



KCA OCTOBER 25 MEETING WILL COVER MANY TOPICS

At our September meeting, I had hoped to cover a number of other issues important to KCA members and the community, but the discussion of our Church Hotel resolution ran very long.

On Tuesday, October 25 at 7 pm, KCA will hold its delayed October meeting at Good Will Baptist Church. Holdover items will be consideration of resolutions on the following topics:

Against closure of Adams Morgan's two Post Offices;

Against DC Council Bill 19-0172, the Professional Taxicab Standards and Medallion Establishment Act of 2011;

Against on-line gambling legislation, the Lottery Modernization Act of 2010, which was passed with no public hearing by the City Council;

A resolution in favor of maintaining the maximum possible sidewalk width for pedestrians within the 18th Street Streetscape project's new construction;

A resolution to protest the license request of El Tamarindo to expand their sidewalk cafe in size and hours of operation to include 24 hour service on the public space on weekends (alcohol service would remain within the legal limits).

A resolution severing KCA's relationship with the Adams Morgan Partnership BID;

A resolution severing KCA's relationship with the Adams Morgan Main Street Group.

There will also be a presentation by Brookland Homes, a development group seeking to dramatically alter the building at 1845 Kalorama Road within the Washington Heights Historic District. Their proposal, if approved, would expand the existing 3-story single family home into an 8 condo, 5 story structure, with open courtyard between an expanded, taller original building, and a rear, totally new building. For the 8 units, ranging between 611 square feet and 1,261 square feet in size, only 2 parking spaces would be provided.

As you can see, there's a lot to cover and I hope you will be there to help us work through these issues.

-Denis James

KCA MEETING MINUTES SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 pm.

President Denis James presented a resolution to protest a license change request by Heaven and Hell to add a "summer garden", outdoor space that would be 15 feet away from neighbors on the basis that it would lead to disturbance of the peace, order and quiet of the surrounding neighborhood. ANC 1C has already protested this application.

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 15 to 0 on motion by **Mary Belcher**, seconded by **Roger Teleschow**.

There was a discussion of whether people could pay their KCA dues at a meeting or the day of the meeting and vote at that meeting. **Denis** expressed his rule of thumb that KCA should not accept payments on the day of meetings.

There was a motion by **Mary Belcher**, seconded by **Joyce Douglas** that membership fees not be accepted at the meeting in order to avoid "packing" a meeting.

Wes Combs said that there not be any vote on the Church hotel project at this meeting because facts about the project had not been provided to the membership.

Adam Edinger thinks we should vote now. As long time member, he doesn't think it's right for anyone to walk in the door to vote.

Lacy MacAuley said she has been hearing for years about the hotel and has heard enough for a vote.

Shinko Watkins said that he had paid on line 15 minutes ago and there had been nothing online about not being able to vote.

John Cloud said that he doesn't think people should just be able to show up and pay dues to vote at the meeting.

Bonnie Roberts-Burke said that people should be allowed to join at any time, as a matter of neighborliness.

Jacques Morgan wondered how many are "new"?

Larry Hargrove said that if you live within the boundaries and have paid your dues, you should be entitled to vote.

Roger Teleschow said that there should be a decision one way or the other. If there is an ambiguity, there should be a rule.

Denis proposed that there be a “sense of the meeting” vote by everyone present, not limited to those who had paid memberships before today. Will we accept people who offer their money at the meeting as voting members? The “sense of the meeting” by a 15-12 vote was that anyone who paid at the meeting should be able to vote.

Discussion of the Church Hotel PUD Application

Denis gave a brief summary of the project and the reason for the timing of the resolution:

The developers are seeking relief from existing zoning regulations, including the Reed-Cooke overlay, rear and side yard requirements, height limits and use, and to change the building’s address to Columbia Road.

He expressed concern that the project as proposed would set a precedent of a building too tall and massive for the site, leading to other very large future proposals which would lead to a loss of the human scale of Adams Morgan. The resolution is being presented so that KCA can make timely comment to the DC Office of Planning for a report they create on the application for a meeting with the DC Zoning Commission called a {“Set-down” hearing: Whether a project has enough merit for the Zoning Commission to hold a full evidentiary hearing on the merits.

Denis suggested that due to the presence in Adams Morgan of one very large hotel, the Hilton Washington, we already know the negative effects such a 24-7 operation can have, and in this case it would be right in the heart of the very congested center of the neighborhood on very narrow streets.

At this point, Denis moved the resolution on the Church Hotel proposal, seconded by Bob Ellsworth.



Church Hotel site section looking east, from developer’s PUD application, filed 7-29-2011. Three-story buildings in Washington Heights Historic District are in foreground.

Kalorama Citizens Association Resolution Expressing Concerns to the Office of Planning with regard to the Planned Unit Development Application for Construction of a Hotel at Euclid and Champlain Streets

Whereas, developers have proposed to build a 104’ tall hotel, the “Adams Morgan Historic Hotel” at Euclid and Champlain Streets, N.W., on lots currently occupied by the Church of Christ, Scientist, and the City Paper/WPFW Radio building, and

Whereas, as soon as mid-October, the DC Office of Planning, which actively invites public participation, will present a report on this application to the DC Zoning Commission at a so-called “set-down hearing” at which the Zoning Commission will decide if this project has adequate merit to go forward to a full-blown Zoning Commission hearing, and

Whereas, KCA wishes to provide community input to that report, and

Whereas, the proposed hotel will contain up to 227 guest rooms and a 174-car underground garage; with pedestrian and vehicular entrance to the hotel on Champlain Street, N.W.; and

Whereas, the proposed site of the hotel lies within the boundaries of a zoning area known as the “**Reed-Cooke Overlay**,” which seeks to protect the residential nature of the neighborhood and which limits new building heights to 40 feet and prohibits within its boundaries bars and hotels, while encouraging “small-scale business development that will not adversely affect the residential community” of Reed Cooke; and

Whereas, the developers of the proposed hotel project on July 29, 2011, filed with the DC Zoning Commission a “Planned Unit Development” (PUD) application to seek relief from Reed-Cooke Overlay restrictions; the current R-5B zoning of the Church; the current RC/C2B zoning of the other parcels and relief from rear and side yard requirements in order to construct a hotel that would exceed those restrictions; and

Whereas, DC has established a “Comprehensive Plan for the Capital City” to guide future land use, building construction, and other development, which states in city Policy Mid-City-2.4.5: “Protect existing housing within the Reed Cooke neighborhood, maintaining heights and densities at appropriate levels and energizing small-scale business development that does not adversely affect the residential community;” and, for the larger Adams Morgan area, in city Policy Mid-City-2.4.1: “Protect the historic character of the Adams Morgan community through historic landmark and district designations, and by ensuring that new construction is consistent with the prevailing heights and densities in the neighborhood;” and

Whereas, the members of KCA would like to see the Christian Science Church building preserved as part of a more moderately sized project than has been proposed.

Now, then, **be it resolved** that the members of the KCA wish to notify the Office of Planning that:

1. The hotel project as currently proposed seeks 2½ times the height allowed by the Reed-Cooke Overlay and, if approved such approval would run counter to the guidance for neighborhood development as laid out in the city’s Comprehensive Plan;

2. The height, density, and mass of the project as proposed, as well as the range of commercial activities it plans to host, is at odds with the residential nature of the Reed-Cooke neighborhood and will have negative impacts on the quality of life for residents of Champlain, Euclid and other nearby narrow neighborhood streets, including traffic congestion, residential parking demand and late-night events that will cause disturbance;

3. The height and overall scale of the hotel as currently proposed will visually overwhelm the historic row-houses along the east side of 18th Street, in the adjacent Washington Heights Historic District, as well as the row-houses and smaller apartment buildings along Champlain and Euclid Streets;

4. Approval of a project of this scale will set a precedent for other very tall, very dense projects, be they hotels or other uses that will greatly detract from the human scale of Adams Morgan, and further contravene the goals of the Comprehensive Plan as expressed above.

Upon approval by the KCA, this resolution, with cover letter, will be sent to the DC Office of Planning for inclusion in the project file.

Maureen Gallagher, President of, and **Billy Simpson**, a member of, the **Reed-Cooke Neighborhood Association**, [RCNA] were then asked to talk about concerns that RCNA had with the proposal filed with the Office of Planning.

RCNA took a look at the project about 3 years ago, when the developer presented conceptual plans to the DC Historic Preservation Review Board [HPRB]. Exterior plans have changed, but the fundamental size and height have not. RCNA took the position then that it was ok with the concept of a hotel, but that the specific proposal was too large. The Reed-Cooke Zoning Overlay doesn't allow hotels.

Before the "set-down" hearing, the Office of Planning [OP] will write its report, including whether the proposed development conforms with the comprehensive plan. RCNA will present feedback to OP about the noncompliance of the project as proposed. By giving feedback before the set down hearing, it hopes to signal to OP that the neighborhood cares about the decision.

Contrast the Courtland (an apartment building directly east of the project), which is 75 ft tall measured from Euclid. The proposed hotel would be at least 2 stories higher.

Bob Ellsworth pointed out that the drawings submitted by the developer are a gross distortion of those relative heights.

Adam Edinger believes that the neighborhood has definitely compromised by allowing a hotel. In contrast, the developer has followed a "take it or leave it" approach. If we chose not to "take it" what would be the alternative?

Billy Simpson said that RCNA has avoided those "what if" discussions, staying focused on what's before us. The developer has approached the community as "this or nothing". RCNA has refused to take that stance.

Maureen Gallagher pointed out that the developers' first proposal was a condominium project, which RCNA voted to support.

Wes Combs asked how tall the proposed condo would have been?

Billy said it was 75-80 feet.

Wes Combs then asked whether any other buildings in Reed-Cooke were the height of the hotel proposal?

Billy said no.

Tony Harvey said that, as part of an urban renewal plan, a library was considered as one of the options. When the condo project was proposed, it extended to the height of the church and brought the church into the Reed-Cooke overlay. The City Paper property was not included in those plans. The community was enthusiastic about it, but the project disappeared. Then came the hotel.

Maureen Gallagher said that the condo project was never actually put before the Zoning Commission, but OP staffers suggested there could be problems with dividing the building.

Chad Walter asked what incentives to the community were being offered by the developers?

Billy Simpson answered that the developers must provide public benefits for a PUD, but it's murky as to what that means. Preservation of the Church itself is claimed as a benefit, together with a 4000 square foot community meeting space, and an agreement with the Adams Morgan Youth Leadership Academy [AMYLA] The proposal also claims there will be tax benefits for the District.

Chad asked whether the benefits included any development of Unity Park?

Billy Simpson noted that there was nothing in the proposal but that there would be an opportunity to have those discussions.

John Cloud: City Paper building and the studios of WPFW are being sacrificed. We were told: "It didn't pencil out...we had to go bigger". That brings to mind Caesar Chavez, who said that when people talk about cost/benefit, you need to consider who pays the costs and who gets the benefits.

Billy Simpson: The Reed-Cooke overlay was added in 1989. There were light industrial buildings in the neighborhood. There was concern that nightlife was being pushed into residential areas. Its objective was to get incompatible uses out of the neighborhood and put in low rise residential. About 70-80 % of those incompatible uses have transitioned as intended by the overlay.

Roger Telschow said that he's in favor of a good development there. But there's a difference of opinion on how big the project should be. His reading of the resolution is that the proposal is too big. Development never gets more favorable to the neighborhood after it's approved. The time to comment is now.

Lacy MacAuley said that the point of the resolution that speaks to her is that this project would set a precedent that will be contrary to the scale of the

neighborhood. There is no reason to compromise the Reed-Cooke Overlay. It keeps the scale of the neighborhood human.

Denis James said the Washington Heights Historic District goes to the alley adjoining the Church. The developers own elevation shows that the scale of the proposed hotel would loom over the neighboring 3 story buildings in Washington Heights and not respect their integrity.

Lisa Duperier expressed the wish that the developers could show us what the project would look like from street views like the Italian Embassy developers did. She said HPRB did vote for the project. She said the hotel will help with deterioration of the neighborhood, that it will change the demographics of the 18th Street crowd, setting an image. We lack an image-setter. The church has considered other projects, but no one else was willing to come forward with a proposal. She can't discuss financing. The proposal didn't address Unity Park because they were told that "politics" was involved with any changes to the park. She said the developers will be donating part of the property to the alleyway to eliminate its dogleg.

At this point, the question was called and the vote was 22 in favor; 6 against the resolution

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm.

-Ted Guthrie, Secretary

FACTUAL INACCURACIES IN THE PUD APPLICATION FOR THE CHURCH HOTEL, 10-24-2011

We have reviewed the PUD application filed by the developer on July 29, 2011 for the proposed Adams Morgan hotel. In the course of our review, we identified the following factual assertions that we believe to be inaccurate. There may of course be others:

Page 1: The developer describes the project as a "boutique" hotel. While the word "boutique" does not appear to have an official definition, it clearly has the connotation of a hotel that is relatively small. In reality, as disclosed on page 11, the developer is proposing to construct as many as 227 guest rooms.

Page 4: The developer asserts that the PUD application requests a maximum height of 92 feet. That may be an accurate measurement from Columbia Road, but the zoning relief is being sought with respect to a lot that sits further down the hill on Champlain Street. The scope of the requested relief can only be properly assessed by considering it against the baseline of what would be permitted as a matter-of-right on that lot. And the current matter-of-right commercial allowance for that lot is 40 feet measured from Champlain Street. Considered against the true matter-of-right baseline, the developer is seeking to build a structure that ranges from approximately 100 feet

tall (at the highest point on Champlain Street) to 110 feet tall (at the lowest point on Champlain Street), not including rooftop structures. Or in other words, the proposed building is at least two and a half times taller than what would be permitted on there as a matter-of-right.

Page 5: The developer asserts that the project will provide "balance and diversity in a part of Adams Morgan recognized primarily for late-night bar activity." The statement is repeated on page 8. While one part of Adams Morgan may indeed be recognized for its late-night bar activity, the developer's statement fails to acknowledge the residential nature of the rest of Adams Morgan, including the streets on which the proposed hotel will actually sit (Champlain Street and Euclid Street).

Page 8: The developer asserts that "[o]ne of the great strengths of this project is the diversity of use introduced by a high-quality, full-service boutique hotel to a neighborhood that currently does not have such quality accommodations." This statement fails to acknowledge the accommodations provided nearby by the long-established Washington Hilton Hotel in Adams Morgan and the Omni Shoreham and Marriott Wardman Park hotels in Woodley Park.

Pages 10-11: The developer asserts that "[m]any buildings surrounding the proposed Hotel are of comparable height..." A similar statement is made on pages 18-19. The developer then lists seven buildings together with their purported measurements. With respect to these seven buildings, the developer has already been compelled to acknowledge publicly that the adjacent building, the Cortland (1760 Euclid Street), is only 6 stories and 75 feet tall. In the PUD application, the Cortland is described as being 8 stories and 90 feet tall. Similarly, the Woodley (1851 Columbia Road) is only 7 stories and is listed in the historic Sanborn maps as being only 78 feet tall. But in the PUD application, it is labeled as being 95 feet tall. Two of the other listed buildings, the Imperial (1763 Columbia Road) and the Euclid (listed at 2482 Ontario Road, but actually fronting at 1740 Euclid Street), were already identified as only being 75 feet tall. So it is difficult to characterize any of these as being comparable to the developer's proposed structure. As noted above, the developer's proposed structure is between 100 and 110 feet tall, or approximately 25% taller than these purported comparables. The purported heights of the three remaining buildings are also doubtful. The Melwood (1803 Biltmore Street), the Alcazar (listed at 1823 Mintwood Place, but actually fronting at 1841 Columbia Road), and the Argonne (1629 Columbia Road) are each 8 stories and do not appear to be 95 feet tall. We would urge the Office of Planning to check all of the asserted heights against a reliable source.

Page 11: The developer asserts that "the proposed height of the Addition is not inconsistent with the neighborhood; rather, the height of the proposed Addition complements the 68-foot height of the Church Building..."

In reality, the proposed structure is two stories taller than the adjacent Cortland apartment building, and at least twice as tall as most of the buildings on Champlain Street, Euclid Street, and throughout the Reed-Cooke neighborhood. Further, the historic architectural elevations in Appendix A of the PUD application show the peak of the roof of the Church Building as being just under 65 feet tall.

Page 18: The developer asserts in a footnote that Champlain Street is 50 feet wide. In reality, Champlain Street is only 30 feet wide measured curb to curb. Further, the developer describes the recent Italian Embassy project as imposing a 90 foot structure across the street from 2 story rowhouses. In reality, the rowhouses across from the Italian Embassy project are 3 stories, and the developers agreed to reduce the portion of their building that sits across from those rowhouses down to approximately 60 feet. Further, the Italian Embassy project will result in a residential building not a commercial building. The proposed hotel will have a significantly different impact on the adjacent residential neighborhood than a condominium project.

Pages 18-19: The developer asserts that the project is appropriate in light of the commercial establishments along 18th Street and Columbia Road, and states that the project is “not only close to the same business community – it is a part of it.” These paragraphs again fail to acknowledge the residential nature of the rest of Adams Morgan, including the streets on which the proposed hotel will actually sit (Champlain Street and Euclid Street).

Page 19: The developer states that “[t]he Subject Property is on the farthest northern edge of the [Reed-Cooke] Overlay and is completely disconnected from the main body of the Overlay to the south.” While it is true that the property is not contiguous with other properties that are also subject to the Overlay, the Overlay specifically states that one of its purposes is to “[p]rotect adjacent and nearby residences from damaging traffic, parking, environmental, social, and aesthetic impacts.” (emphasis added).

Page 19: The developer states that “[t]his Property is located in a high density neighborhood...” This contradicts the statements on pages 4 and 8 in which the neighborhood is accurately described as low-density commercial, moderate-density residential.

Page 26: The developer describes the project site as being “within blocks of Metrorail stations.” In reality, the two closest Metrorail stations (Woodley Park Metro and Columbia Heights Metro) are each nearly three quarters of a mile from the project site.

Page 31: The developer asserts that the project is consistent with Land Use Policy 1.3.2 pertaining to development around Metrorail stations. However, that policy makes clear that a project should only be considered to have a meaningful connection to a Metrorail station if it is within a radius of one quarter mile to one half mile from

the Metrorail station. Indeed, the policy suggests that in certain neighborhoods the radius should be even smaller. *-Prepared by the Executive Committees and members of the Kalorama Citizens Association and the Reed-Cooke Neighborhood Association.*

INCONSISTENCIES WITH THE DC COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE PUD APPLICATION FOR THE CHURCH HOTEL

Municipal Regulations

The District of Columbia Municipal Regulations impose the fundamental requirement that “the PUD process shall not be used to circumvent the intent and purposes of the Zoning Regulations, nor to result in action that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.” DCMR 11-2400.4 (emphasis added). We have accordingly reviewed the Comprehensive Plan and noted below excerpts from a significant number of policy requirements in the Comprehensive Plan against which we believe this proposed development, in its present form, is inconsistent.

Comprehensive Plan, Citywide Policies

Land Use Policy 1.4: Neighborhood Infill Development: “[I]n both residential and commercial settings, infill development must be sensitive to neighborhood context... and density and scale should reflect the desired character of the surrounding area.”

Land Use Policy 1.4.1: Infill Development: “Such development should complement the established character of the area and should not create sharp changes in the physical development pattern.”

Land Use Policy 2.1.3: Conserving, Enhancing, and Revitalizing Neighborhoods: “Recognize the importance of balancing goals to increase the housing supply and expand neighborhood commerce with parallel goals to protect neighborhood character...”

Land Use Policy 2.1.5 Conservation of Single Family Neighborhoods: “Protect and conserve the District’s stable, low density neighborhoods and ensure that their zoning reflects their established low density character. Carefully manage the development of vacant land and the alteration of existing structures in and adjacent to single family neighborhoods in order to protect low density character, preserve open space, and maintain neighborhood scale.”

Land Use Policy 2.1.7: Conservation of Row House Neighborhoods: “Protect the character of row house neighborhoods by requiring the height and scale of structures to be consistent with the existing pattern...”

Land Use Policy 2.1.10: Multi-Family Neighborhoods: “Maintain the multi-family residential character of the District’s Medium and High-Density residential areas. Limit the encroachment of large scale, incompatible commercial uses into these areas, and make these areas

more attractive, pedestrian-friendly, and transit accessible.”

Land Use Policy 2.3.1: Managing Non-Residential Uses in Residential Areas: “Maintain zoning regulations and development review procedures that: (a) prevent the encroachment of inappropriate commercial uses in residential areas; and (b) limit the scale and extent of non-residential uses that are generally compatible with residential uses, but present the potential for conflicts when they are excessively concentrated or out of scale with the neighborhood.”

Land Use Policy 2.3.2: Mitigation of Commercial Development Impacts: “Manage new commercial development so that it does not result in unreasonable and unexpected traffic, parking, litter, shadow, view obstruction, odor, noise, and vibration impacts on surrounding residential areas.”

Land Use Policy 2.3.4: Transitional and Buffer Zone Districts: “Maintain mixed use zone districts which serve as transitional or buffer areas between residential and commercial districts... Zoning regulations for these areas should ensure that development is harmonious with its surroundings, achieves appropriate height and density transitions, and protects neighborhood character.”

Land Use Policy 2.3.9: Transient Accommodations in Residential Zones: “Continue to distinguish between transient uses - such as hotels, bed and breakfasts, and inns - and permanent residential uses such as homes and apartments in the District’s Zoning Regulations. The development of new hotels on residentially-zoned land should continue to be prohibited...”

Land Use Action 2.3.A: Zoning Changes to Reduce Land Use Conflicts in Residential Zones: “As part of the comprehensive rewrite of the zoning regulations, develop text amendments which: (a) Expand buffering, screening, and landscaping requirements along the edges between residential and commercial and/or industrial zones; (b) More effectively manage the non-residential uses that are permitted as a matter-of-right within commercial and residential zones in order to protect neighborhoods from new uses which generate external impacts; (c) Ensure that the height, density, and bulk requirements for commercial districts balance business needs with the need to protect the scale and character of adjacent residential neighborhoods...”

Land Use Policy 2.4 Neighborhood Commercial Districts and Centers: “In some locations, commercial and residential rear yards abut one another, causing concerns over rodents, odors, noise, shadows, view obstruction, and other impacts. Effective zoning and buffering requirements are important to address such concerns and protect neighborhood character. Zoning overlays have been adopted in some commercial districts to limit the range of allowable uses and reduce the likelihood of external impacts.”

Land Use Policy 2.4.6: Scale and Design of New Commercial Uses: “Ensure that new uses within commercial districts are developed at a height, mass, scale, and design that is appropriate and compatible with surrounding areas.”

Land Use Policy 2.4.11: Hotel Impacts: “Manage the impacts of hotels on surrounding areas, particularly in the Near Northwest neighborhoods where large hotels adjoin residential neighborhoods.”

Comprehensive Plan, Mid-City Policies

Mid-City Policy 1.1.3: Infill and Rehabilitation: “Infill development should be compatible in scale and character with adjacent uses.”

Mid-City Action 1.2.A: Conservation Districts: “Consider the designation of... Mid-City neighborhoods as ‘Conservation Districts’. Design standards and review procedures for such districts would be less rigorous than those used in Historic Districts, but would strive for more compatible infill development and maintenance of historic building scale, mass, and height conditions.”

Comprehensive Plan, Adams Morgan Policies

Mid-City Policy 2.4.1: Protecting the Character of Adams Morgan: “Protect the historic character of the Adams Morgan community through historic landmark and district designations, and by ensuring that new construction is consistent with the prevailing heights and densities in the neighborhood.”

Mid-City Policy 2.4.2: Preference for Local-Serving Businesses: “Enhance the local-serving, multi-cultural character of the 18th Street / Columbia Road business district. Encourage small businesses that meet the needs of local residents, rather than convenience stores, large-scale commercial uses, and concentrations of liquor-licensed establishments...”

Mid-City Policy 2.4.3: Mixed Use Character: “Encourage retention of the older mixed use buildings along 18th Street and Columbia Road and facilitate infill projects which complement them in height, scale, and design...”

Comprehensive Plan, Reed-Cooke Area Policy

Mid-City Policy 2.4.1: Reed-Cooke Area: “Protect existing housing within the Reed Cooke neighborhood, maintaining heights and densities at appropriate levels and encouraging small-scale business development that does not adversely affect the residential community.”

In this connection, the Comprehensive Plan specifically notes that “a zoning overlay was created for the Reed-Cooke area in 1989 to protect existing housing and ensure compatible infill development on a number of large properties.”

- Prepared by the Executive Committees and members of the Kalorama Citizens Association and the Reed-Cooke Neighborhood Association.

URBAN FORESTRY ADMINISTRATION ENLARGING SELECT ADAMS MORGAN TREE BOXES

The DC Urban Forestry Administration, an agency of the DC Department of Transportation, in cooperation with the Office of Planning and the Department of the Environment is undertaking a program to enlarge 97 street tree boxes, and in 6 cases, to cut new ones on five neighborhood blocks in Adams Morgan.



Kalorama Rd tree-box after concrete removal. *Photo: Ted Guthrie*

Funded by the Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the program has the following benefits:

1. Removal of impervious surfaces, which means less waste water is directed to Blue Plains;
2. Green Median Renovation. On Cliffbourne, some of the tree boxes will be merged into a continuous strip;
3. Tree Canopy Renovation: When new trees are planted, and as existing trees prosper better due to the increased area for roots and water retention, this will aid in improving the overall DC tree canopy.



Workers spread topsoil in an expanded tree-box on the 1800 block of Kalorama Road. *Photo: Steve Mckindley-Ward*

The following streets will see these improvements made:

- 1800 and 1900 blocks of Biltmore, 36, expanded;
- 1800 block of Cliffbourne, 12 expanded;
- 1800 block of Columbia, 2 new, 5 expanded;
- 1800 block of Kalorama, 3 new, 30 expanded.

-Denis James

PLEASE CONTINUE TO RENEW DUES!

Thanks to all who have paid dues so far in 2011. To those with dues still outstanding, please take a moment now to drop a check in the mail. Send to KCA, PO Box 21311, Washington, DC 20009. Your support is very important and greatly appreciated. Contributions are tax-deductable to the extent allowed by law.

THE NEXT TWO KCA MEETING DATES

KCA will meet on Thursday, November 17th at Good Will Baptist Church, and on Thursday, December 15, most likely at a local restaurant for our annual Holiday celebration, details for which are yet to be worked out.

The KCA newsletter is published in print and electronically up to 10 times a year.

© 2011 Kalorama Citizens Association
All Rights Reserved
www.KaloramaCitizens.org

CONTRIBUTIONS AND DUES PAYMENTS

KCA is updating our e-mail list to provide neighborhood news updates and for electronic delivery of our newsletter. Folks often switch e-mail addresses. If a 2 person household, please provide both e-mail addresses.

Please supply your current e-mail address here → _____

Second e-mail address for 2 person household: _____

Wish to receive KCA newsletter electronically? Yes No

Pay dues or contribute to a KCA project!

Pay 2011 dues

Biltmore Triangle Garden

Walter Pierce Park Archaeology Project

Donation for Marie Reed Learning Center Students
For Holiday Season – A KCA tradition

Amount enclosed: _____

Please return this form with your check to KCA, PO Box 21311, Washington DC 20009.

KCA is a 501(c)(3) organization. All dues and contributions are fully tax deductible to the extent provided by law.

View this newsletter on our website in beautiful living color: <http://www.kaloramacitizens.org/newsletters>



Kalorama Station
PO Box 21311
Washington DC 20009
Return Service Requested

THE NEXT KCA MEETING

TUESDAY OCTOBER 25 7 PM

**MANY NEIGHBORHOOD
ISSUES**

**GOOD WILL BAPTIST CHURCH
1862 KALORAMA ROAD NW**