

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zoning Commission



ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 15-28A

Z.C. Case No. 15-28A

Press House Pursuit, LLC

(Modification with Hearing of a Consolidated PUD @ Square 772, Lots 812 and 7002)
November 24, 2025

Pursuant to notice, at its November 24, 2025, public hearing, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (the “Commission”) considered the application (the “Application”) of Press House Pursuit, LLC (the “Applicant”) for a modification with hearing to the conditions of, and plans approved by Z.C. Order No. 15-28 (the “Original PUD Order”) that approved a consolidated planned unit development (“PUD”) for Lots 812 and 7002¹ in Square 772 (the “Property”).

The Commission reviewed the Application pursuant to the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedures, which are codified in Subtitle Z of the Zoning Regulations (Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, Zoning Regulations of 2016, to which all subsequent citations refer unless otherwise specified). For the reasons stated below, the Commission **APPROVES** the Application.

SUMMARY ORDER

I. Background Information

Parties

1. The following were automatically parties to this proceeding pursuant to Subtitle Z § 403.5:
 - The Applicant; and
 - Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 6C.
2. The Commission received no requests for party status.

Notice

3. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 300.7 and 300.8, on October 24, 2024, the Applicant mailed to all property owners within 200 feet of the Property and the ANC 6C, a “Notice of Intent to File a Zoning Application” pertaining to the Applicant (Exhibit [“Ex.”] 2).

¹ The Applicant removed its request to use 10,000 square feet of the vacant portion of the building component located on Lots 808 and 7000 in Square 772, adjacent to Lots 812 and 7002 in Square 772, for additional hotel use in Exhibit 20, 20A and 20B1-B3. Therefore, Lots 808 and 7000 in Square 772 are not referenced.

4. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 300.9, prior to filing the Application with the Commission, the Applicant met to discuss the Application with Single Member District ANC 6C07. According to the Applicant's Certificate of Notice at Ex. 2A, per ANC 6C standard practice, the full ANC 6C does not meet with Applicant's for zoning actions until after the proposal is submitted to the Commission (Ex. 2A).
5. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 400.9-400.12, on May 29, 2025, at its duly noticed public meeting, the Commission considered the Application and voted to set the case down for a public hearing.
6. Pursuant to Subtitle Z, § 402.1-402.2, on the Office of Zoning ("OZ") sent notice of the November 24, 2025 public hearing to the following on October 3, 2025:
 - The Applicant;
 - ANC 6C;
 - ANC Commissioner 6C07;
 - The Office of the ANCs;
 - The Ward 6 Councilmember, in whose district the Property is located;
 - The At-Large Councilmembers;
 - The Office of Planning ("OP");
 - The Department of Buildings ("DOB");
 - The Department of Energy and Environment ("DOEE");
 - The District Department of Transportation ("DDOT");
 - OZ's Legal Division ("OZLD"); and
 - The owners of property within 200 feet of the Property.(Ex. 28).
7. OZ also published a notice of the November 24, 2025, public hearing in the October 10, 2025, *District of Columbia Register* (72 DCR 011090 *et seq.*) as well as on the calendar of the OZ website (Ex. 26).

Prior Approvals

8. The following prior approvals were granted by the Commission:
 - Pursuant to the Original PUD Order, effective December 23, 2016, the Commission granted a consolidated PUD with a related map amendment for the Property to the C-3-C zone (now the MU-9 zone) to construct a mixed-use residential and commercial project with underground parking and ground-floor retail (the "Approved PUD");
 - The Approved PUD contains two residential components, a hotel, office/retail space, and ground floor retail. As approved by the Commission, the Approved PUD has an overall density of approximately 6.67 floor area ratio ("FAR"), or approximately 461,721 square feet of gross floor area ("GFA"), and maximum heights of approximately 110 feet and 120 feet, not including penthouse; and
 - The Approved PUD is comprised of four buildings that are organized into two parts for zoning purposes, referred to as the "West Building" (301 N Street) and the "East Building" (331 N Street). The East Building encompasses the entire eastern half of the

Overall PUD Site and is approved for an 11-story, 120-foot residential building with approximately 276 residential units and ground-floor retail. The West Building of the Approved PUD contains the National Capital Press (“NCP”) Building at the northwest corner of the Overall PUD Site which was retained and approved for ground-floor retail and two floors of office and/or retail above. A smaller 11-story, 110-foot residential structure containing approximately 96 residential units and ground floor retail was approved between the NCP Building and the East Building. Lastly, the Commission approved an 11-story, 110-foot hotel with approximately 175 rooms (or a residential condominium) at the southeast corner of the Overall PUD Site. The NCP Building, the hotel, and the smaller residential structure comprise the West Building.

II. THE APPLICATION

9. On March 31, 2025, the Applicant submitted the Application for review by the Commission as a Modification with Hearing. The Application included a statement in support, architectural plans, and supporting documentation, and proposed the following four modifications to the hotel component of the Approved PUD:
 - Redesign of certain exterior architectural elements of the hotel structure;
 - Add hotel as a permitted use to a portion of the ground floor of the NCP Building;
 - Increase the hotel guest room count to 189 units (with flexibility to vary the number of units by +/- 10%); and
 - Modify the design of the hotel penthouse and devote a portion of the penthouse and outdoor roof area to an eating and drinking establishment use.(Ex. 1-7).
10. The Applicant asserted that the Application continues to meet the standards and requirements for PUD approval and provided an analysis of applicable evaluation criteria as well as a Comprehensive Plan consistency analysis, including when viewed through a racial equity lens; the Applicant’s analysis included a discussion of its community outreach and engagement efforts, which included meetings and discussions with ANC 6C along with residents in the immediate Property vicinity, and various organizations (Ex. 3). As part of the Application, the Applicant requested a special exception pursuant to Subtitle C § 1501.1(d) and Subtitle X, Chapter 9 to allow the proposed eating and drinking establishment within a portion of the penthouse and on the rooftop terrace on the highest roof of the hotel (*Id.*).
11. On June 4, 2025, the Applicant submitted its prehearing statement (Ex. 17).
12. On September 15, 2025, the Applicant submitted revised plans and proposed conditions that respond to requests made by ANC 6C and make minor refinements to the proposed hotel program, as follows:
 - The Applicant reduced the approximate number of hotel guest rooms from 189 rooms to 179 rooms, four more rooms than approved under the Original PUD Order (the Applicant continued to request flexibility to vary the number of hotel guest rooms by +/-10%);

- In response to the ANC's expressed preference to maintain the entire NCP Building ground floor for future retail/commercial use, the Applicant agreed to withdraw this aspect of the Application and maintain the use of the ground floor entirely for retail/commercial use as approved under the Original PUD Order; and
 - In response to the ANC's concerns over the use of amplified music on the rooftop terrace associated with the proposed penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment, the Applicant: (i) agreed to certain conditions limiting the hours and decibel levels of amplified music, and (ii) agreed to monitor sound levels caused by any amplified music on the rooftop terrace.
- (Ex. 20A-20B3).

13. In light of the concerns raised by ANC 6C regarding amplified music on the rooftop terrace, the Applicant requested the Commission to consider including the following conditions in its final order for the Application to the extent it deemed necessary:
- The Applicant shall not permit outdoor amplified music on such terrace or any other rooftop outdoor space(s) of the project during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. The Applicant may permit outdoor amplified music during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on such terrace or other rooftop outdoor space(s), provided that such outdoor amplified music shall not exceed 65 db(A) when measured at the Property line;
 - The Applicant may permit indoor amplified music during the hours of operation of any eating and drinking establishment use located inside the project's penthouse, provided such indoor amplified shall not exceed 65 db(A) when measured at the Property line; and
 - The Applicant shall maintain a recording device at the 3rd Street property line that will monitor sound levels caused by the project's use of amplified music on the rooftop and maintain a record of the prior 30 days.
- (Ex. 20A).

III. RESPONSES TO THE APPLICATION

OP Report

14. OP submitted a set down report dated May 19, 2025, recommending that the Commission set down the Application for a public hearing (Ex. 15).
15. OP submitted its final report on September 26, 2025, which recommended approval of the Application, including the requested special exception to allow an eating and drinking establishment within the penthouse and on the outdoor terrace located at the penthouse level, pursuant to Subtitle C § 1501.1(d); OP stated that the proposed eating and drinking establishment should not adversely affect the use of neighboring properties due to its limited size and its location at the roof level (Ex. 23). OP further stated that it supported the Application's proposed modifications to the Approved PUD; and the modifications would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including when viewed through a racial equity lens, and should have a generally neutral impact. OP noted that the Housing Production Trust Fund contribution generated by the rooftop eating and drinking establishment would support affordable housing in the District (*Id.*).

DDOT

16. DDOT submitted a report dated September 25, 2025, which determined that the Application may lead to a minor increase in vehicle, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle trips on the localized transportation network, and may result in increased pick-up and drop-off activity and slightly reduced availability of on-street parking within the immediate area. Despite these minor impacts, DDOT stated that it had no objection to approval of the Application (Ex. 22).

ANC 6C

17. On September 17, 2025, ANC 6C submitted a written resolution (the “ANC Resolution”) stating that at its duly noticed public meeting on September 10, 2025, with a quorum present, the ANC voted 7-0 to support the Application, as amended by the Applicant in Exhibit 20A of the case record (Ex. 21). The ANC Resolution made the following statements regarding the four modifications requested in the Application:
 - The ANC supported the Applicant’s request to modify the number of hotel rooms to 179 rooms, with flexibility to vary the number of hotel rooms by +/-10%;
 - The ANC supported the redesign of a number of exterior architectural elements of the hotel structure;
 - The ANC strongly objected to replacing street-facing retail space in a portion of the NPC Building’s ground floor with a use that would substantially reduce activation of the street front, and thus welcomed the Applicant’s decision to withdraw this request from the Application; and
 - The ANC supported the request to modify the design of the penthouse, and the addition of a penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment, subject to conditions that restrict the hours and noise levels of the penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment.
18. Regarding the conditions related to the hours and noise levels of the penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment, the ANC Resolution stated that the conditions set forth by the Applicant in Exhibit 20A of the case record “largely conform to the conditions essential to ANC 6C’s support.” However, the ANC stated that in its vote to support the Application, it specified that the sound-measurement device that will be used to measure the sound levels caused by the project’s use of amplified music on the rooftop terrace should be: (i) located at the terrace level, and (ii) along the 3rd Street property line (Id).

CONCLUSIONS

Authority

1. Pursuant to the authority granted by the Zoning Act of 1938 (June 20, 1938, 52 Stat. 797, as amended; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01 (2018 Repl.)), the Commission may approve a PUD and modifications to an approved PUD consistent with the requirements of Subtitle X, Chapter 3, and Subtitle Z § 704.
2. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 300.1, the purpose of the PUD process is to provide for higher quality development through flexibility in building controls, including building height and density, provided that a PUD: (a) results in a project superior to what would result from

the matter-of-right standards; (b) offers a commendable number or quality of meaningful public benefits; and (c) protects and advances the public health, safety, welfare, and convenience, and is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

3. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 303.1, as part of the PUD process, the Commission may grant relief from any development standards established in the corresponding zone, which shall be considered a type of development flexibility against which the Commission shall weigh the benefits of the PUD.
4. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 303.13, as part of any PUD, the applicant may request approval of any relief for which special exception approval is required. The Commission shall apply the special exception standards applicable to that relief unless the applicant requests flexibility from those standards.
5. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 304.3, in deciding a PUD application, the Commission shall judge, balance, and reconcile the relative value of the public benefits and project amenities offered, the degree of development incentives requested, and any potential adverse effects according to the specific circumstances of the case.
6. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 304.4, to approve a proposed PUD, the Commission shall find that the proposed development (a) is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the subject site; (b) does not result in unacceptable project impacts on the surrounding area or on the operation of city services and facilities but instead shall be found to be either favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable given the quality of public benefits in the project; and (c) includes specific public benefits and project amenities of the proposed development that are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the subject site.
7. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 704.4, the scope of a hearing for a Modification with Hearing shall be limited to the impact of the modification on the subject of the original application and shall not permit the Commission to revisit its original decision.

Special Exception Relief

8. The Commission finds that the Application meets the applicable special exception criteria for the requested modifications to establish an eating and drinking establishment in the penthouse of the hotel component of the Approved PUD. The Commission notes OP's conclusion that the proposed eating and drinking establishment should not adversely affect the use of neighboring properties (Ex. 3, 15, 20A, 23).

Not Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Other Adopted Public Policies Related to the Property (Subtitle X § 304.4(a)).

9. The Commission previously found that the Approved PUD was not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan (Z.C. Order No. 15-28, Conclusion of Law No. 7-9). Based on the case record, the Commission finds that the proposed modifications to the Approved PUD continue to be not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including when viewed

through a racial equity lens (Ex. 3, 15, 23). The Commission finds the Applicant's community outreach and engagement regarding the Application adequate and finds the Applicant's responses to the concerns of ANC 6C regarding potential noise impacts caused by amplified music on the outdoor terrace of the penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment sufficient (Ex. 20A). The Commission agrees with OP that the Application would not significantly advance or impede policies of the Comprehensive Plan related to racial equity since the requested modifications, including the special exception relief, are related to a change of use in the penthouse that would not adversely impact neighboring properties, nor result in loss of affordable housing, nor lead to other inequities for the neighborhood or planning area as a whole (Ex. 15, 23).

No Unacceptable Impacts that are Incapable of Being Mitigated or Acceptable Given the Quality of Public Benefits (Subtitle X § 304.4(b)).

10. The Commission previously found that the Approved PUD could be "approved with conditions to ensure that any potential adverse effects on the surrounding area will be mitigated." (Z.C. Order No. 15-28, Conclusion of Law No. 11). Based on the case record, the Commission concludes that the Application will not result in any unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area or on District services or facilities that cannot be mitigated or that are not acceptable given the overall PUD's public benefits and amenities (Ex. 20A, 23).
11. In response to the concerns expressed by ANC 6C regarding potential noise impacts caused by amplified music on the outdoor terrace of the penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment, the Commission agrees with the ANC that a reasonable set of conditions is appropriate to address these potential impacts. In response to the ANC's request that the sound monitoring device be located on the rooftop terrace along the 3rd Street property line, the Applicant stated that it needed flexibility to determine the location that would be the most useful to monitor and appropriately measure relevant sound from the operation of the rooftop eating and drinking establishment terrace. The Commission finds the Applicant's rationale to have flexibility to identify the optimal location of the sound monitoring device once the hotel is constructed reasonable and thus concludes the conditions offered by the Applicant in Ex. 20A of the case record sufficient to address the ANC's concerns.

PUD Flexibility Balanced Against Public Benefits and Project Amenities (Subtitle X § 304.4(c) and 304.3)

12. The Commission previously concluded that the Approved PUD was not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan," and further stated "[t]he Commission has judged, balanced, and reconciled the relative value of the project amenities and public benefits offered, the degree of development incentives requested, and any potential adverse effects, and concludes approval is warranted." (Z.C. Order No. 15-28, Conclusion of Law No. 6). The Commission need not revisit these conclusions because the Application did not request additional PUD flexibility or propose any modifications to the approved public benefits or project.

"Great Weight" to the Recommendations of OP

13. The Commission is required to give "great weight" to the recommendation of OP pursuant to § 5 of the Office of Zoning Independence Act of 1990, effective September 20, 1990

(D.C. Law 8-163; D.C. Official Code § 6-623.04 (2018 Repl.)) and Subtitle Z § 405.9 (*Metropole Condo. Ass'n v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 141 A.3d 1079, 1087 (D.C. 2016)).

14. The Commission finds persuasive OP's analysis of the Application, its conclusion that the Application satisfies the applicable special exception criteria and the PUD evaluation criteria and is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including when reviewed through a racial equity lens; and its recommendation to approve the Application persuasive, and concurs with this judgment (Ex. 15, 23).

"Great Weight" to the Written Report of the ANC

15. Pursuant to § 13(d) of the Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Act of 1975, effective March 26, 1976 (D.C. Law 1-21; D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d)) and Subtitle Z § 406.2, the Commission must give "great weight" to the issues and concerns raised in the written report of the affected ANCs. To satisfy this great weight requirement, District agencies must articulate with particularity and precision the reasons why an affected ANC does or does not offer persuasive advice under the circumstances (*Metropole Condo. Ass'n v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 141 A.3d 1079, 1087 (D.C. 2016)). The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has interpreted the phrase "issues and concerns" to "encompass only legally relevant issues and concerns." (*Wheeler v. District of Columbia Board of Zoning Adjustment*, 395 A.2d 85, 91 n.10 (1978)).
16. The Commission finds persuasive and concurs with ANC 6C's support for the Application (Ex. 21). As discussed above, the Commission agrees with the ANC that conditions to address the hours and sound levels of any amplified music on the rooftop terrace of the penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment are warranted; however, the Commission believes that the Applicant should have flexibility to identify the optimal location of the sound monitoring device (at the 3rd Street property line) once the hotel is constructed. Accordingly, the Commission's approval of the Application will be subject to the conditions proposed by the Applicant at Ex. 20A of the case record.

SUMMARY ORDER

17. Since no persons or parties appeared in opposition to the Application and the affected ANC, 6C, supported the Application with conditions related to the hours and noise levels of the penthouse-level eating and drinking establishment, a decision by the Commission to grant this Application would not be adverse to any party (Ex. 21, 20A). Therefore, pursuant to Subtitle Z § 604.7, the Commission authorized a summary order in this case and determined it may waive the requirement that findings of fact and conclusions of law accompany the Order because such waiver will not prejudice the rights of any party.

DECISION

In consideration of the case record, the Commission **ORDERS APPROVAL** of the Application for a Modification with Hearing to the approved consolidated PUD in Z.C. Order No. 15-28 for the following:

- A special exception pursuant to Subtitle C § 1501.1(d) and Subtitle X § 901.2 to establish an eating and drinking establishment use within the penthouse of the hotel component of the Approved PUD;
- Redesign of certain exterior architectural elements of the hotel structure;
- Increase the hotel guest room count to 179 rooms (with flexibility to vary the number of hotel guest rooms by +/- 10%); and
- Modify the design of the hotel penthouse and devote a portion of the penthouse and outdoor roof area to an eating and drinking establishment use.

Condition Nos. 1 and 3 of Z.C. Order No. 15-28 are revised as follows:

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. The Project shall be developed in accordance with the plans marked as Ex. 13D, 21C, and 33A of the record, **as modified by the plans marked as Exhibits 20B1–20B3 in Z.C. Case No. 15-28A,** as modified by guidelines, conditions, and standards herein (collectively, the “Plans”).
3. The Applicant shall have flexibility with the design of the PUD in the following areas:
 - j. **To vary the number of hotel guest rooms by +/- 10%, provided that such variation does not substantially alter the exterior configuration or appearance of the building.**

A new condition is inserted into the “MITIGATION” section of Z.C. Order No. 15-28 as follows:

MITIGATION

12. **For the duration of the use of eating and drinking establishment on the penthouse-level of the hotel, the following measures shall be implemented to mitigate the potential impacts of amplified music that may be generated on the rooftop terrace of such establishment:**
 - a. **The Applicant shall not permit outdoor amplified music on such terrace or any other rooftop outdoor space(s) of the project during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. The Applicant may permit outdoor amplified music during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. on such terrace or other rooftop outdoor space(s), provided that such outdoor amplified music shall not exceed 65 db(A) when measured at the Property line;**
 - b. **The Applicant may permit indoor amplified music during the hours of operation of any eating and drinking establishment use located inside the project’s penthouse, provided such indoor amplified shall not exceed 65 db(A) when measured at the Property line; and**
 - c. **The Applicant shall maintain a recording device at the 3rd Street property line that will monitor sound levels caused by the project’s use of amplified music on the rooftop and maintain a record of the prior 30 days.**

FINAL ACTION

VOTE (November 24, 2025): 5-0-0

(Gwen Wright, Tammy Stidham, Anthony J. Hood, Robert E. Miller, and Joseph S. Imamura to approve).

In accordance with the provisions of Subtitle Z § 604.9, this Order No. 15-28A shall become final and effective upon publication in the *District of Columbia Register*; that is, on August 7, 2026.

BY THE ORDER OF THE D.C. ZONING COMMISSION

A majority of the Commission members approved the issuance of this Order.



ANTHONY J. HOOD
CHAIRMAN
ZONING COMMISSION



SARA A. BARDIN
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF ZONING

THE APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO COMPLY FULLY WITH THE PROVISIONS THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, D.C. LAW 2-38, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE § 2-1401.01 ET SEQ., (THE “ACT”). THIS ORDER IS CONDITIONED UPON FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE PROVISIONS. IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ACT, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED: RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PERSONAL APPEARANCE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY OR EXPRESSION, FAMILIAL STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, MATRICULATION, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, GENETIC INFORMATION, DISABILITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS A FORM OF SEX DISCRIMINATION WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION. THE FAILURE OR REFUSAL OF THE APPLICANT TO COMPLY SHALL FURNISH GROUNDS FOR DENIAL OR, IF ISSUED, REVOCATION OF ANY BUILDING PERMITS OR CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDER.