

My name is Ken Archer and I am a Georgetown homeowner where I live with my wife and 3-year-old son. The rewrite of the District's zoning code being led by the Office of Planning is one of the most consequential initiatives in District government right now. I am here with two clear messages for the Committee.

First, the openness and inclusiveness of the process led by OP are a model for government agencies and are beyond reproach. Any claim to the contrary is simply incredible. Every person that has voiced objections to any OP proposal has been afforded multiple in-person meetings. Most of them have been included onto the Citizens Task Force, including Ms Gates who just testified as well as her colleague Nancy MacWood of the Citizens of 100. There have been endless Zoning Commission hearings open to public testimony and will continue to be this Summer. This has been perhaps the lengthiest period of public comment of various forms for any government initiative in recent District history.

Second, I want to bring to your attention, Mr Chairman, one important area of zoning reform which is particularly vulnerable to individuals who are fully taking advantage of the openness that OP has instituted in its process. This area is Accessory Dwelling Units.

The Office of Planning is proposing to correct the misguided prohibitions on renting out a portion of one's house or renting out one's detached garage. These are known as Internal ADUs and External ADUs. It is critical that homeowners be allowed to rent out internal ADUs and external ADUs by right for several reasons.

First, we expect to add 100,000 jobs to the District in the coming years. If we don't add that many residences, we will add 100,000 commuting cars into and out of the city every day. Every opponent of allowing ADUs by right also opposes an increase in commuting traffic cutting through our neighborhoods. But they can't have it both ways. Do we want to allow more density in existing homes in order to reduce cut-through commuting traffic? Or do we want to increase cut-through commuting traffic by continuing to ban ADUs? It's one, or it's the other.

Second, affordable housing is a critical issue for the District. Elderly residents in larger homes than they need who struggle to pay their mortgage are able to age in place by renting out a portion of their home or their garage. That's why the AARP has taken a stand in support of allowing ADUs by right. While opponents of ADUs sometimes try to link it to a smart growth movement of transient young residents, this characterization is undermined by the AARP's support for ADUs.

In my neighborhood of Georgetown, I know several residents who support allowing Internal and External ADUs by right. They know that nanny flats and carriage houses bring in younger residents who are more likely to send kids to public schools, less likely to spend much of each year away in second homes, and more likely to support neighborhood amenities.

Unfortunately, a couple Citizens Association members and ANC commissioners have communicated repeatedly to OP that Georgetown is opposed to OP's proposal on ADUs. There are legitimate exceptions in the new regulations that Georgetowners are more unified in support of – such as wider side yards – and OP should include these exceptions into a Georgetown district. But there is a sincere

difference of opinion amongst Georgetowners on the issue of ADUs. In that environment I think OP should hear out every side as they have and then make the decision that they believe is the right decision for the next 50 years. And this committee should hold OP accountable for doing that as well.

Opponents of by right ADUs point to the potential onslaught of students into the neighborhood. I and the Office of Planning have fought the Georgetown campus plan as hard as anyone, but what OP has said in its report on the Campus Plan and what the Georgetown Citizens Association has said in its filings and testimony is that the student group housing problem is a demand-side problem, and is being addressed on the demand side.

Opposition to by right ADUs is not about students, Mr Chairman, it's about fear of a generationally and economically diverse neighborhood and the impact of . Allowing by right ADUs will not reduce the home values of Georgetown homes – it will increase home values by improving the vitality and amenities in the neighborhood.

Other areas where sensible public policy objectives risk being jeopardized by parochial interests include parking maximums, which the Zoning Commission supported and is expecting to see fleshed out in more detail this Summer. They will be surprised when they see that Parking Maximums are gone, presumably because a couple developers said that parking maximums, even with special exception relief, will hard economic development in the city by scaring away developers.

I would encourage you and your excellent staff, Mr Chairman, to join my in thanking the Office of Planning for their model of openness in public policy formation, and in watching very closely areas like ADUs and parking maximums that are so important to the future of the city.