHAMMAD: When will that
decision be made? Can I ask?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You asked for 180 days, right? When is that going to start?

MS. MUHAMMAD: Well, actually, in our resolution, we requested the 180 days, beginning from the first day of testimony, which was November the 4th.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we are already on countdown. Okay? No, but stay tuned. Stay tuned. That is all I can say. Stay tuned. There are some more things that are going to happen. You will hear something from the Office of Zoning real soon, especially ANC commissioners, on some other things that this Commission is planning.

We're going to discuss all of that on the 9th. If you want to come down and hear our discussion, that will be great.

MS. MUHAMMAD: I would like to. That is why I am trying to ask you what time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We start at 6:30. I get confused now. We start at 6:30 that
night. That's our regular meeting.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Yes, sir. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: We meet every second Monday or you can tune in and watch us webcast live.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank this panel. We appreciate all of your testimony.

MS. MUHAMMAD: Thank you.


MS. CROYDON: Croydon.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Croydon.
MS. CROYDON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're welcome.

Did I call too many people? Mr. Otten, I'm going to come back to you. And I see Ms. MacWood. I've got you all on the next panel. Yes, that's fine.

MR. OTTEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did I call too many people? Okay. Okay. We're going to start to my left, to your right. You may begin.

MR. STRACUZZI: Thank you for having us, first of all. I appreciate you taking your time to hear the public's vision on your vision.


I would just like to say if you think about what is going on in the city with the parking, let's look at 7th Street and what is going on with the public housing.
development that was there and what is going on there now. Again, when it was there in the past, there was adequate parking for the tenants. And being so people didn't park in the outskirt neighborhoods, I have friends that live on 5th Street over there. When I go there, it is impossible to find parking.

Just look at 14th Street, what it was and what it is now. It is impossible to find parking if you go to Target, even with the parking they have. Things have changed in the city to a fact that it doesn't work.

Look at Eye Street, Southwest, what it is with the older buildings and what it is with the newer buildings. We are taking away the parking of the residents in the neighborhoods.

I am with the Statehood Green Party. So I have to say that we are for cleaner vehicles and clean up the environment. But, again, we still have needs for vehicles. And until we get to the point
that we can lessen our dependency on fossil fuels, we have to be realists here.

Now when it goes, I want to talk about the AMI. When you look at this realistically, this is not a real figure. Based on the fact when you have to do a real study in this matter, we have to go to tax and revenue, what is being built in those areas. Look at Congress Heights, what is going to happen at the Metro. And let's look at on South Capitol what is going to happen by the Murray's. These developments are going to be built with public money.

I myself cannot qualify to live anywhere in the District of Columbia anymore. I have an Audi 8, a bug, but I can't qualify because my income has dropped so low. I am an independent sales rep for the furniture industry. I make five cents on the dollar. What happens to people like me and others that are working poor now?

Now, I know once the income picks
up, the economy picks up, my income will grow again and I will go back to living like I was. But until then, I have to live in another type of world, which is okay because I always say D.C. has pockets of good. If you go at night, you know where to live.

Realistically, there's a lot of good places in this city. But, again, it's getting to the point that you can't qualify to live in these places anymore. And it's all based on what is going on in the development in our city.

So I know you have a very hard decision. But what I do say is that when we come up with a solution, let's look through tax and revenue in a one-mile radius what's going on in that area income-wise. Let's take it in perspective: how many people are in public housing, what the population is of the area, how many people are unemployed in this area. And, on top of that, let's do a real calculation based on real residents in
the area because, again, you don't work for the mayor's office. You don't work for the developers. You work for the residents of the District of Columbia. And we're here telling you to think about us just as much as everybody else.

And I know you have a very difficult task ahead of you. And I don't envy you for it. But it does have to be done. And the decisions have to be made. So let's hope that the decisions are going to be there for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

And thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. CROYDON: Thank you, Chairman Hood. My name is Elizabeth Croydon. I am an independent filmmaker. I am here to address specifically the smart growth solution.

There is not enough time to read this. It's 1,000 pages long. What is 180
days, 6 months, compared to 100 years?

Excuse my informality. I just got off a plane from Hollywood in New Mexico. I'm planning my third feature film. I've shot two in this city. Where is my crew going to park without ample parking? You do want my revenue and income. I want to give it to you.

We need affordable housing. There are students. There are artists, low-income. If someone is making $65,000 a year, why would a landlord give a house to someone making $30,000?

Let me address the term "smart growth." That implies that any other solution is foolish. And I know we have all heard educated voices today.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Stop the clock just for a moment. If you move back just a little bit --

MS. CROYDON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You're on that
mike. That's good.

MS. CROYDON: I'm not used to this kind of mike. I'm used to an SM58.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Move back. We want to make sure we hear you clearly. Okay.

MS. CROYDON: Thank you, Chairman Hood. All right.

So smart housing, smart growth, smart zoning, no, no, no. This is twilight zoning. And I kind of want to look for Rod Sterling. You know, to imply that the D.C. citizens are uninformed is wrong. We have a longstanding tradition. And we need to set an example.

Some people say D.C. stands for Damage Control. I say D.C. stands for District of Change. And we need to set an example to the world. There are other solutions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?
MR. DURANT: Good morning. I mean, good afternoon. Good evening, Chairman Hood. I don't even know what time it is I am so tired. But I appreciate the Commission allowing me to speak.

My name is Guy Durant. I live in Ward 5. And I am also a 200 Footer, but I represent myself today.

Basically I just want to talk about a couple of issues. One is the affordable housing, and the other is parking. And also I want to start by saying that I do hope that you will extend 180 days for everyone to review this because there hasn't been enough time for everybody to react to what is going on here.

And I wanted to start by saying that I think affordable housing is a very important issue. There is such a need to make sure, as Renee Bowser said, that we change it so that the District of Columbia median income is used, instead of just the
regional. So I really want you to take that seriously and extend this to 180 days so you can more people of lower economic means to come in here and testify. A lot of us are not, you know, of that income level. Some of us are more upper income. And so we need to hear more voices.

So, speaking about more voices, now let me talk about parking and just say that, you know, there's a concept that we all know about called stakeholders. And when you're making big policy decisions, you want to really include all the stakeholders at the table. My question to you is, have you really included and has the Office of Planning really included and has DDOT really included the major stakeholders in the parking issue? And that is car owners.

Now, how are you going to do that? It is very simple. You reach out to AAA. Where has AAA been? They have been shunned. They have been avoided. They have
been left out of this process. I know firsthand because I have talked with Mr. John Townsend at AAA. And he has told me that you have not included him in this process to the large degree you could. The Office of Planning has not included him in the process. They represent over 80,000 members. So you really don't have the right to make a decision about car owners unless you're going to include the largest organization of car owners: AAA. So do not have any decisions, you know, lifting the parking minimums without AAA at the table. In fact, AAA should supervise DDOT because DDOT is making so many bad mistakes as far as transportation. AAA should be overall part of the civic, you know, group that oversees them.

So I would just say if you need to get AAA at the table, before you make any policy decisions about parking, AAA should be involved. And I just want to say that I
think the reason they weren't involved was because the Office of Planning and DDOT don't give a park. Okay? And you need to give a park about the people that are senior citizens trying to drive. You need to give a park about all the people in the District of Columbia who really are struggling right now to really shop and live here.

You talked about affordability. And if we don't, we are one of the places in the country that have the worst traffic situation because we don't give a park.

And so I'm asking you, don't make the situation worse by changing this into what is going to become the motherparker of all situations.

(Laughter.)

MR. DURANT: So I am just saying please, you know, give a park about D.C. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?
MR. OGUNSANYA: Good evening, Chairman Hood, fellow commissioners. Today I will be speaking on behalf of my organization. My name is David Ogunsanya, and I work for City First Homes here in Washington, D.C. Today I will be testifying in favor of lowering the parking minimum requirements in higher-density areas.

To start, City First Homes is a nonprofit that creates permanently affordable homes in transit-oriented hubs in Washington, D.C. And I will be more than happy to answer any questions you have about shared equity or shared appreciation as well.

As an organization, City First Homes supports parking reforms to reduce parking minimums in higher-density areas that have multiple sources of transportation readily available. Sometimes minimum parking requirements are too high and create extra costs for developers, who, in turn, transfer those costs to homeowners at sale or at lease
up of a rental. This reform will help bring
down the cost of housing and make challenging
projects more feasible. It would also enable
developments to better serve the growing
market of transit-oriented households in
Washington, D.C.

Reducing parking also allows
residents to choose an ecological lifestyle
by relying more on walking, bicycling, using
public transportation that the District has
invested so much money into. This also
creates a more vibrant city and reduces
congestion on our streets. As you all know,
14th Street and U Street can be hectic on the
evenings.

Also, we would like to commend
the Zoning Commission for creating the
District's IZ program. While it has had its
administrative challenges, we believe that
its issues can all be addressed. The IZ
program is built on the framework of
permanent affordability. This is the same
thing City First Homes was built on.

We run this very similar program for permanently well-stewarded affordable homeownership and condo buildings, co-ops, and single family homes all around the District, which realizes the best of wealth creation for individual homeowners and sustaining affordability for the next generation of homeowners.

The IZ program and City First Homes programs are built on the experiences of successful programs around the country with years of experience and successful long-term affordable homeownership and stewardship of more than 500 units of permanently affordable homes in their programs. We continuously strive to increase the effectiveness of our program by participating in sharing groups around the country.

We are very eager to see the IZ program succeed and will continue to contribute to help its success however we
I thank you again for creating this farsighted affordable housing program. It promises to be one of the leading ways we will create and sustain affordable housing opportunities, especially in neighborhoods which are readily rising in value and will be out of reach of the future generations of moderate and low-income homeowners.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. YOUNG: Good evening. My name is Mary Young. I am commissioner for ANC 3B04. My chairperson testified earlier this evening. And I have to say as a baby commissioner -- I was just elected last November and have only been serving for 11 months -- on February 2013, attending my second meeting, I voted to approve by unanimous decision a resolution on the part of ANC 3B regarding the changes to the zoning
law.

At the time, mostly the discussion was only among the five persons making up the commission. And we represent approximately 10,000 persons. Since that time and during the past 11 months, I have been working among my constituents and have discovered how important it is not to think that I am the decider on their behalf and that I bring back to our ANC their concerns and encourage them to engage in open public discussion.

This did not happen before we voted on that resolution. We engaged in a flurry of emails among ourselves, reported out our decision to the public, and then we approved the resolution to accept the changes. And we only looked at those changes, really, that reflected us as our 3B.

I know that my chairperson will testify that our position has not changed and the resolution as signed stands. However,
this is no longer my position since I had not consulted with the people I represent. And we only looked at the very narrow issues pertaining to our 3B, which are mostly private homes, multi-unit buildings, and a very small commercial strip. So the other issues in the zoning changes were never looked at, nor addressed by us, which I think we should have done.

Now that our other ANCs are seeking more time, I feel that we should not rush to sign into law the zoning changes proposed until other ANCs, especially for those areas of the city which have more complex issues and those east of the river, have ample opportunity to understand how the changes in the zoning law will impact them. I also think that we, too, in ANC 3B should take a closer look at all of the changes because we are not an enclave, but we belong to a wider city as well.

As a nation, we are now
experiencing all of the unintended consequences of a law that was rushed through without enough study and input from concerned parties. Let's learn from that experience and not repeat it. Time is not the enemy.

Another thought I had is that with the heightened master plan, which could possibly be enacted in the near future, should we not wait to see what impact that would have on our zoning laws. I feel a postponement would allow the heightened master plan to come to conclusion and at the same time give time to those persons who need more time to study the zoning changes.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. BORNE: Hello, commissioners. My name is Lyndi Borne. I'm a resident of Ward 6. And thank you for staying out here very late so that we can testify.

I noticed that there have been
many people testifying on the issue of parking. And I do think that we might need a lot more parking because a lot more people might have to live in their cars because they can't afford to live in homes here. And I kind of don't even mean that as a joke because there is literally a school teacher who, you know, works for D.C. Public Schools and is staying in a shelter because she cannot afford to live within the District limits right now. And, you know, there are other cases like this.

But I really just wanted to make the point that we can have development without displacement. We don't need to displace people and gentrify. We can make the city better. I am not against having a zoning rewrite. In fact, I am very much in favor of changing the status quo.

Specifically, I want to address the AMI, as a few other people have already. One proposal that we already heard is that we
can just use the D.C. AMI, which is significantly lower. It's not 107,000 a year. It's below 100,000 a year. But I really think we need to be more honest about what affordable means and really embrace the idea of inclusive zoning and affordability.

If you are a minimum wage worker or above minimum wage, you work at Target, you still cannot afford to live in a place that is $1,600 a month, which is 80 percent of the AMI now. I very much support tying it to the minimum wage and then going up from there. A hundred percent of minimum wage is your income, 200 percent, and so on.

And I also want to make the point that I am not saying we only need to make sure that the lower class can afford housing. The middle class, too, is struggling right now and is being slowly displaced and then displacing other people and just going south and going east.

And I really think we can have an
inclusive city, but we need to stop pretending by using words like "affordable" completely cynically when it's clearly not the case.

Oh, I know that there is also another argument that the federal HUD money requires that we use the AMI. And I don't think this is a very valid argument. And we don't need to use the public/private partnerships at all, I believe. I think we can completely go public and we can use this idea of tying it to minimum wage, which is completely logical.

So I would love to have more time, as everyone has asked, so you can all discuss this more and we can come to a better conclusion and have a better city for all of us.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

REV. DICKERSON: Good afternoon.
I am Jim Dickerson with Manna, Incorporated. And I am a 44-year resident. I want to thank you all for your service tonight.

The affordable dwelling unit owners from five market-rate buildings have submitted testimony to the Zoning Commission concerning extremely detrimental issues with their units and their 20-year resale-restricted covenants, their 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 for issues that future IZ and ADU unit owners like them will have.

The Zoning Commission holds the covenants for ADU owners in two of those buildings: The Fedora and Chase Point. I've attached -- I'm sorry. I haven't got it. I didn't attach it, but you got this from another owner, a detailed example from Chase Point.
Some of these owners could not attend tonight due to extra jobs they are working that they have to have to afford their condo fees, major health issues, or still being scared to death about speaking out publicly.

While the devastating consequences of other ADU units and buildings have been submitted and testified to tonight, I would particularly like to alert you to Chase Point in Ward 3 near the Friendship Heights Metro stop. At Chase Point, there are 5 ADU units in a building of 108 units. Some of the market-rate units in that building are worth 105 million. And a Yemeni official owns three units that he uses when he comes into town.

All of the ADU owners have seen their condo fees almost double since they purchased in '08. Each of these low-income owners is paying close to over $800 in condo fees, close to or over, or for some of them,
their condo fee is more than their monthly mortgage payment.

They have attempted to work with their condo association on fee increases, but the association is under no obligation to control fee increases for ADU owners. And they feel the cost should be spread evenly across all of the owners, including the lower-income ones. This is outrageous and totally drives low-income owners deeper into poverty and creates tremendous stresses on their lives. And this is not what I'm sure the Zoning Commission had in mind when it created these units, but it's what we have now. And these are terrible consequences. We spoke to this, and we were disregarded when these policies were put in place.

Chase Point board is currently being sued by a former owner and has sought legal counsel over 200,000 the board is spreading across all of the owners equally, resulting in a $1,920 special assessment to
be paid over 4 months. And the ADU owners
have expressed an extension, but the condo
board is not open to that. These ADU owners
have spent so much more money on their units
than they have --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
much.

REV. DICKERSON: -- expected.

Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

REV. DICKERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
much.

Next?

REV. DICKERSON: I want to
also --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. Thank you.

Thank you.

REV. DICKERSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. We
have it.

REV. DICKERSON: You got it?
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Yes.

REV. DICKERSON: Good.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Next?

MR. CHELEN: Hello. I am John Chelen. I am a Ward 3 resident. And I expect that I would have five minutes this evening because I am representing the Ward 3 Democrats. I was a head of the zoning task force and also had a role in other efforts in Cleveland Park and greater Ward 3.

I tried to anticipate the questions you are asking yourselves this evening because you don't have, I believe, clear guidance from anybody who has worked for you, either officially, informally. You have heard, though, a lot of practical suggestions this evening. I think that is what we need you to take to heart.

Theory is easy. Those of us -- and I guess I shared many years with many of you here, too, accumulated a lot of data over the years, a lot of exceptions to the easy
theories we put together.

I think what I urge you to take a look at are the efforts of some good thinking people. And I would start with the two letters that have been submitted to you by Councilmembers Cheh and Evans. They take to task the analytical approach, the data used, the effects that are likely to result from what OP has proposed on parking. Those letters have been submitted to you. I won't go into them in detail. But I want to emphasize that what they wrote to you has been emphasized by three other organizations at least.

First of all, the Ward 3 Democrats passed two resolutions. One of them was on process. I spoke to that when I testified before you in your first hearing. Nobody was really satisfied with how this happened, but I'll pass by that.

Their second resolution, though, was that the parking proposals really did not
meet the needs of the residents in Ward 3. Ward 3 Dems is a fairly diverse grassroots organization. It includes many people, the kind of people I think you would like to have seen here tonight: the typical median family with one or two kids and a minivan. We don't see too many of those people here tonight. They are members of Ward 3 Dems. They come to Ward 3 Dems meetings. They know the burdens now with the lack of parking, as it is, in Ward 3, Cleveland Park in particular.

A similar resolution was passed by CPCA. You heard Susie Taylor's testimony. I thought she did a very nice job talking about the need for more nuanced planning and analysis. Basically people like being hit by one size fits all is essentially a sophomoric approach to the analysis of this issue.

The same kind of resolution was passed by the Business Association of Cleveland Park. They ran into another buzz saw recently. You probably have heard about
the effort to close the service lane in Cleveland Park. Nearly every single business owner put a sign in their front window saying, "Don't Touch Our Service Lane." It was going to eliminate parking. It was going to create a nightmare for traffic, probably increase the accident risk. Luckily, the neighbors joined together with the business association to say, "Let's take a better approach to this."

I think what struck me, in particular, in all of these circumstances was not merely the inadequacy of the analysis. I mean, I mentioned the flawed data that OP has relied upon, the cherry picking of data, the avoidance of the right data, what it would have been against, their proposals. But the fundamental problem of coordinating the planning mechanisms between DDOT, OP, the fire department, the police department, and others shows us that no one of these agencies is really able to comprehend the basic
effects on day-to-day life.

Now, this is not merely quality of life, as some people seem to think. It's efficacy of life. It's the ability of the lower-income persons, sole proprietor who relies upon their vehicle as an entrepreneur to do their day-to-day work, for the mom to carry the kids to school back and forth. We don't hear anything about the basic essential day-to-day challenges that face people in the District. It's not in the documents. It's not been in the presentations. We don't hear anything that's contraindicated being addressed.

So, for example, as solid evidence that if you reduce parking, you are going to have a major effect on an increase in local traffic. There is good data that shows 25 to 30 percent of local traffic is based on the hunt for parking. Has OP indicated that it has even taken this into account?
I could go through a litany of these kinds of pieces of evidence, alternative modes of analysis that really have not been included, let alone has the community had a chance to raise these issues. So I ask you in my last two seconds please read these resolutions. If they have not been submitted to you, I will submit them.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

MR. CHELEN: And read the letters.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much.

MS. CROYDON: Thank you, Chairman Hood. Ms. Tregoning was not present during my testimony, and I would like her to specifically refer to me, Elizabeth Croydon, to see what I had to say. Please excuse me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. CROYDON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

If you all can hold your seats? We may have some questions.

Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rev. Dickerson, can you help me or everybody, frankly? How do you balance when it comes to condo fees? How do you balance the homeowners who paid market and are facing, you know, increases in their condo fees versus the homeowners in the ADU units? How do you balance the acceptance of trying to please everybody in our work together? Do you have any suggestions?

REV. DICKERSON: Well, I mean, you have -- when somebody can purchase a, what, 1.5 million, a million-dollar condo, and then there's another person who is lower income --

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Excuse me for interrupting, but that is one extreme. Really, you know, market rate goes maybe to
600,000. And you may be right that they could afford that.

REV. DICKERSON: They can't balance it. You know, there's -- I don't know how unless you pour a lot of subsidy, as has been tried in other cities and is being given up on because it's just there's not enough subsidy to subsidize this for the rising condo fees, et cetera. They go up, and they go up, and they go up. And these owners are on fixed incomes. They're not able to do this. They're not able to keep up with these costs. And it drives them into financial ruin.

And so far, you're trying to balance it in the building itself that these folks are in. It's really very difficult. And it's not really possible long-term. It doesn't work. And then if they get foreclosed on, what happens? They go back out into the affordable housing market. They're not able to -- you know, we lose the
unit or we lose them. They go back to the -- it's not really saving a unit. So there's another way, we feel, on the ownership side to do this as you can manage it on the rental side, if it's rental.

We just did a lottery for 90 rental units at the city center, and it's work fine with a rental. But ownership is a different thing. And these folks risk everything for that.

And then they get resented by the upper-income owners. It doesn't work socially. It just doesn't work. Their finishes are different. They are in different parts of the building.

We work with eight of these different buildings. And they're stuck. They're trapped. And so it needs to be looked at again to come up with a program that does work.

I don't know. How do you balance it? I don't --
VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.

REV. DICKERSON: I'm saying, basically, it's impossible to balance it.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Is your conclusion, then --

REV. DICKERSON: Economically, it is.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Is your conclusion, then, to eliminate homeownership units --

REV. DICKERSON: No. That's another --

VICE CHAIR COHEN: -- in --

REV. DICKERSON: In the building?

VICE CHAIR COHEN: In buildings but homeownership on a single --

REV. DICKERSON: Homeownership in some of these buildings is just not financially feasible long-term unless you subsidize the condo fees, all of the fees that go up, up, up always going up --

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes.
REV. DICKERSON: -- because the upper-income owners resent that the others don't and all of this.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: No. I understand that.

REV. DICKERSON: They want them to pay it, the same as anybody.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: All right. I do understand your conclusion. Thank you.

REV. DICKERSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

Colleagues, any other questions of this panel? Okay.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Yes, one other. I am going to mispronounce your name. So I am going to call you Mr. City First.

MR. OGUNSANYA: It's Ogunsanya.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

MR. OGUNSANYA: No problem.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'll still mispronounce it probably.

City First, again, is very
involved with homeownership for affordable units. Do you lend in condos or are you totally single family?

MR. OGUNSANYA: Well, we do both single family and condominiums. And what we saw in our initial program, we had a second mortgage program. And we discontinued that because we realized it wasn't, you know, sustainable. And we came up with a new method of a recoverable grant program, where you reduce the price of the unit at a certain percentage so that the homeowner is below 20 percent, is below -- doesn't even require 20 percent to bring to the table, which eliminates PMI. And you still keep your market raise appraisal. So that keeps track with the market.

And when they sell, they show their appreciation and that subsidy is retained to make the property more affordable for the next purchaser, whenever that happens.
VICE CHAIR COHEN: Where are you getting your subsidy, though, to --

MR. OGUNSANYA: Well -- I'm sorry? I didn't hear you.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: I'm sorry. Where do you get your subsidy?

MR. OGUNSANYA: Well, initially we started with funding from the D.C. government. And as time went on, we recycled those funds at resale. So let's say initially we had a $75,000 second mortgage. At resale, it would become, a portion of that, 75, into a grant. And now we can use it for two units, instead of one.

And also we have grants and funders that support our program. And we are able to go into an entire building and offer predevelopment. And when the units come out, the developer agrees for the units to be priced at a certain AMI level. For our program, it's below 120.

We have worked with the DHCD on a
building on 2nd Street: Metropolitan Overlook. And that is 60 percent AMI. And it's the same method. And we do have proof of concept that it works.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: But you can't do it without subsidy from the D.C. government to continue this. Are you now working on your own by just your revolving fund?

MR. OGUNSANYA: Yes. We are working on our own right now. But what we found out is with the initial subsidy that was put into our program, we're able to recycle those funds and still retain the affordability of those homes without requiring additional subsidy for each unit. So what we look at is affordability years of a unit, not just affordability at time of sale or resale.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: And your target is at up to 120 percent of median.

MR. OGUNSANYA: Yes because when
the legislature was passed, that was the
target. It does have to be 120 percent AMI
and below, but our portfolio averages 85
percent AMI. But our portfolio of homes is
affordable to 50 percent AMI of the HUD MSA.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
Miller?

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Just quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Dickerson, Rev.
Dickerson, for all that you have done for
affordable housing and homeownership
opportunities and your organization has done.
We have your written testimony that showed
the algorithm that you referred to in your
testimony and --

REV. DICKERSON: The algorithm
from Hell as a calculation for how they
recalculate the resale prices for the folks,
yes. It's a very difficult program to
administer.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Mr.
Ogunsanya, have you submitted -- thank you.

Have you submitted your testimony in writing? And if you haven't, would you please submit? You said you had some ideas about shared equity. And I don't know if you have ideas about the condo fees issue.

MR. OGUNSANYA: Yes, I do. I do have a copy of my testimony here.

COMMISSIONER MILLER: Do we have it?

MR. OGUNSANYA: And I just wanted to say that I do understand the condo fee issue. It is very tough for a lot of homeowners. And I sympathize with them. But I do believe that IZ is a wonderful program. And both issues can be resolved.

The common trend that I have noticed with a lot of IZ owners that were here or ADU owners was they were never informed or notified or didn't know what was going on. And that is due to lack of, you know, engagement with the homeowner. That's
where our program is different because we are very engaged. And we steward our homeowners and our property from the time they purchase until whenever the sale.

We send them annual service. We provide them discounts. We send them an annual letter reminding them of their covenant and what they have agreed to so that it is not a shock when they are ready to sell that they have to share all the -- they can only sell for a certain price or that they cannot rent their unit.

So I do completely understand the issue with condo fees. I know some states have tried the land trust model and some states have even tried to give tax breaks on the development side so that when the units come online, the co-op fees are less due to the developer getting a tax break.

So City First is definitely open to assisting in any way we can. And we're all for affordable housing.
COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you.

Please submit your testimony in writing at some point. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank this panel. I really appreciate you coming down and providing testimony.

MS. CROYDON: Happy holidays.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Same to you.

Thank you.

Okay. Nancy MacWood, Chris Otten, Cyril Crocker, Tom Quinn. And who else would like to testify? Linda Leaks. I know a few people. Linda Leaks. Who else? Is there anyone else? Okay. You two try to come forward. I think I might have enough, but let's see. If not, we'll do the next panel. Right. Save one seat. Okay. I think we might have -- okay. This gentleman, Cyril, is going to take a seat. I think you
can come up. Sir, you can come on up. Okay. Do we have anyone else left who would like to testify tonight? Okay. Two, three. Okay. We'll do another panel. One person come up now if you'd like, whoever is closer. There you are. You can come on up. Okay. We're going to start on my left, your right. You may begin.

MR. WELLEMEYER: Good evening. My name is Jonathan Wellemeyer. I would like to thank you for your patience and also your endurance. Planning and zoning are generally about looking 10, 25, or even 50 years into the future, but this evening seem to me it's about discussing an archaic regulation so that we might finally catch up with the increasingly less car-dependent urban realities with which we have been living for quite some time. In a greater national discourse, there has been to a large extent a popular preference for markets. The profit motive was supposed to
lead to the best innovation and the most
rational decision-making. I don't always
agree with this. In fact, I often disagree
vehemently. But, however, when a major
developer comes to town ready to put millions
of dollars on the line, I trust that they
have done their research, whether I agree
with the particular development or not.

This is happening right now. The
developer has done market study after market
study and determined they need build only a
certain number of parking spaces to provide
for their tenants and customers.

Yet, when they come to us with
their plan, we say, "Sorry. You need to
build roughly three times as many parking
spaces as you penciled out."

And on top of that, sometimes our
neighbors protest, saying that "If you do not
build three times as many spaces as you'd
like, our neighborhoods will be flooded with
overflow parkers. And I won't be able to
park in front of my building or in my neighborhood."

This leads me to another broader discussion that goes on, which is -- well, first, let’s keep in mind a conservative, highly averaged cost estimate for a single parking space is $40,000, which is more money than I make in a year.

With that in mind, I can come to this or any other major city in this country. And if I say, "I would like a good job with benefits," I am considered entitled. If I come and I expect an affordable place to live with good transportation options, I am called entitled. If I come and I expect good schools and save spaces for my children, I am called entitled. And if I come and I expect affordable, effective health care, I am called entitled or even a socialist. If I, further, come and say I would like one or sometimes even two, three parking spaces, I am simply called an American. It is as if
free parking is my birthright, held higher than some human rights.

And in this recessionary period where we're all asked to adjust our expectations, reexamine our priorities, and essentially revalue every service in society, parking minimums should be near the top of the list. Parking and its related infrastructure represent one of the largest and most invisible subsidies in this country. And we shouldn’t build more than we need. And, further, we should start paying for what we have.

I urge you to please abolish parking minimums. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?

MS. HALSEY: Good evening, commissioners. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Laurel Halsey. I have lived in Washington, D.C. for five years. And at the moment, I work as a custom
framing specialist at International Art and Framing downtown.

I am testifying tonight in favor of lowering the off-street parking minimum requirements. In an effort to explain why, I just wanted to tell a bit of my personal story.

D.C. is a lovely city, and I am in no hurry to leave. During my time here, I have lived on Capitol Hill, Glover Park, and now Petworth, where a little over a year ago, I lucked out in finding a tiny and expensive room in a group house with nice people, who have since become my good friends.

I enjoy being able to easily access so much of this city on my bike from where I live. Biking keeps me healthy, saves me money, is eco-friendly, and contributes almost nothing to traffic congestion.

I also enjoy the many perks my own neighborhood offers, including friendly people, a farmer's market, free concerts.
during the summer, consignment shops with amazing sales, restaurants, and so on. And I can do all of this without breaking the bank or having to rely on a car.

I worry, though, that as Petworth continues to gentrify, I will be gentrified out unless I start earning more money, a prospect which seems unlikely as I have recently decided to pursue my musical and other artistic passions in earnest, rather than focus on landing a higher-paying job.

About a year ago on this pricing out, a friend of mine who used to live on H Street and no longer can afford to, even though he works full-time, I worry that this will happen to my neighbors, too, who are similarly industrious and, yet, not wealthy. Many of them have lived in our neighborhood for years. Many of them have children or are taking care of elderly relatives. And many of them take the bus every day.

My mother, a full-time freelance
editor in her 60s, is another D.C. resident, who at first benefitted from the
gentrification of her neighborhood but is now
being pushed out by it. For the past few
years, until very recently, she lived on
Capitol Hill near Lincoln Park, a beautiful
area she is sad to leave. She loved that she
could walk everywhere, to yoga, to church, to
the store, to Eastern Market, to volunteer as
an ESL teacher, to visit with friends, and so
on. Every once in a while, she would take
the Metro or the bus and, even less, used a
Zipcar.

Her health improved as a result
of the exercise. And because she experienced
so much of her neighborhood on foot, she felt
that it was hers. She would not voluntarily
go back to living in a car-centered
lifestyle, the one that she tolerated for so
long before coming to D.C.

Unfortunately, in spite of all
the money she saved on transportation and her
growing professional success, she is having to move to Texas for a couple of months to save money on rent.

Goodness, time flies.

She hopes to be able to come back and afford to live in D.C. again, but we'll see if she will be able to afford to.

Thank you for your time and attention.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great. Thank you.

Next?

MS. MacWOOD: Good evening. I appreciate the opportunity to testify. I am Nancy MacWood representing the Committee of 100.

We have extensive testimony that tracks the subtitle C bullet points we submitted earlier. Our comments include treatment of nonconformities, number of principal buildings per lot, height measurement, inclusionary zoning, and density
controls. But I will restrict my oral testimony to what must be your favorite topic: parking. We hope, however, that you will consider the entire testimony.

The Committee of 100 agrees with many of the comments opposing the parking proposals. There is no D.C.-based data that we have seen to support reducing the minimum parking requirements. In single family and two-family zones, the requirement for on-street parking would be waived if there is no alley access.

Why would we want to discourage driveways where a family's car or cars could be parked, 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.

In the R-5 and commercial zones,
OP is proposing a single parking requirement that exempts the first 4 residential units and applies one space for every 3 units, which would eliminate the escalating 1 per unit up to 1 for 4-unit current requirement. We have seen no persuasive information that this proposal won't result in exacerbating spillover parking in areas adjoining new multifamily buildings.

The D.C. percentage of households owning cars has been pretty consistent, no big increase or decrease, according to the Census Bureau, for the past 20 years. Without neighborhood-specific data demonstrating that car ownership, on-street demand, and business support lead to the reasonableness of reductions, we believe they will create more frustration and anger in neighborhoods due to spillover.

There is no guarantee that without parking, new units will be more affordable. If you want to ensure a
connection between parking and affordability, you might consider continuing the requirement of 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 for you.

In my neighborhood, a building on Wisconsin Avenue was converted to housing. And the one space per three-unit parking requirement was provided. And 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 the tenants consume. We recommend that the minimum parking requirements continue and be reduced only by special exception.
For similar reasons, 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.

The 50 percent reduction in
minimum parking requirement proposal should be eliminated until there are targeted studies and proposals per the comprehensive plan, the reason the 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. This seems a more appropriate role for the Council through the comprehensive plan. And so far they have only suggested using parking maximums as a 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.

    Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Great. Thank you.

Next?

MS. LEAKS: Thank you. Thank you for allowing me to testify.

    I will be brief. I just want to make two points, a couple of points. One is I would ask for more time to review the zoning amendments. One month is insufficient. And I would love if we could have more time.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Excuse me. Can you give us your name? I didn't have your name.

MS. LEAKS: Yes. My name is Linda Leaks.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Thank you.

MS. LEAKS: I work with a group called Justice Advocacy Alliance. And we do work around advocacy.
Okay. And the second point I want to make is there are -- and I know this is a reminder, but there are 600-plus families living in D.C. General Shelter. There are 70,000 low-income family names on the DCHA's waiting list. There are 6,000 individuals right this minute sleeping on the streets outside at least. There are more than 300 families in hotels and motels around here, especially on whatever that highway is going out of town here in D.C.

The minimum wage here in D.C. is $8.25. And that means that if you have a job making minimum wage, you make $330 per week. That means that you make $1,300 per month. That's a problem. I just want to remind you that the National Low-Income Housing Coalition says that the D.C. rental housing wage is $25 per hour. That's what you need to make in order to afford housing in D.C.

I want to just remind you of the income categories in this city. We have
moderate income. We have low income. We have very low income. And we have extremely low income.

And, finally, I just want to say you have the power to require developers who get all of those benefits, you know, incentive benefits -- you know what those benefits are -- to make IZ units and ADU units available to residents in the income category of 30 percent of AMI and below, 30 percent and below. So please, please, please do it.

And I appreciate the opportunity to share that information with you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.

Next?


The key thing we wanted to touch on tonight was affordability in the District
of Columbia and truth in affordability. As Ms. Leaks has pointed out, we have a serious crisis. Chapter 1 and chapter 5 of our D.C. comprehensive plan, going back to 2006, acutely highlights this crisis. Yet, despite the several years that OP has undergone the zoning rewrite, nothing has been done that we can tell to change IZ to make it stronger in terms of eligibility.

Tonight we heard about problems with implementation. I don't know if that is on the Zoning Commission. That might be more of a DHCD issue. But we know the Zoning Commission sets the eligibility criteria and amounts of units created. And in Adams Morgan, the affordability crisis is real, is quite real. And we want to propose several ideas.

Certainly, Commissioner Cohen, I heard you mention the HUD metric of AMI being the only metric we could use. If that is the case, we need to lower the ratios, right, in
In terms of the actual eligibility issues and the creation of housing to contend with this crisis, we just don't understand why the Office of Planning didn't contend with an eight percent requirement for a serious bonus density that developers get. Montgomery County requires 12.5 percent without any bonus density. So that number needs to change. We want it to be doubled, to 16 percent at the very least, in any new development. And, as well, obviously the issue of eligibility is a question. Those numbers need to be lowered to truly affect D.C.'s affordability crisis.

Now, what we're hearing instead, it's interesting because the affordability does touch on the parking issue and does touch on more time. Clearly OP needs more
time to look at these IZ regs to make them better and so that we have something to bring to you all that's from them that has actually changed it to address our affordability issues and crisis.

You know, using the concept that eliminating parking is going to make buildings cheaper, that that is going to be passed on to the public basically is a complete disregard of corporate behavior. You know, I worked on Wall Street for two and a half years. And I reviewed several Fortune 500 budgets during that time. The corporate behavior I know is any savings they make goes right to the top. This is the CEOs and directors. It might trickle down to some of the consumers very infrequently.

So the point is that, you know, reducing parking, right now it is really our only bargaining chip, as has been pointed out by Ms. MacWood, for the communities to right now have a set amount of parking that is
required and work back from there as needed.

Adams Morgan, we're at complete
capacity on-street parking. That came out
through a BZA case, 20-506, through DDOT's
reports. We're at capacity. So, you know,
working a situation into the zoning regs,
again, something that we would have expected
OP to really analyze and prepare for you all,
is analysis of how to explicitly include in
the zoning regs ways to reduce parking
requirements but increase affordability in
housings tangibly. That hasn't been done.
We know it is done that way through off-site
housing requirements for offices.

There is a whole series of
regulations that require a certain percentage
of off-site housing when offices are
proposed. We can do the same thing with
parking. And so just eliminate parking does
not eliminate people coming into the city
with cars and does not eliminate people
moving into these buildings with cars. It is
just not substantiated.

There are some good signs that we have seen from the BZA and this Commission in terms of binding covenants to prevent people that move into those buildings from getting RPPs. That could be something written into the zoning regs as well. And that is something positive.

I guess I just want to conclude on the fact that clearly dealing with the affordability crisis is going to need more time. My ANC has passed, or Adams Morgan ANC has passed, a resolution asking for more time, along with, I know, many ANCs around the city. This is definitely required to contend with the affordability issues and crisis we have in a real way through our zoning regs.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much.

Next?
MR. CROCKER: Good evening, commissioners. My name is Cyril Crocker, and I am a resident of Ward 5 in the District of Columbia. I have come tonight to state why I feel that reducing the parking requirements for developments in the District is a good idea.

First, I believe our parking regulations should reflect the realities of the community. We simply are no longer a city made up exclusively of car-dependent residents. More and more citizens in our expanding population have chosen to seek alternative means of transport.

On a personal note, when I turned 16, I had already been taking driver's education classes in school and had obtained a learner's permit. Within a week of my birthday, I had a license and was driving my dad's hand-me-down car. In contrast, I have an 18-year-old son and a 21-year-old, neither of whom has even gotten a driver's license.
They simply don't view it as necessary. Additionally, the reality is that, unlike when I was growing up, the District offers many viable alternatives to car ownership.

As our city continues to prosper, more and more neighborhoods are fortunate enough to have retailers beginning to return to them. So there are amenities for our residents within walking distance.

Mixed-use developments bring offices, stores, and residents together and reduce the need for long commutes with heavy parking requirements at each end of the trip.

Telecommuting options further the elimination of automobile dependence. Internet shopping actually brings back the time when one of the primary reasons for visiting brick and mortar stores is for the social experience. And smart retailers are locating where there is easy access to as many shoppers as possible without having to acquire excess acres for surface parking or
incurring needless expense and providing several stories of structured parking that go unused.

With densification encouraged at or near Metro stations, residents have access to much of the capital 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 automobiles when the residents of these units have clearly chosen to live in an environment that supports alternative means of transportation.

Thank you for your time and attention.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.

Next?

MR. QUINN: Good evening. My
name is Tom Quinn. I am an ANC commissioner on ANC 3E, representing the eastern side of Friendship Heights, but, to be explicitly clear, I am not testifying tonight on behalf of ANC 3E. But, as this body is well-aware, ANC 3E has demonstrated with its actions before this Commission that it can support parking-free buildings in the appropriate context.

The source of the fiercest opposition to the Office of Planning's proposed changes in both earlier drafts and the current draft has been the changes in required parking minimums. And, frustratingly, the Office of Planning has significantly compromised on the original proposal to create transit corridors with no required parking minimums to the point where the current proposal on parking minimums goes too far to appease opponents. The status quo of minimum parking requirements in areas with abundant transit service has been a failure.
My own experience as a resident of Ward 3 suggests Wisconsin Avenue corridor is already oversaturated with off-street commercial parking spaces. Yet, we also have communities with streets swamped by drivers seeking out free parking on residential side streets.

In Friendship Heights, none of the commercial parking garages have high occupancy rates, not during the week, not during the holiday season, and definitely not on the weekend. And utilization rate is so low that one commercial building is no longer open for weekend parking.

A similar situation exists in Tenleytown. Despite featuring free validated parking, the two primary commercial parking lots in Tenleytown are both underutilized.

Despite this, all of the recent proposals for new residential and commercial projects in upper Northwest have included massive numbers of parking spaces that in
most cases greatly exceed what is required under the current zoning law.

Some examples, the American University new law school in Tenleytown will have 400 parking spaces. Fifty-three thirty-three Connecticut Avenue will have 214 parking spaces for 261 units. Park Van Ness will have 226 parking spaces for 273 units. The proposed new Safeway, Wisconsin and Ellicott, will have 340 parking spaces for approximately 220 units and a new grocery store. And across the street from that, at the Martin's site, the latest proposal for that had 175 parking spaces for approximately 200 apartments.

So this shines a light on the fact that under the current law, the existing minimums have done nothing to discourage the inclusion of high ratios of parking spaces. And given the percentage of car-free households in the District, particularly multi-unit buildings, if anything, these
recent developments suggest that the Office of Planning should have kept its proposal for parking minimums. These facts highlight just what a compromise the current proposal represents.

Finally, I would like to add that on-street parking pressure and the associated traffic along with the frustration residents feel when they have trouble finding parking to their homes is a real concern for some people in my single-member district. 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 is 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 reductions in parking minimums --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. We appreciate it. Thank you.

Next?

MR. CAPIELLO: Good evening, everybody. My name is Mickey Capiello. And I want to thank every one of you guys for your service to this city.

Well, I came to D.C. to start a new life. It's about four years I'm in this city. And I think it's just an amazing, wonderful city and a city that -- it's the nation's capital, a city on which the whole world looks upon. And I also think that what we're going to do as a city in the next year is going to change the landscape of the city for the next 100 years. And it's an opportunity for this city and us as people to set the tone for every other city in America. America pays attention to Washington, D.C.

I came to the city to start a new
life. It's a life of recovery. I right now live in a recovery home that will be closed shortly along with two others in the Northwest section of Washington, D.C. The Union Mission has since left. And A Woman's Face on 10th Street has since left. And I'm also an architect student. And I'm an artist as well. And the City of Washington, D.C. has given me that opportunity to pursue those two.

And I feel like someone like me and many others would love to give back to the city as well, but it's become unaffordable. I'm one of those people who hasn't made 30,000 yet, but I will shortly. I know I will.

And I think as a city and as a people and when I look at the government -- and I am learning a lot about this city since I have been here, how it is set up. I think it is amazing that you have the four quadrants, you have your Office of
Planning and your Zoning Commission and you have these local ANCs. And I really, really think that these local ANCs, you know, they really understand the pulse of each neighborhood. And I guess what I'm asking is for the Office of Planning and the Zoning Commission to delay for six months and allow the ANCs to be able to respond and maybe together with the ANCs and the Commission work together for better zoning rewrites and make the city affordable for everybody.

You know, what makes this city great is its public spaces: Union Station. And there are people that maintain and keep facilities like Union Station, the Metro Center, but they don't have places to live any more. You know, we are being forced out. And all we are asking is affordable housing for everybody, black, white, gay, straight, old, young, everybody, to live in one building together and to keep the neighborhoods intact. And I think we can all
do that together. That's all we're asking.

I'm all for gentrification. I'm an architecture student. And I think the city has so much potential. But I guess what I am saying is together we can all work through this. But we just need more time. That's all.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very much. We appreciate everyone's testimony.

Let's see if we have any questions. Any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not any questions of this panel. We appreciate your testimony. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Is there anybody left that wants to testify? Please come up now. I see somebody trying to get up. Please come up. Take a seat. Let's do this quickly because we want to hear your testimony.

MR. FLANAGEN: I'll be brief.
VICE CHAIR COHEN: Okay. I assume that these are the last two witnesses. So, please, I'm going to start with the gentleman first.

MR. FLANAGEN: Thank you very much.

My name is Neil Flanagen. I am actually a 26-year resident of the District of Columbia. I am the sole millennial in Ward 3 Vision. And I really want to say, first, that the sort of generational gap that has been proposed by so many people in these hearings should be -- we need to focus on the solutions that work for all people and all people are in proportion to their percentage here -- not percentage here but their need, rather.

Thanks to all who have spoken about the issue of affordability in the city. I think it is a serious problem that we are all facing. I hope we can find a solution.

I want to speak exclusively as an
individual working towards a licensure in architecture that what I have found in my relatively limited practice has been quite interesting. First is that the effect of architectural ideology on the current zoning, the idea of an architect zoning, and parking minimums, particularly in the anti-urban policies that were quite popular and were related, similarly, to the freeways that were attempted to be built in D.C. in the 1950s, are closely intertwined with the parking minimums in the sense of the idea that we have to require parking.

Similarly, that same period is extraordinarily hostile to cities and the lives many of the people, including my parents, chose to undertake when they came to D.C.

The second point is that we need to emphasize not just one size fits all but percentage changes in the way that, for example, I don't need to drive. There's no
reason why the city should be subsidizing my
efforts to drive. I am completely able-
bodied and quite fit and don't face danger in
the streets to the degree that certain
populations, particularly women, do.

But there are those who do need
to drive, particularly those who are elderly.
And the city should make specific and
explicit accommodations for those who have
needs. Particularly, the handicapped parking
spaces originally attempted are something
that should be continued.

And, finally, the things that I
want to emphasize, that the reduction of
parking minimums increases flexibility for
architects. There is nothing like having a
mismatch between the curtain wall and the
column grid to ruin the aesthetic of a
building and also to make difficult and be
considering that the congruent is almost
always driven by the ability to fit spaces,
parking spaces, underneath the building.
For example, at the Babes development, the Tenley View, or Bond at Tenley, whatever it may be, it is quite exciting to me that we were able to save the existing one-story structure to not excavate and produce landfill and a high-carbon footprint through sheeting and shoring as well as excavation and, thereby, save a significant amount of carbon while also lowering the cost. How frequently does that happen to the building process?

And I hope that we are able to find several pieces within zoning regulation that can improve affordability and also flexibility for all residents.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

Next, please.

MS. STEWART: Good evening. My name is Jean Stewart. And I appreciate the opportunity to add my two cents. I am a federal retiree. I have lived in the
District for 43 years, most of it in Ward 1 and Adams Morgan. I have particularly loved Adams Morgan as a neighborhood because of its terrific diversity, its liveliness, the fact that all different economic levels live there, all kinds of ethnic groups, and all ages.

And I have seen, obviously, some changes. There has been some gentrification. It's whiter than it used to be, and I think the income level has gone up. But I don't want to see it become something that it hasn't been for 43 years. I don't want to see it look like a lot of other urban areas or suburban areas that are all chain stores and upper income folks. And I am just very much afraid of what the current trends are going to lead to that. And I would really like to have the additional time -- 180 days sounds fine -- so that our neighborhood organizations and the other neighborhood organizations can really look at the plans.
I'd really like to compare it with the city's comprehensive plan, which talk about the desirability of maintaining and fostering diverse neighborhoods and fostering neighborhoods where everybody can live, not just affluent folks. And that includes retirees like me, although I am fortunate enough to have a very good pension, but I know a lot of retirees are not. And I would like to see, you know, much more affordable housing so people like the previous gentleman, who is just getting started and hasn't made his first 30,000 yet, would also have a decent place to live in the city.

And so I just really would like to reiterate what so many of the other folks here have said: the need to really look carefully at how we can maximize housing, decent housing, for all income levels, and resolve the crisis that I think we really
have now with homelessness and homeless families and people like me feeling like they're, you know, middle class people, soon not going to be able to live here because we can't afford it.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR COHEN: And thank you.

Commissioners, are there any questions for these final testimonies?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIR COHEN: Thank you for your testimony, appreciate it, your coming down and staying so late.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. As the Vice Chair says, we want to appreciate all of those who hung in here with us tonight.

Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else?

MS. SCHELLIN: Nothing else this evening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So tomorrow night at 6:00 o'clock, we will be asking our
questions of the Office of Planning and DDOT.

Okay. So with that --

MS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. The announcement about the correction on the training time.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, they won't hear me.

MS. SCHELLIN: Do you want to make that announcement?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We're still in session. We'll be out shortly.

 Last night I made a mistake and announced that we were going to have closed training from 9:00 to 12:00 on December the 10th. That training is from 1:00 to 4:00. So I just wanted to correct that announcement yesterday of our closed meeting for training.

Anything else, Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, with that, this hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter...
was concluded at 10:27 p.m.)