

Transcript

April 3, 2025, 3:52PM



Jesick, Matthew (OP) 7:22

Hi folks.

Thanks for joining us.

My name is Matt Jessek and I'm with the office of Planning.

I think maybe we'll wait one more minute just to see if a few other folks join us, but thanks for signing on.

Well, maybe I'll go ahead and get started and other folks can join us along the way. If they're running late.

So thanks again everyone for being here.

My name is Matt Jessica.

I'm a development review specialist with the Office of Planning.

And joining me today is Joel Lawson, the associate director at the Office of Planning for Development Review.

And we're excited to have you guys here with us.

We are looking forward to getting ANC feedback on the office of Planning's latest proposed zoning text amendment and this is to address issues that we've seen over the years regarding alley lots.

Hopefully you can hear me.

Hopefully you can see my presentation on the screen, but give me a sign if any of those technical issues crop up.

And before we get into the meeting, just to let everyone know, we are recording this, it will be posted on our website for anyone who couldn't make this meeting.

Or the the meeting on Tuesday that we had those meetings will be available to view on the website as well as the presentation itself.

So thanks again for joining us.

We want to get your feedback before we present any proposed text amendments to the zoning Commission.

We're having these two ANC meetings this week.

And what I'll do, I'll give a short presentation about Alley lots and what our proposals are to change the regulations for alley lots.

And then we can have a discussion about it. It looks like we have a smaller group

today. So I think we have a nice sort of informal discussion.

Just right off the bat is a quick overview. The three areas, the three primary areas that we're looking at.

In the regulations are the subdivision rules for alley lots the use regulations for alley lots and then development standards, which are things like lot occupancy and yard requirements.

It's certainly not rewriting the whole rule book on Ali.

Lots. It's not a complete overhaul.

We feel the changes are fairly targeted, but we hope they'll be useful to folks.

And property owners.

So how did we get here?

The real impetus was from the zoning Commission, who heard a previous alley lot text Amendment Case 1913 approved about five years ago, and we can get into what that was about.

It addressed 1 issue with Alley lots.

But at that time, at the hearing for that case, they heard from alley lot owners saying we really needed to go farther.

The the changes at that time.

Time were not sufficient to really address their concerns about alley lots, and I think that resonated with the zoning Commission and so they asked us to give it a further study.

And so that's what this current text amendment is all about.

And since that time, we've also heard from the the BCA.

That's the Board of zoning adjustment that the alley lot rules really need a second look.

We've heard from the alley lot owners over the years with giving us their feedback, and then even an agency like DC Water.

They have their thoughts on how alley lot should be developed if we are to make any changes to the regulations.

And then finally, we also.

So always on all of our projects take guidance from the comprehensive plan and the comprehensive plan certainly supports, you know any opportunities for new housing, but also in general better utilization of underutilized lots, especially when they're in transit, rich or very walkable neighborhoods.

So that's kind of how this current text amendment came about.

Now, just as a refresher.

I think probably many of you have dealt with all the lots in your Anc's, but just to review and how a lot is a lot that, as its name suggests, only fronts on an alley and has no St. frontage.

So all of the regulations that were talking about today.

Would only impact Alley lots, not street facing lots.

And I should also say some folks have raised a question about this particular image this was.

An example image that we picked, but allelot certainly come in all different shapes and sizes and configurations and relationships to the street facing lots.

So this is just one example.

As we've gotten into this process, we've started to collect data about alley lots.

Including where they're located.

And they they are all over the city more or less. But there are concentrations where you might expect in the older rohome neighborhoods like Capitol Hill and Georgetown.

And some mayansies hardly have any. You know, we have Anc's with one or two ally lots.

So the changes may have more interest today.

Some agencies than others.

Some other data we're trying to collect.

For the existing uses on alley lots, we know that you know many are used for residential today commercial uses.

Parking in some regards for gardens, some are just vacant.

So we want to try and quantify that.

Also, the width of the alleys.

How wide are the alleys upon which these lots sit? That may impact how they can be used in the future.

That's some of the data that we're we're working on collecting.

So that's just a little bit of background.

I think we can maybe get into the regulations a little bit now and again that first area that we're looking at are the subdivision rules and we're not really changing many of these.

One area we are looking at is the required alley width for an alley lot subdivision.

Right now 24 feet is required.

And we're proposing to reduce that to 15 feet.

15 feet is a common alley within the district and based on our experience, many of the lots that we deal with.

Are on 15 foot alleys.

Certainly not all.

Some would still fall below that standard.

And again, that's something we're trying to quantify.

We're not changing the lot area minimum for a matter of right projects, not changing the frontage requirements or how lots can be combined or converted today.

One thing we are looking at is.

Creating a special exception mechanism.

So the Board of Zoning adjustment can review any proposals that may fall below the minimum standards.

OK. And the the next area that we're looking at is the use permissions on alley lots.

And let's start with our R1 and R2 zones.

These are our low density, detached and semi detached residential zones.

And today you cannot do residential on an alley lot in those zones.

And what we're proposing is that they more closely match what you can do on a street facing lot. That is one principal unit plus an accessory unit and the ability to do that accessory unit would either be a matter of right. If your lot is over the lot.

Area minimum threshold or a special exception process would be required if you're under the minimum lot area threshold.

A similar mechanism would apply in the R3 zones, where today you're allowed one unit per lot.

We are proposing that you also be allowed.

An accessory unit and R3 is one of our row house zones.

RF is another very common row house zone where today you can do one unit per lot.

We're proposing similar to the other zones that I mentioned, that you can do 2 units.

In this case, it'd be two principal units, and again that be based on the lot area that you have if you're.

Were below the minimum would either be a matter of right or a special exception.

And then in the RA zones, which are our apartment zones.

We were, we proposed 2 units per lot where today you can do one unit per lot.

Also, for residential zones, there is another lot with or excuse me an alley with

requirement and that's 24 feet.

Today we proposed to reduce that to 15 feet in all cases.

You can do it down to 15 in some instances today. If you're within 300 feet of a street, we want that to apply universally.

And then there is a special exception mechanism today. If you fall below that standard, we would not be changing that.

That would still exist.

All of the other uses on alley lots would remain unchanged. Everything from agriculture to storage those would.

Those would not change.

And if I'm going too quickly through anything, we we can come back at the end and spend as much time as we need on any particular questions that you might have.

A.

Use permissions in commercial zones.

We are not changing anything here today on an alley lot.

You can do whatever you can do on a street facing lot.

And that would remain the same going forward.

Now the third area we're looking at is the development standards and this is getting more into the nitty gritty of the regulations.

So I'll try and hit the highlights.

You know, in our lower density zones.

We we certainly expect you know more openness, a little bit more greenery. So to reflect that intent of those zones, we actually want to make the lot of occupancy requirements more strict.

Right now.

Now 80%.

Is the most restrictive lot occupancy, and in fact there's not a maximum for the smallest lots.

Well, we're proposing to actually start at 80% lot occupancy and then step down to 40%.

For the largest lots, and that would match what we have on Street facing lots today.

So hopefully this would help maintain the openness of the R1 and R2 zones.

Similarly for yards in the R1 zone, we want to increase the yard requirement in those zones right now, five feet is required.

We want to bump that up to 8 feet in the R1.

On height for alley lot buildings and you'll see this in all of the zones that we go through.

20 feet is allowed today.

We want to bump that up two feet to 22 feet and that would align with what's permitted today for accessory buildings.

On to the RF zones. Again, these are our row house zones.

No real substantive changes here.

I mentioned the height that we'd be tweaking. Also clarification to the wording for the yard requirements, but it would still be 5 feet.

Now RA, these are our apartment zones. It's interesting.

There's no a lot of occupancy prescribed for all lots today, so we want to insert a standard and we're borrowing this language from the row house zones. So it would match up.

Now many of you are familiar with section 5201 of the regulations.

This comes through the Anc's fairly often, which is sort of a blanket special exception.

It applies both the street facing lots and alley lots, but they're not quite consistent.

We want to add the ability to secretly from a lot of occupancy for alley lots where it doesn't exist today and that would match up with our street facing lots.

And then the final, you know, major change we're looking at just like in the RA zones, we are inserting a lot of occupancy provision in the MU zones.

These are our mixed-use zones which are typical on commercial corridors.

So we would just be applying a standard where none exists today.

And that's it. As far as the major text changes.

As far as text amendments go, we do feel this one's fairly targeted, but we hope it will be helpful to property owners and neighbors in the Anc's as well.

Just wanted to talk about process a little bit.

We're having these ANC meetings this week and you know we view this as an initial contact with the ANC as we anticipate future meetings.

You know, this zoning Commission process will be like any other zoning Commission process from the Anc's point of view. You will get notice from the Office of Zoning prior to any public hearing.

You'll be given great weight in front of the zoning Commission.

You can provide written testimony, oral testimony.

At any hearing.

So it should be a similar process to what you're used to for other zoning Commission

cases.

And I should say also we really appreciate you being here taking time out of your day. And I know office of planning has reached out to ancsc a lot lately and there's more to come.

So but we appreciate you guys.

Giving us.

Put on all of these projects, especially this one today, of course. But thanks for that. As I think I mentioned, we are in pretty constant contact with a group of valley lot owners. We're meeting with them again tomorrow to kind of go over the same information.

We'll continue outreach to other city agencies.

We've already reached out to FEM, as we've heard from DC water, we'll reach out to DPW.

D.

Maybe do EE to get their feedback?

Back on these changes.

Continue collecting data also on our lots like I mentioned and with all that we'll prepare a written report to the Zoning Commission and we hope to present it to them in May.

That's what we're shooting for.

That's the set down meeting.

If anyone's not familiar with that term, that's just the meeting where the zoning Commission decides if a project is ready to move forward to a public hearing. And they may send us back to the drawing board, or they may move us forward. Or or, you know, give us some suggestions.

It's really up to them. Assuming they do kind of send us forward towards a public hearing, that's when we anticipate some additional public outreach.

We'll take, you know, the feedback that we get from you guys.

From Yahweh lot owners from the general public and of course anything that the zoning Commission.

You know, any feedback they give us?

Try to respond to all of that.

Wrap it up into our final proposal, which would go to the the public hearing and we don't anticipate that that would happen prior to the fall of of this year.

So that's kind of I think everything I wanted to say about the process.

But yeah, we'd love to get your thoughts on all of you know in your Anc's.
Have you dealt with a project that you thought was?
Really nice solution for an alley lot. Did you encounter any?
Particular issues or problems?
What opportunities do alley lots provide for us?
Also, just a reminder, you know our our website is up and running.
We have some basic information on there.
The presentations will be going up on the website. These ANC presentations and the recordings of the meetings.
And please feel free to e-mail us anytime at ally.watts@dc.gov for any additional questions or feedback.
But yeah, that's all for me on my presentation, but would love to hear back from you guys about your thoughts.
I see Commissioner Bowers.
Is that do I have that right?

I **Isaac Bowers, US PIRG** 26:38

Yeah, correct.
Isaac Bowers, ANC3AO3.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 26:43

Great.

I **Isaac Bowers, US PIRG** 26:44

I was just elected to cycle.
Sorry if there's any background noise there.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 26:49

Good.

I **Isaac Bowers, US PIRG** 26:49

So I'm new to this.
I don't even know if there are any LA lots in the three AO three district.
But I just.
I was wondering if you could.

Go into a little more detail on the law occupancy.

So that's like the percentage of the total lot.

That could be.

Occupied by housing or presumably other uses. Is that correct?

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 27:18

Exactly. That's the percentage of a lot. And I can go back up to that.

Let's find that.

This is a good example I guess is any.

I Isaac Bowers, US PIRG 27:31

Right.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 27:32

Yeah, it's it's the percentage of a lot.

Basically the the footprint can occupy of a building.

So if your lot is 1000 square feet and your lot occupancy maximum is 40%, then you the footprint of the building essentially could be 400 square feet.

I Isaac Bowers, US PIRG 27:55

So I guess I'm curious why so?

These are alley lots.

So it's just alleys on one side and the other.

I'm curious why they.

Concern in places like the R zones where I get, you know, lower density St. facing it kinda makes sense to you know, abide by that R1R2 zone space, but feels like in an alley lot where it's just alleys on other side and no St. facing.

I'm not.

I'm not quite clear on the policy rationale for limiting it.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 28:33

That's an excellent question.

I mean, certainly, you know in the row house zones.

We kind of expect buildings to be very close together.

In the lower density zones.

We do expect a little bit more space in the yards.
A lot of occupancy, like you said for street facing lots is lower.
I think where we've heard concerns from some folks is.
You know, they've had this open space behind them for basically forever or, you know, ever long they've lived there.
And they want to maintain the character of their neighborhood.
So how can we do that?
Think for the smaller lots like you see on this chart.
You your lot occupancy permissions would still be higher than the street facing lots, at least under our proposal as it stands.
It's not. So you get to the the much larger lots where you have a lower lot occupancy.
You know, similar with the yards right now.
With an 8 foot side yard proposal that would match the side yards for street facing lots, that would actually be smaller than the rear yard requirement for a street facing lodge.
So I think there is a slightly larger kind of.
You know, potential footprint that we can realize.
And the other thing is, you know, not all alley lots are surrounded by alley some.
Kind of do back up to other street facing houses. All this is to say we're trying to balance.
You know, allowing a little bit more flexibility in terms of use but but trying to maintain the same character in the low density zones.

I Isaac Bowers, US PIRG 30:27

So just so I understand, like how this might work out in practice, let's say you had.
A.
An allied law, you know, a row houses on an alley and all of the row houses were currently occupying 60% of the lot and 40% of the lot was kind of like yard space and somebody wanted to extend their particular house.
Outwards.
They would.
Be limited to 80% say in an R1 zone of 3000 square feet, as opposed to being able to take up the entire.
Occupy their entire lot.
And the idea would be that the neighbors wouldn't have their kind of view of the

yard going down, interfered with too much up and down the row.

Is that is that kind of how it would work out in practice?

Is that what you see?

People objecting to.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 31:27

Well, it it's hard to say, you know, on any particular example what would happen?

Yeah, I think.

We would just need to look at, you know, each individual case.

What is the present law occupancy?

What are they proposing?

What does that mean for?

You know, for the proposed lot occupancy on their property and would that proposal kick them into a a special exception process where you know the ANC could weigh in, the neighbors could weigh in before the board of zoning adjustment and then the Board of Zoning Adjustment obviously would.

Would ultimately decide those types of questions.

LJ Lawson, Joel (OP) 32:09

Hi I also wanted to just make sure it's understood that they the information.

Hi everybody.

This is Joel from the office of Planning.

Sorry that the information that Matt is presenting is just for alley lots.

The provisions that apply right now to St. fronting lots would not change.

So for example, you know in our zones the typical lot occupancy that's permitted is 40%. Now for a street fronting lot and that would not change.

As part of these proposals.

But Matt is looking at what are the appropriate, what do we think are the appropriate development standards for alley lots, you know, as opposed to St. funding lots.

I Isaac Bowers, US PIRG 32:56

Yeah, yeah. No, I totally understand that I'm.

I'm just kind of wondering what?

'S intuitively, it feels to me like if.

You're part of a. If you're in a row of houses that are all facing out just on alleys. In

other words, it's an alley lot thing.

It's gonna be probably more, more packed.

You would have kind of expected to be a little more packed, a little more dense than a street facing.

1.

So I'm just, you know, I'm not quite sure why.

Why we would restrict that at this point in time?

Since historically that seems like it's been the case, I don't know if there's a particular case or anecdote you can share with me, or if you have like an example.

A photo of an existing lock where you would you could show like.

Here's the current.

Restriction on lot occupancy.

And here's how it would work out in practice.

It would just help me visualize it.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 34:04

Yeah, we could certainly come up with some, I guess.

Yeah, sample site plans or something like that.

I think that the scenario that you're describing with, you know, kind of multiple row house type development that would mostly be in zones like the RF zones where you do.

We're not proposing any changes to the lot occupancy and there are the higher lot occupancy standards already.

So I think that the type of development that you're describing would still be possible.

Umm.

In in the the denser parts of the city.

I Isaac Bowers, US PIRG 34:47

Yeah, definitely get that.

My my particular neighborhood tends to be a little less dense, more single family housing.

Like I said, I don't even know if we have any alley lots.

But just generally looking at the city.

Across the board, definitely a little bit of a housing crunch.

I feel as if we have to have a a pretty good policy justification to reduce.

The occupancy that people can add on to their lots.

Umm and I I guess I under what I'm understanding is you're kind of taking.

An approach where.

It's less than full occupancy and.

But more than a street facing occupancy and kind of doing some something in between those areas, but you know again like that's just kind of a number.

So I'm I just would like to know, I guess maybe you have a specific example where you can show that this would make a significant difference to the neighbors.

Who's and how they would be impinged by a full occupancy of a lot that faces out on the alley.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 36:12

Well, I really appreciate that these comments, it sounds like.

It sounds like if I can sum up what you're saying that you would be supportive of.

Either not reducing the law occupancy in these lower density zones or.

Having some higher number? Is that a fair summary of your thoughts?

I Isaac Bowers, US PIRG 36:39

Yeah, my my baseline would be, you know, unless we've observed major problems with us over the years to allow the full lot occupancy, so.

My bias would be towards let's demonstrate.

Why this reduced occupancy would be, you know, a a public good that overcomes the kind of idea that people should be able to expand and we need more housing and more room for families in the district.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 37:14

Understood. Thank you for that.

And I see there's a comment in the chat.

About do we have maps available to show where the alley lots are for ANC 2 E?

Unless he would also be interested in how to easily find out where all sort.

You see, they we do have their their locations we can provide individual maps that it's they're very hard to kind of show.

At a citywide scale.

SB Stephanie Bothwell 37:53

Let's see what I.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 37:54

So yeah, we can if there are sort of specific requests, we've already got one for 2 E actually the other night we can certainly provide those.

But folks should feel free to speak up.

If you have any comments or questions.

Anyone else?

KJ Kauffman, Jenn (SMD 4D08) 38:22

I think there's a hand raised from Paula Edwards.

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 38:22

Any thoughts or?

Yes, go ahead, Commissioner Edwards.

EP Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01) 38:28

Thank you.

If I understand you correctly, this is primarily an effort to synchronize the regulations between front facing lots and alley facing lots.

Is that correct?

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 38:44

I think there'd certainly be more alignment in terms of uses.

Maybe in the lower density zones a little closer alignment in terms of lot occupancy and and yard requirements.

So yeah, there'd be a little bit more cohesion, I guess you could say in the regs.

EP Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01) 39:05

OK. And how would this affect ad us?

JM Jesick, Matthew (OP) 39:11

Well, accessory units.

Presently, they're permitted on street facing lots in the R zone.

So R.

One R2.

R3.

But they're not permitted on alley.

Lots, in fact, no residential is permitted on alley lots in R1 and R2.

So what we're proposing?

Is that in those zones?

All three of those zones R1R 2R3.

You could do a principal unit.

Plus an accessory unit.

And that accessory unit would either be a matter of right if you meet the lot area minimums, or it would be by special exception. If you do not.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 39:59

OK.

So anyone who had an alley facing lot would need a special exception to build an Adu.

Is that correct?

Did I understand you correctly?

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 40:09

Not quite. Our proposal would be that if they meet the lot area minimum for the zone.

That accessory unit could be a matter of right.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 40:19

Oh, all right. OK.

Thank you. And in my SMD I.

Think we have one or two. The problem we have more.

And I suppose this won't address it is we have like little islands in the middle of the alley, and they're little private property.

Oh, privately owned property islands and people aren't maintaining them.

And they I don't.

I don't know.

It's just really complicated, but I don't think this addresses that.
But thank you very much.
This is helpful.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 40:53

Thank you for that.

Yeah, that is a comment that we've heard from both neighbors and ally Lot owners that sometimes these lots, if they can't be used for something else, they just get neglected and.

You know, can be overgrown or worse, and you act like a sort of a dumping ground sometimes.

So that's if we can put them to some kind of productive use while still, you know, maintaining neighborhood character. I think that's something we'd be in favor of.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 41:24

Great. So can we talk offline about that because we have a real problem with one in our neighborhood that we'd like to have addressed and I don't know if you as a Regulatory agency can, I mean, can help us with that. But someone needs to 01 other.

Question. Well, this this won't affect DPW trash collection.

Things like that to go on and alleys at all. So.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 41:48

No, I mean we we definitely want to get feedback from DPW, but we're not proposing to, you know, reduce the size of alleys or or anything like that.

We, you know, alleys serve an important function for services and so we don't want to actually impinge on the alley space itself, which is, you know, district property not not private property.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 42:08

OK.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 42:09

So as far as the kind of enforcement issues go, I know department of Buildings.
Has a vacant.

Property enforcement sort of hotline.

I believe so.

I can try and find that information and get that to you.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 42:25

Great. Thank you very much.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 42:36

Commissioner Kaufman, I see your hand is raised.

KJ **Kauffman, Jenn (SMD 4D08)** 42:39

Oh, thank you. Good afternoon.

Yes, I I also am interested in in maps for ANC 4D of alley lots. I wanted to say that I I really like and support the idea of the matter of rights proposal here for accessory units.

And the R zones, I think it makes a lot of sense.

And you know, don't have as many in in my ANC, but or SMD in particular.

But I, but I appreciate the.

I think it aligns with like the purpose and provides opportunity for for for more housing here in DC.

I also had questions around the development standards for the you don't need to go back to the slide regarding the R zones because I too kind of wonder, you know does do we need to change to those proposed, you know limitations and you said?

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 43:27

OK.

KJ **Kauffman, Jenn (SMD 4D08)** 43:38

Something around like you know, perhaps we can provide some sample, you know, kind of site proposals. And I think I'm gonna hold on to those questions. And then, you know, look at that 'cause, I think I'm, I'm you know I just don't have those types of lots.

In my ANC.

And so it's just kind of hard for me to conceptualize, but I think that's a question

mark that will be perhaps illuminated if you do share that kind of samples for us to to peruse.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 44:10

Yeah, we're happy to to do that.

We'll we'll try and do sort of standard examples and you might say I think folks always say, well, that's not like the alley lot in my neighborhood that that wouldn't apply here.

KJ **Kauffman, Jenn (SMD 4D08)** 44:26

For sure, yeah.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 44:28

So, but we'll we'll do our best to try and come up with some examples.

KJ **Kauffman, Jenn (SMD 4D08)** 44:32

Thank you.

I appreciate it.

This is very helpful.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 44:36

No, thank you.

Any other thoughts or questions? Did I go over anything too quickly or?

Like I said, we'll be reaching out again, assuming you know the zoning Commission moves us forward.

Thank you, Krishna Kaufman.

So yeah, any other final thoughts or Joel, do you have any, including thoughts?

LJ **Lawson, Joel (OP)** 45:16

Hi. No, no concluding thoughts for me.

Thanks again to all of you for turning out for this. If if other thoughts or questions come to mind, feel free to reach out to us. Matt, I think we have a do we have a slide showing the contact information?

I know everybody will be able to see that once the presentation is up on the website, but here we go.

So there's our e-mail address. If you have thoughts or questions or reach out to us in any way you can.

Is kind of perfect timing to be for us to be getting your thoughts and your experiences on Ali lots as we're kind of refining the proposal and getting it ready to take forward to the zoning Commission.

So yeah, I really appreciate your time and I'll turn it back to you Matt. Thank you.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 46:05

I'm sorry, Paula Edwards.

I have one last question, I'm sorry.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 46:08

Sure, sure.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 46:09

Now these lots only have entrance and egress from the alley, is that correct?

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 46:16

That's absolutely right, yes. They only print on allies.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 46:17

Oh, OK.

Oh, all right.

So then that's a deal.

Is that ADOT issue about how?

Entrance and egress works or?

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 46:32

Well, I think generally speaking they're concerned about, yeah, or how people get around, you know, on foot or on bike or by vehicle.

So they will be interested in how the alleys are being used, but I think in the past they've generally been supportive of, you know, when there have been these alley lot projects that they've not had any concerns with them. They can't speak without for them in all cases.

But generally speaking, I think they're supportive of of these types of projects.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 47:03

OK. And historically, is there any did, did you see anything in the historical record about why they were originally zoned this way or?

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 47:14

We're very fortunate in the Office of planning in our Historic Preservation Office. We literally have the person who wrote the book on alley lots.

Architectural historian Kim Williams and she has a her book goes through the History Valley lots. It's fascinating.

You know, the original purposes were just.

There were larger St. facing lots, but maybe starting right before the Civil War.

War then, especially during and after the Civil War, people started carving off the back of their lots.

Really, because there was a housing shortage in the city.

And this was a place where smaller generally speaking.

Less, you know, permanent housing could be constructed relatively cheaply.

And that's really where our alley lots came from originally.

So that's super brief.

Summary. But.

They've always been sort of a little bit different than the street facing counterparts.

And certainly around the 1930s, I think there was a strong push actually to to eliminate alleyway housing.

It was seen as unsanitary, et cetera.

But I think these days with, you know, obviously modern.

Sanitation and utilities.

It's it's an opportunity we feel like for the district where.

There already are some housing units, but maybe we can have a few more.

EP **Edwards, Paula (SMD 4A01)** 48:49

OK.

Great. Thank you very much.

JM **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** 48:52

Do.

Well, if that's it, just again thank you everyone and really appreciate your time and we'll be reaching out again and I'll try to follow back up with some of the information we spoke about today.

So thank you and bye bye.



Lawson, Joel (OP) 49:13

Thank you.



Isaac Bowers, US PIRG 49:14

Thanks to everyone.



Lawson, Joel (OP) 49:14

Bye now.



Jesick, Matthew (OP) 49:16

Thanks.

□ **Jesick, Matthew (OP)** stopped transcription