

“Open Agenda” Notes for the September 26, 2017 meeting of ANC1D

Agenda approval

Public discussion

“Each Commission shall set aside a portion of each public meeting *to hear the views of residents* within the Commission area and other affected persons on problems or issues of concern within the Commission area and on proposed District government actions that affect the Commission area.”

Committee reports:

Transportation (Jon)

Public Space (Stuart)

Housing (Paul)

Secretary’s report

Minutes of the July 25 meeting (draft sent out July 26).

Request instruction to provide, upon request, letters of support for stipulated liquor licenses for the Paisley Fig and Pear Plum restaurants.

Treasurer’s report

Consent items: Checks to James True, \$75, postering for the September meeting; HearSay Interpreting, \$100, interpreting at the September meeting; Julio Lopez, \$30, for assistance at the September meeting. Reimbursement to Jack for website hosting, \$144, approved at the July meeting.

FY18 budget

Unfinished business

New business

1. Renew Class B Retailer's liquor licenses

Resolved, that ANC1D advises the Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration (ABRA) to renew all the Class B retailer's licenses in Mount Pleasant:

ABRA-083128 Ramos Market, inc. International Progreso Market
ABRA-088966 Hanmi Corp Best World Supermarket
ABRA-092449 Each Peach, LLC Each Peach Market
ABRA-024753 David & Cindy Incorporated Samber Food Store
ABRA-076413 Myungjoon, Inc. Los Primos

2. on DDOT's options for the 16th St bus lanes (Jon)

Resolved, that ANC1D advises the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) of the following with regard to the 16th St NW Bus Lanes Project:

- * That Mount Pleasant remains strongly opposed to the elimination of the Newton St and Lamont St stops, per its resolution of April 25, 2016;
- * That before the end of the year, DDOT should share data with ANC 1D about the resulting service improvements, if any, from this summer's adjustment of the relative frequency of express buses (S9) versus local buses (S1, S2, S4);
- * That the use of overhead lane controls at the Mount Pleasant St/Harvard St/Columbia Rd intersection, expressed as options 2A and 5A in DDOT's current plans, are preferable to other proposed options for controlling traffic on the proposed reversible lane between Arkansas Avenue and U Street;
- * That it welcomes a reversible traffic lane between Arkansas Avenue and U Street;
- * That it strongly encourages DDOT to pursue a lane configuration that features both a reversible traffic lane between Arkansas Avenue and U Street (as in Options 2 and 5) and a dedicated rush hour bus lane between Arkansas Avenue and P Street for both the morning and evening rush hours (as in Option 4), or, if this is not feasible, to explain to the public why not, in clear, unambiguous, and detailed terms;
- * That DDOT should consider deploying Transit Signal Priority technology both on local buses (S1, S2, S4) and at intersections north of Arkansas Avenue.

Why: While most aspects of the 16th St Bus Lanes Project improve bus service for all, the elimination of local bus stops involves a stark, qualitative loss of service for local bus riders, generally more vulnerable residents, in exchange for a marginal improvement for commuters. This past summer's service adjustment already favored express bus riders over local bus riders, and we ask DDOT to update us about the effects of the service adjustment. Our stops exist due to street layout, locations of institutions, and residential density. Despite not meeting the national average for ideal distance between bus stops, these specific factors cannot be wished away.

A reversible middle lane for traffic between Arkansas Avenue and U Street makes sense. To control the reversible lane, the overhead signals as described in Options 2A and 5A are a good choice. However, the central premise of this project is a dedicated rush hour bus lane. Why hasn't DDOT presented an option with both a reversible traffic lane and a full-length dedicated bus lane for both morning and evening rush hours? They do not seem mutually exclusive. We ask DDOT to provide a new option with both a reversible traffic lane and a full-length dedicated rush hour bus lane, or explain why such a configuration is infeasible.

Finally, Transit Signal Priority technology has now been deployed on the S9 express buses. Given that TSP tends to work best when traffic is not too congested, we ask DDOT to consider using TSP on local buses, particularly at night when they are crowded and move slowly because of on-street parking. Late night bus service is important to service industry workers, who could use a few minutes shaved off their nightly commutes. We are also concerned about the prevalence of bus bunching at the Spring Street stop during the morning rush-hour. Further extending TSP along 16th Street could be a low-impact option to mitigate bus bunching.

3. Resolution On 1739 And 1745 Harvard St Nw Special Exception Requests (Stuart)

Resolved, that ANC 1D advises the District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment to deny the applications for rear additions at 1739 Harvard St NW and 1745 Harvard St NW, request updated burden of proof statements in both applications that directly address the concerns raised by residents within a 200 foot radius, and request a shadow study in the application for 1739 Harvard St NW.

Why: ANC 1D advises that the Board of Zoning Adjustment (BZA) take the above actions because members of ANC 1D believe more information would be helpful in making an informed recommendation regarding these applications.

The BZA has requested that ANC 1D provide advice on applications for rear additions because of new zoning regulations that became effective in September 2016. Under these new regulations (11-E DCMR § 5201), homeowners in rowhouse areas (RF-1 zones) seeking a rear addition of greater than 10 feet in length must show that their addition will not have an undue adverse effect on neighboring properties. The homeowners show that their addition will not have an undue adverse effect through an application to the Board of Zoning Adjustment. The BZA requests input from the ANC during review of these applications.

ANCs have an opportunity to provide advice against the approval standards set forth in the regulation. The regulation reads as follows:

5201.3 An applicant for special exception under this section shall demonstrate that the proposed addition or accessory structure shall not have a substantially adverse effect on the use or enjoyment of any abutting or adjacent dwelling or property, in particular:

(a) The light and air available to neighboring properties shall not be unduly affected;

(b) The privacy of use and enjoyment of neighboring properties shall not be unduly compromised;

(c) The addition or accessory structure, together with the original building, as viewed from the street, alley, and other public way, shall not substantially visually intrude upon the character, scale, and pattern of houses along the subject street frontage;

(d) In demonstrating compliance with paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of this subsection, the applicant shall use graphical representations such as plans, photographs, or elevation and section drawings sufficient to represent the relationship of the proposed addition or accessory structure to adjacent buildings and views from public ways; and

(e) The Board of Zoning Adjustment may approve lot occupancy of all new and existing structures on the lot up to a maximum of seventy percent (70%).

ANC 1D will defer to the BZA and Historic Preservation Review Board to make determinations on sections (c), (d), and (e) above. ANC 1D chose to focus our advice to the BZA on sections (a) and (b).

In reviewing the applications for these rear additions, ANC 1D has determined that the applicants' burden of proof statements do not provide enough information for the ANC to make a determination on the requirements in sections (a) and (b). Specifically, the applications do not

directly address the concerns of neighbors in opposition to this project. As the burden of proof rests on the applicants to show that their projects do not have an undue adverse affect on neighboring properties, and the applicants failed to meet that burden of proof, the ANC's advice to the BZA is as appears at the top of this resolution.

As everyday residents of Mount Pleasant in addition to our roles as ANC commissioners, we recognize the need of homeowners for increased living space. We understand that our fellow community members--like ourselves--hope to stay in Mount Pleasant for the foreseeable future. However, as commissioners, we also must abide by legal controls that prevent the possible undue adverse effects of additions on neighboring properties. We therefore encourage the applicants and those opposed to these projects to communicate openly about how these additions may be possible.