



## *Near Southeast/Southwest*

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6D

1101 Fourth Street, SW  
Suite W 130  
Washington, DC 20024  
202.554.1795  
Email: [office@anc6d.org](mailto:office@anc6d.org)  
Website: [www.anc6d.org](http://www.anc6d.org)

February 20, 2015

**VIA E-MAIL:** [zcsubmissions@dc.gov](mailto:zcsubmissions@dc.gov)

RE: ZC 03-12Q/03-13Q – Request for Waiver for Late Filing

Dear Chairman Hood & Distinguished Members of the DC Zoning Commission:

I am writing to request a waiver for late filing re ZC 03-12Q/03-13Q that was submitted on 2/15/2015. The late submission was due to administrative learning curve issues that we hope to have corrected soon.

We apologize for the tardy submission and thank you in advance for all consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

### **COMMISSIONERS**

SMD 1 *Marjorie Lightman*  
SMD 2 *Stacy Cloyd*  
SMD 3 *Rachel Reilly Carroll*  
SMD 4 *Andy Litsky*  
SMD 5 *Roger Moffatt*  
SMD 6 *Rhonda Hamilton*  
SMD 7 *Meredith Fasbett*

  
Roger Moffatt  
Chairman, ANC 6D  
Near Southeast/Southwest



## *Near Southeast/Southwest*

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6D

1101 Fourth Street, SW  
Suite W 130  
Washington, DC 20024  
202.554.1795  
Email: office@anc6d.org  
Website: www.anc6d.org

February 15, 2015

**VIA E-MAIL:** [zcsubmissions@dc.gov](mailto:zcsubmissions@dc.gov)

RE: ZC 03-12Q/03-13Q -- Time Extension and Modification of 1st Stage PUD re Flexibility

### OFFICERS

Chairperson  
*Roger Moffatt*

Vice Chairperson  
*Andy Litsky*

Secretary  
*Stacy Cloyd*

Treasurer  
*Meredith Fasbett*

Dear Chairman Hood & Distinguished Members of the DC Zoning Commission:

At a regularly scheduled and properly noticed public meeting on February 9, 2015, with a quorum being present (a quorum being 4), Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 6D voted 6-0-0 in opposition to Modification Request 2 (Flexibility) submitted by the DC Housing Authority in the Post-Hearing Submission Materials for Draft Zoning Commission Order Z.C. Case No. 03-12Q/03-13Q.

### COMMISSIONERS

SMD 1 *Marjorie Lightman*  
SMD 2 *Stacy Cloyd*  
SMD 3 *Rachel Reilly Carroll*  
SMD 4 *Andy Litsky*  
SMD 5 *Roger Moffatt*  
SMD 6 *Rhonda Hamilton*  
SMD 7 *Meredith Fasbett*

The ANC adamantly opposes a plan by the applicant to construct income-segregated buildings on these Squares as it would circumvent the theme of HOPE VI revitalization and the goal of the PUD.

Furthermore, the ANC finds that imposing bounding minimum and maximum percentages of ACC units on each of the squares as a requirement of allocation flexibility, as described in the Post-Hearing Submission Materials, does not minimize income segregation. The bounding percentages do not address the percentage of ACC units on a per building basis. The basing of the bounding percentages on the total number of residential units per square rather than the total number of required replacement ACC units also could result in a higher concentration of ACC units on a single square. See Exhibit A, Tables 1 and 2. And if, in the future, the applicant requests an increase in the total number of residential units permitted per square, the bounding percentages, as defined, could allow an even greater concentration of ACC units on a single square. See Exhibit A, Table 3. The ANC finds that the bounding percentages do not ensure that the redevelopment of these squares will be in keeping with the goal of the PUD.

The ANC remains adamantly opposed to the flexibility to move ACC units from Squares 739, 767, and 768, as is written in Modification Request 2 and the Post-Hearing Submission Materials. Furthermore, the ANC expects that a request for allocation flexibility be accompanied by a commitment to build unit-by-unit mixed income housing and a more detailed explanation of its anticipated development of each square.

Sincerely,

Roger Moffatt  
Chairman, ANC 6D  
Near Southeast/Southwest

## Exhibit A

### Maximum ACC Unit Allocation per Square

### Minimum ACC Unit Allocation per Square

Table 1

Possible Allocation of Units

Applies 15% Minimum and 50% Maximum to Total # of Residential Units Per Square as outlined in PUD

	Square 739		Square 768		Square 767		Total Units by Type
	# of Units	% of Square	# of Units	% of Square	# of Units	% of Square	
Market Rate Units	182		251		125		558
ACC Units	140	43%	44	15%	22	15%	206
Total Units Per Square per PUD	322		295		147		

Table 2

Possible Allocation of Units

Applies 15% Minimum and 50% Maximum to Total # of Remaining ACC Public Housing Units (206 units)

	Square 739		Square 768		Square 767		Total Units by Type
	# of Units	% of ACC	# of Units	% of ACC	# of Units	% of ACC	
Minimum ACC Units Required	31	15%	31	15%	31	15%	
Maximum ACC Units Permitted	103	50%	103	50%	103	50%	
Total ACC Units to be Distributed	206						

Table 3

Possible Allocation of Units

Applies 15% Minimum and 50% Maximum to Total # of Residential Units Per Square

Assumes the Total # of Residential Units per Square increases by 25% for Square 739 and decreases by 25% for Squares 768 and 767

	Square 739		Square 768		Square 767		Total Units by Type
	# of Units	% of Square	# of Units	% of Square	# of Units	% of Square	
Market Rate Units	166		251		130		547
ACC Units	156	49%	33	15%	17	15%	206
+/- 25% change from PUD	403		221		110		
Total Units Per Square per PUD	322		295		147		