

**DRAFT
FOR OZLD USE ONLY**

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING
Z.C. CASE NO. 24-01**

**Howard University, The Trustees of Florida Avenue Baptist Church, and
Florida Avenue Baptist Church**

(Zoning Map Amendment from the RA-2, PDR-2 and PDR-3 zones to the MU-9B and MU-10 zones; east side of Georgia Avenue, N.W. between Euclid Street, N.W. to the north and Florida Avenue, N.W. to the south: Sq. 3060, Lots 830 & 839; Sq. 3064, Lots 44, 45, 826 & 837; Sq. 3065, Lots 829-831, 833 & 834; Sq. 3074, Lot 11; Sq. 3075, Lot 807; and Sq. 3078, Lots 17, 26-28 & 30) – Ward 1

The Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (the “Commission”), pursuant to its authority under § 1 of the Zoning Act of 1938, approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 797; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01 (2018 Repl.)), and pursuant to § 6 of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, approved October 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 1206, as amended; D.C. Official Code § 2505 (2013 Repl.)), hereby gives notice of its adoption of the following amendments to the Zoning Map:

- Map amendment to rezone the properties identified below, which are located on the east side of Georgia Avenue, N.W., from Euclid Street, N.W. south to Florida Avenue, N.W. (collectively, the “Property”), as follows:
 - Square 3060, Lots 830 and 839, from the RA-2 zone to the MU-10 zone;
 - Square 3064, Lots 45 and 837, from the RA-2 zone to the MU-10 zone;
 - Square 3064, Lots 44 and 826, from the PDR-2 zone to the MU-10 zone;
 - Square 3065, Lots 829-831, 833, and 834, from the PDR-3 zone to the MU-10 zone;
 - Square 3074, Lot 11, from the PDR-3 zone to the MU-9B zone;
 - Square 3075, Lot 807 (western portion), from the PDR-3 and RA-2 zones to the MU-9B zone;
 - Square 3075, Lot 807 (eastern portion), from the PDR-3 and RA-2 zones to the MU-10 zone; and
 - Square 3078, Lots 17, 26-28, and 30, from the PDR-3 zone to the MU-10 zone.

The Commission determined that the Property is appropriate for Inclusionary Zoning (“IZ”) Plus pursuant to Subtitle X § 502.1(a)(1). As such, the Property shall be indicated with an “IZ+” symbol on the Zoning Map.

THE PETITION

On January 12, 2024, and as amended on January 17, 2024, Howard University (hereinafter referred to as the “University” or “Petitioner”), in conjunction with The Trustees of Florida Avenue Baptist Church and the Florida Avenue Baptist Church (collectively, the “Church”), filed a petition requesting that the Commission approve a proposed map amendment to rezone the Property from the RA-2 zone to the MU-10 zone, the PDR-2 zone to the MU-10 zone, the PDR-3 zone to the MU-10 zone, the PDR-3 zone to the MU-9B zone, and the RA-2 zone to the MU-9B zone (the request is collectively referred to as the “Map Amendment” or the “Petition”). (Exhibit [“Ex.”] 1–4A.)

Description of the Property to be Rezoned

The Property consists of approximately 1,157,379 square feet of land area (26.56± acres) primarily within Howard's Central Campus and is located within the boundaries of Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("ANC") 1E and ANC 1B. The Property includes the Howard University Hospital, the Howard University College of Medicine, Howard University auxiliary services, and various retail uses. The Property is bounded on the north by Euclid Street, on the south by Florida Avenue, on the east by the University's campus and single family residences, and on the west by Georgia Avenue. There are multiple future mixed-use developments approved or being constructed on the west side of Georgia Avenue. These future mixed-use developments include approximately 180 hotel keys, 900 residential units, a 20,000 square foot public plaza, 75,000 square feet of retail space, and 200,000 square feet of office space.

The majority of the proposed area to be rezoned is governed by the 2020–2030 Howard University Central Campus Plan (the "Campus Plan"). The Campus Plan became effective on April 8, 2022, (Z.C. Order No. 20-08) and outlines several future and major projects to be undertaken for new and renovated buildings which would result in improved facilities for student, faculty, and staff including additional housing on campus for University students. The Campus Plan also outlines ways to address issues concerning the wider community and restricts housing on land subject to the Campus Plan for University students, faculty, and staff.

Current Zoning

The Property is currently zoned RA-2, PDR-2 and PDR-3.

The **Residential Apartment ("RA") zones** are designed to be mapped in areas identified as moderate- or high-density residential areas suitable for multiple dwelling unit development and supporting uses. Subtitle F § 100.2. The RA zones are intended to, among other things:

- Permit flexibility by allowing all types of residential development;
- Promote stable residential areas while permitting a variety of types of urban residential neighborhoods;
- Promote a walkable living environment; and
- Allow limited non-residential uses that are compatible with adjoining residential uses.

[Subtitle F § 101.2.]

The **RA-2 zone** is intended to provide for areas developed with predominately moderate-density residential uses. Subtitle F § 101.5. The RA-2 zone permits a maximum density of 1.8 floor area ratio ("FAR") (2.16 FAR for IZ); permits a maximum building height of 50 feet ("ft."); permits a maximum penthouse height of 12 ft., except 15 ft. for penthouse mechanical space; and permits a maximum lot occupancy of 60%. Subtitle F §§ 201.1, 201.4, 203.2, 205.1, and 210.1.

The **Production, Distribution, and Repair ("PDR") zones** provide for heavy commercial and light manufacturing activities employing large numbers of people and requiring some heavy machinery under controls that minimize any adverse effect on other nearby, more restrictive zones. PDR zones also provide for areas suitable for development as heavy industrial sites, but at the

Z.C. NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Z.C. CASE NO. 24-01

PAGE 2

same time protects those industrial developments from the intrusion of non-industrial uses that impede the full utilization of properly located industrial sites. Subtitle J § 101.1. The provisions of the PDR zones are intended to, among other things:

- Regulate the use of land and structures and the erection and modification of structures in areas characterized by PDR uses, typically with heavy truck traffic and loading and unloading operations;
- Encourage the retention of viable land to accommodate production, warehousing, distribution, light and heavy industrial, and research and development activities; and
- Minimize encroachment by uses that are incompatible with PDR uses, including residential uses, which could impair existing PDR activities.

[Subtitle J § 101.2.]

The **PDR-2 zone** is intended to permit medium-density commercial and PDR activities employing a large workforce and requiring some heavy machinery under controls that minimize any adverse impacts on adjacent, more restrictive zones. Subtitle J § 101.4. The PDR-2 zone permits a maximum density of 4.5 FAR for use categories listed in Subtitle J § 201.2¹ (3.0 FAR for all other uses); permits a maximum building height of 60 ft.; and permits a maximum penthouse height of 12 ft., except 18 ft., 6 inches (“in.”) is permitted for penthouse mechanical space. Subtitle J §§ 201, 203.2, 205.1.

The **PDR-3 zone** is intended to permit high-density commercial and PDR activities employing a large workforce and requiring some heavy machinery under controls that minimize any adverse impacts on adjacent, more restrictive zones. The PDR-3 zone permits a maximum density of 6.0 for use categories listed in Subtitle J § 201.2 (4.0 FAR for all other uses); permits a maximum building height of 90 ft.; and permits a maximum penthouse height of 20 ft. Subtitle J §§ 201, 203.2, 205.1.

Proposed Zoning

The Petitioner proposes to rezone the Property to the MU-9B and MU-10 zones.

The **Mixed Use (“MU”) zones** provide for mixed-use developments that permit a broad range of commercial, institutional, and multiple dwelling residential development at varying densities. Subtitle G § 101.1. The MU zones are designed to provide facilities for housing, shopping, and business needs, including residential, office, service, and employment centers. Subtitle G § 101.2.

The MU zones are intended to, among other things:

- Provide for the orderly development and use of land and structures in the MU zones, characterized by a mixture of land uses;

¹ These land use categories include Agriculture, Large; Animal Sales, Care, and Boarding; Arts, Design, and Creation; Government, Large Scale; Government, Local; Production, Distribution, and Repair; Utility (basic); and Waste-Related Services.

- Provide for a varied mix of residential, employment, retail, service, and other related uses at appropriate densities and scale throughout the city;
- Reflect a variety of building types, including, but not limited to, shop-front buildings which may include a vertical mixture of residential and non-residential uses, buildings made up entirely of residential uses, and buildings made up entirely of non-residential uses; and
- Ensure that infill development is compatible with the prevailing development pattern within the zone and surrounding areas.

[Subtitle G § 101.3.]

The **MU-9B zone** is one of two types of MU-9 zones. The MU-9 zones are intended to permit high-density mixed-use development including office, retail, and housing, with a focus on employment and residential use and are intended be located in or near the Central Employment Area,² on arterial streets, in uptown and regional centers, and at rapid transit stops. Subtitle G § 101.14. The MU-9B zone permits a maximum density of 6.5 FAR (7.8 FAR for IZ), and a maximum FAR of 6.5 for non-residential uses; permits a maximum building height of 90 ft. (100 ft. for IZ), with no limit on the number of stories; permits a maximum penthouse height of 20 ft; and has no maximum permitted lot occupancy for residential use. Subtitle G §§ 201.1, 203.2, 205.1, and 210.1.

The **MU-10 zone** is intended to:

- Permit medium- to high-density mixed-use development with a balance of uses conducive to a higher quality of life and environment for residents, businesses, employees, and institutions;
- Be applied to areas where a mixture of uses and building densities is intended to carry out elements of the Comprehensive Plan, small area plans, or framework plans, including goals in employment, population, transportation, housing, public facilities, and environmental quality;
- Require a level of public space at the ground level; and
- Allow residential and non-residential bulk to be apportioned between two (2) or more lots in the same square.

[Subtitle G § 101.15.]

The MU-10 zone permits a maximum density of 6.0 FAR (7.2 FAR for IZ), and a maximum FAR of 3.0 for non-residential uses; permits a maximum building height of 90 ft. (100 ft. for IZ), with no limit on the number of stories; permits a maximum penthouse height of 20 ft.; and a maximum lot occupancy of 75% for residential use (80% for IZ). Subtitle G §§ 201.1, 203.2, 205.1, and 210.1. In the MU-10 zone, the allowable residential and non-residential FAR may be apportioned between two (2) or more lots in the same square, regardless of the FAR limits, subject to a

² The Central Employment Area (“CEA”) is the core area of the District of Columbia where the greatest concentration of employment in the city and region is encouraged. The geographic boundaries of the CEA are detailed in the Comprehensive Plan. Subtitle B § 100.2.

combined lot agreement in accordance with the provisions of Subtitle C, Chapter 12 and the conditions set forth in Subtitle G § 201.3(a) and (b). Subtitle G § 201.3.

SUBMISSIONS PRIOR TO SET DOWN

The Petitioner's *Statement in Support* (Ex. 3) asserts, among other things, that the proposed Map Amendment will establish zoning on the Property that is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as required under the Home Rule Charter, will establish zoning on the Property that will further the Property's designations on the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map ("FLUM"), permit an increase in allowable density on the Property that will facilitate the future redevelopment of the Property consistent with its designations on the Comprehensive Plan Generalized Policy Map ("GPM") as a Main Street Mixed Use Corridor and Multi-Neighborhood Center, and provide opportunities to redevelop the Property with new multifamily housing including affordable housing, and retail, where such housing and retail options are lacking and desired in the surrounding area.

The Petitioner's *Evaluation of Consistency with the DC Comprehensive Plan and Applicable Small Area Plan* (the "Comp Plan Evaluation") (Ex. 3E) applies the Commission's Racial Equity Tool to assess the merits of the proposed rezoning. The Comp Plan Evaluation analyzes the Map Amendment against (i) the District's racial equity objectives, (ii) the Comprehensive Plan FLUM and GPM designations on the Property; (iii) the relevant objectives and recommendations of the Mid-City Area Element; (iv) the relevant Citywide Elements; and (iv) the objectives and recommendations of the DUKE Development Framework for a Cultural Designation District within Washington, DC's Greater Shaw / U Street, the applicable Small Area Plans known as the "DUKE Plan." Further, the Petitioner's Comp Plan Evaluation identifies potential inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan. The Petitioner asserts that any such inconsistencies are outweighed by other Comprehensive Plan policies or competing considerations, including those set forth in the 2019 Housing Equity Report prepared by OP and the District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development.

On March 18, 2024, OP filed a set down report (the "OP Setdown Report") recommending that the Commission set down the Petition for a public hearing. The OP Setdown Report noted that the proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Property's designations on the FLUM, which recommends Mixed Use (Medium Density Residential / Medium Density Commercial / Institutional) uses, Mixed Use (High Density Residential / Medium Density Commercial / Institutional) uses, and Mixed Use (Medium Density Residential / Medium Density Commercial). Additionally, as noted in the OP Setdown Report, the mix of uses permitted by the proposed Map Amendment would improve the neighborhood and would not be inconsistent with the GPM, which categorizes the portion of the Property located on the University's campus as a Main Street Mixed Use Corridor and as a Multi-Neighborhood Center. A more detailed summary of the contents of the OP Setdown Report is provided below. (Ex. 12.)

On March 28, 2024, the Commission set down the Map Amendment as a rulemaking case.³ At the Commission’s public meeting, the Commission heard testimony from OP in support of the Map Amendment.

NOTICE

On October 17, 2024, pursuant to Subtitle Z § 502, the Office of Zoning (“OZ”) sent notice of the December 16, 2024, public hearing, and published notice of the public hearing in the November 1, 2024, *D.C. Register* and published notice of the public hearing on the calendar on OZ’s website. (Ex. 18, 19, 20.)

DISTRICT AGENCY REPORTS

DDOT Report

On December 6, 2024, the District Department of Transportation (“DDOT”) submitted a report (the “DDOT Report”) stating that DDOT has no objection to the Map Amendment. (Ex. 28.)

ANC Reports

The Property is located within the boundaries of ANC 1E and ANC 1B. Therefore, both ANCs are an affected ANC, as defined by Subtitle Z § 101.8. On October 31, 2024, ANC 1E submitted a report (“ANC 1E Report”) expressing ANC 1E’s recommendation of support for the Map Amendment. (Ex. 22.) On December 3, 2024, ANC 1B submitted a report (“ANC 1B Report”) expressing ANC 1B’s recommendation of support for the Map Amendment. (Ex. 27.)

OP Reports

****OP Setdown Report****

OP’s Setdown Report states that the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the recommendations of the Mid-City Element, the DUKE Small Area Plan, and the Campus Plan together support rezoning the Property to allow an increase in density and to accommodate the revitalization of this portion of Georgia Avenue through the redevelopment of the University’s properties to support their needs as well as those of the neighborhood and the District as a whole. The uses that could be accommodated by the proposed Map Amendment include retail, service, and health care uses, as well as improvements to the public realm. (Ex. 12.) A summary of the contents of the OP Setdown Report follows.

Comprehensive Plan Maps

Future Land Use Map

The FLUM designates the Property with the following land uses categories:

- Mixed Use (Medium Density Residential / Medium Density Commercial / Institutional);
- Mixed Use (High Density Residential / Medium Density Commercial / Institutional); and
- Mixed Use (Medium Density Residential / Medium Density Commercial)

³ The Commission set this case down as a rulemaking case pursuant to Subtitle Z § 201.7(b)(1) because the University does not own all of the property proposed to be rezoned. Further, the Commission also noted that the property proposed to be rezoned is of a character that raises land use policy questions to a greater degree than highly localized issues of facts and effects on neighboring properties.

These land use categories are defined below:

- **Mixed Use Categories:** *The Future Land Use Map indicates areas where the mixing of two or more land uses is especially encouraged. The particular combination of uses desired in a given area is depicted in striped patterns, with stripe colors corresponding to the categories defined on the previous pages. . . The Mixed Use Category generally applies in the following circumstances:*
 - a. *Established, pedestrian-oriented commercial areas that also include substantial amounts of housing, typically on the upper stories of buildings with ground-floor retail or office uses;*
 - b. *Commercial corridors or districts which may not contain substantial amounts of housing today, but where more housing is desired in the future. The pattern envisioned for such areas is typically one of pedestrian-oriented streets, with ground-floor retail or office uses and upper story housing;*
 - c. *Large sites (generally greater than 10 acres in size), where opportunities for multiple uses exist, but a plan depicting the precise location of these uses has yet to be prepared; and*
 - d. *Development that includes residential uses, particularly affordable housing, and residentially compatible industrial uses, typically achieved through a Planned Unit Development or in a zone district that allows such a mix of uses. 10-A DCMR § 227.20.*

The "Mixed Use" designation is intended primarily for larger areas where no single use predominates today, or areas where multiple uses are specifically encouraged in the future. 10-A DCMR §227.22. A variety of zoning designations are used in Mixed Use areas, depending on the combination of uses, densities, and intensities. . . . Residential uses are permitted in all of the MU zones, however, so many Mixed Use areas may have MU zoning. 10-A DCMR § 227.23.

- **Medium Density Residential:** *This designation is used to define neighborhoods or areas generally but not exclusively, suited for mid-rise apartment buildings. The Medium Density Residential designation also may apply to taller residential buildings surrounded by large areas of permanent open space. Pockets of low and moderate density housing may exist within these areas. Density typically ranges from 1.8 to 4.0 FAR, although greater density may be possible when complying with Inclusionary Zoning or when approved through a Planned Unit Development. The RA-3 Zone District is consistent with the Medium Density Residential Category, and other zones may also apply. 10-A DCMR § 227.7.*
- **High Density Residential:** *This designation is used to define neighborhoods and corridors generally, but not exclusively, suited for high-rise apartment buildings. Pockets of less dense housing may exist within these areas. Density is typically greater than a FAR of 4.0, and greater density may be possible when complying with Inclusionary Zoning or when approved through a Planned Unit Development. The RA-4 and RA-5 Zone Districts are consistent with the High Density Residential category, and other zones may also apply. 10-A DCMR § 227.8.*

- **Medium Density Commercial:** *This designation is used to define shopping and service areas that are somewhat greater in scale and intensity than the Moderate Density Commercial areas. Retail, office, and service businesses are the predominant uses, although residential uses are common. Areas with this designation generally draw from a citywide market area. Buildings are larger and/or taller than those in Moderate Density Commercial areas. Density typically ranges between a FAR of 4.0 and 6.0, with greater density possible when complying with Inclusionary Zoning or when approved through a Planned Unit Development. The MU-8 and MU-10 Zone Districts are consistent with the Medium Density category, and other zones may also apply. 10-A DCMR § 227.12.*
- **Institutional:** *This designation includes land and facilities occupied and used by colleges and universities, large private schools, hospitals, religious organizations, and similar institutions. While included in this category, smaller institutional uses such as churches are generally not mapped, unless they are located on sites that are several acres in size. Zoning designations vary depending on surrounding uses. Institutional uses are also permitted in other land use categories. 10-A DCMR § 227.18.*

Citing to the Framework Element, which states that the FLUM is intended to provide generalized guidelines for development decisions, OP concludes that the proposed Map Amendment is not inconsistent with the Property's FLUM designations. The Framework Element identifies the MU-10 zone as being consistent with the Medium Density category. OP also finds the MU-9B zone to be appropriate because the MU-9B zone permits high-density mixed-use development including office, retail, and housing, with a focus on employment and residential use.

Generalized Policy Map

The GPM indicates that a significant portion of the Property is within the policy area designated as a **Main Street Mixed Use Corridor**, which encompasses substantial portions of 7th Street, N.W. and George Avenue, N.W. The portion of the Property located on the east side of George Avenue, N.W., south of Bryant Street, N.W. and north of V Street, N.W., is designated as a **Multi-Neighborhood Center**.

These designations are defined below:

Main Street Mixed Use Corridors: *These are traditional commercial business corridors with a concentration of older storefronts along the street. The area served can vary from one neighborhood (e.g., 14th Street Heights or Barracks Row) to multiple neighborhoods (e.g., Dupont Circle, H Street, or Adams Morgan). Their common feature is that they have a pedestrian-oriented environment with traditional storefronts. Many have upper-story residential or office uses and some corridors are underutilized, with capacity for redevelopment. Conservation and enhancement of these corridors is desired to foster economic and housing opportunities and serve neighborhood needs. Any development or redevelopment that occurs should support transit use and enhance the pedestrian environment. 10-A DCMR § 225.14.*

Multi-Neighborhood Centers: *Multi-Neighborhood Centers contain many of the same activities as Neighborhood Commercial Centers, but in greater depth and variety. The area served by a Multi-Neighborhood Center is typically one to three miles. These centers are generally found at major*

intersections and along key transit routes. These centers might include supermarkets, general merchandise stores, drug stores, restaurants, specialty shops, apparel stores, and a variety of service-oriented businesses. These centers also may include residential and office space for small businesses, although their primary function remains retail trade. 10-A DCMR § 225.17.

OP concluded that the proposed Map Amendment is not inconsistent with the GPM. The area to be rezoned is part of the larger Georgia Avenue Main Street Mixed Use Corridor, a pedestrian-oriented roadway with multiple bus routes and is in close proximity to the Shaw/Howard University and the U Street/African-American Civil War Memorial/Cardozo Metrorail stations. This portion of Georgia Avenue has traditionally been developed with university uses such as classroom, offices, open spaces, a hotel and some retail uses. Accordingly, the proposed Map Amendment would facilitate new development that would maintain a pedestrian-friendly environment and would encourage transit use. Furthermore, the proposed Map Amendment would enable the redevelopment of this portion of Georgia Avenue with a mix of university uses and new retail uses that would serve the wider community, consistent with the objectives for a Main Street Mixed Use Corridor.

The proposed MU-9B and MU-10 zones are not inconsistent with the recommendations of the Multi-Neighborhood Center designation, which is the GPM designation for the properties located between Bryant Street, N.W. on the north, and V Street, N.W. on the south. These properties would combine with the properties to the west of Georgia Avenue, N.W. to become the long awaited Howard Town Center, which is envisioned to be developed with a mix of residential, retail, office and service uses and would attract persons from beyond the adjacent neighborhoods. The density and intensity of development that would be allowed under the proposed Map Amendment would enable such a mix of uses and could support surrounding uses that are specific to the University and the Howard University Hospital. As such, the proposed Map Amendment would improve the immediate neighborhood and is therefore not inconsistent with the GPM.

IZ Plus

The OP Setdown Report affirmed that residential development on the site by the University, such as dormitories or housing for staff and faculty, would not be subject to IZ or IZ Plus, pursuant to Subtitle C § 100.6(c) of the Zoning Regulations.⁴ However, following the rezoning, any parcels that are removed from the Campus Plan and developed for non-university uses would be subject to the District's IZ Program, including IZ Plus. The parcels owned by Howard University outside of the boundaries of the Campus Plan and the parcels owned by the Florida Avenue Baptist Church and the Florida Avenue Baptist Church Trustees would be subject to IZ Plus.

Racial Equity

The Comprehensive Plan requires the Commission to apply the standard of review applicable to the Map Amendment through a racial equity lens. 10-A DCMR § 2501.8. Consideration of equity is intended to be based on the policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and part of the Commission's consideration of whether the Map Amendment is "not inconsistent" with the Comprehensive Plan, rather than a separate determination about a zoning action's equitable impact.

⁴ The provision exempts "[h]ousing developed by or on behalf of a local college or university exclusively for its students, faculty, or staff" from the District's IZ program.

The Comprehensive Plan Framework Element states that equity is achieved by targeted actions and investments to meet residents where they are, to create equitable opportunities, but is not the same as equality. 10-A DCMR § 213.6. Further, “[e]quitable development is a participatory approach for meeting the needs of underserved communities through policies, programs and/or practices [and] holistically considers land use, transportation, housing, environmental, and cultural conditions, and creates access to education, services, healthcare, technology, workforce development, and employment opportunities.” 10-A DCMR § 213.7 The District applies a racial equity lens by targeting support to communities of color through policies and programs focusing on their needs and eliminating barriers to participate and make informed decisions. 10-A DCMR § 213.9.

The Comprehensive Plan Implementation Element provides guidance to help the Commission in applying a racial equity lens to its decision making. Specifically, the Implementation Element states, “[a]long with consideration of the defining language on equity and racial equity in the Framework Element, guidance in the Citywide Elements on District-wide equity objectives, and the Area Elements should be used as a tool to help guide equity interests and needs of different areas in the District.” 10-A DCMR § 2501.6.

The Property’s location within the Mid-City Planning Area (hereinafter “Mid-City” or the “Planning Area”) informs the racial equity analysis in this case. The Comprehensive Plan notes that, between 2000 and 2017, the Planning Area experienced a shift in population characteristics. In 2000, Black residents were Mid-City’s predominant racial group at 52 percent, and the Hispanic/Latino population was 22 percent. By 2017, the Black population decreased to 31 percent of the total population, the white population increased from 27 percent to 52 percent of the total population, and approximately 18 percent of the population was Hispanic/Latino. 10-A DCMR § 2003.2.

Recent demographic data suggests that the population in the Planning Area is becoming more diverse, likely due to increased housing opportunities and advances in median income among various races/ethnicities. Only 6.7% of residents of the Planning Area are over the age of 65, compared to the Districtwide total of 12.2%, down 7.5% throughout this time period. The percentage of children, however, rose during this time period, but remained below that of the District as a whole. The median income of Mid-City was higher than that of the District in both the 2012–2016 and the 2017–2021 time periods, and the increase in median income over those time periods were also higher. Between 2012–2016, the unemployment rate in the Planning Area was 6%, which was lower than the District’s unemployment rate of 8.7%.

With respect to housing tenure in Mid-City, White, Asian and residents/households identifying as Two or More Races had the highest percentage of owner-occupied housing during both time periods. Hispanic, Black, and African American householders were at a lower percentage, at approximately 30% owner occupancy. While the Map Amendment would not provide opportunities for new housing other than dormitories or housing for university staff and faculty, adding this housing on campus could free up other housing off-campus and relieve housing pressure throughout the Planning Area in general. Over the long term, if any of the Property is deemed by the University as being available for private development, new housing, including

affordable housing, could be constructed in accordance with the permitted densities of the zone, thus advancing relevant objectives in the Comprehensive Plan specific to achieving racial equity.

The Commission's Racial Equity Analysis Tool⁵ is a four-part assessment that outlines information to be provided to assist in the evaluation of zoning actions through a racial equity lens. Part One involves an assessment of the Citywide Elements and the relevant Area Element in the Comprehensive Plan. Part Two requires the Petition to provide a discussion regarding its community outreach and engagement efforts. Part Three requires OP to provide disaggregated data regarding race and ethnicity and Part Four involves an evaluation of impacts and outcomes.

The OP Setdown Report recognized that the Petitioner's Comp Plan Evaluation included the information called for by the Commission's Racial Equity Tool. (Ex. 3E, 12). The OP Setdown Report also analyzed the Map Amendment through a racial equity lens by applying the Commission's Racial Equity Tool, and generally found that the proposed Map Amendment would result in favorable outcomes. (*See* Ex. 12, pp. 12–23.) Further, the OP Setdown Report noted that “[w]hile it can be difficult to assess actual impact that would result from any development on these sites, the potential impacts—positive or negative—of new development that would result from the proposed rezoning can be assessed, on the assumption that development consistent with permissions of the new zones would, at some point, be done.” (Ex. 12, p. 12.)

****OP Hearing Report****

On December 6, 2024, OP submitted a report (the “OP Hearing Report” and, together with the OP Setdown Report, the “OP Reports”) that recommended approval of the proposed Map Amendment and largely reiterated the statements and conclusions of the OP Set down Report. (Ex. 29.)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: CITYWIDE ELEMENTS

Applying Part One of the Commission's Racial Equity Tool, both the Petitioner and OP asserted that the Map Amendment proposal is, on balance, not inconsistent with the Citywide Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. (Ex. 3E, 12.) The Petitioner and OP have found that the proposed Map Amendment would further policies of the Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Environmental Protection, and Economic Development Element. Moreover, OP found that certain policies of the Educational Facilities Element would be advanced by the proposed rezoning. (Ex. 3E, p. 14-15.) The policies cited above and the justifications put forth by the Petitioner and/or OP are summarized below.

Land Use

As the Land Use Element guides the direction of future growth, it also affects future access to housing, education, jobs, services, amenities, and transportation and impacts the health and safety of residents. Growth can and must occur in a way that expands access to affordable housing, education, transportation, employment, and services for communities of color, low-income households, and vulnerable populations. Achieving equitable development requires attention to both the context and needs of different planning areas and to District-wide equity issues, described throughout the Comprehensive Plan. 10-A DCMR § 304.4.

⁵ Available at <https://dcoz.dc.gov/release/zc-racial-equity-analysis-tool-new>.

The proposed rezoning to the MU-9B and MU-10 zones would facilitate the redevelopment of underutilized land with a mix of uses that would enhance the surrounding neighborhood and revitalize and the lower Georgia Avenue, N.W. corridor. Neither the Comprehensive Plan Maps, the Mid-City Area Element and Focus Policy Areas, nor the Howard University Campus Plan anticipate PDR uses on the Property. The proposed Map Amendment would allow for redevelopment with a mix of neighborhood-serving retail, university housing, office, and other institutional uses that would serve the University as well as existing and future residents of the surrounding neighborhood and would therefore help to create a vibrant corridor experience.

The proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Land Use Element overall, and specifically furthers those policies and planning actions listed below:

- *Policy LU-1.4.1: Station Areas as Neighborhood Centers*
- *Policy LU-1.4.2: Development Around Metrorail Stations*
- *Policy LU-1.4.3: Housing Around Metrorail Stations*
- *Policy LU-1.4.6: Development Along Corridors*
- *Action LU-1.4.B: Zoning Around Transit*
- *Action LU-1.4.C: Metro Station and Inclusionary Zoning*
- *Policy LU-1.5.1: Infill Development*
- *Policy LU-1.5.2: Long-Term Vacant Sites*
- *Policy LU-2.1.1: Variety of Neighborhood Types*
- *Policy LU-2.1.2: Neighborhood Revitalization*
- *Policy LU-2.1.3: Conserving, Enhancing, and Revitalizing Neighborhoods*
- *Policy LU-2.2.3: Restoration or Removal of Vacant and Abandoned Buildings*
- *Policy LU-2.2.4: Neighborhood Beautification*
- *Policy LU-2.3.5: Institutional Uses*
- *Policy LU-2.4.5: Encouraging Nodal Development*
- *Policy LU-2.4.6: Scale and Design of New Commercial Uses*
- *Policy LU-3.2.6: Rezoning of Industrial Areas*
- *Policy LU-3.3.1: Transportation Impacts of Institutional Uses*
- *Policy LU-3.3.2: Corporate Citizenship*

Transportation

The Transportation Element provides policies and actions to maintain and improve the District's transportation system and enhance the travel choices of current and future residents, visitors, and workers. 10-A DCMR § 400.1.

The Campus Plan incorporates many of the goals and policies of the Transportation Element which would be implemented through any new development or redevelopment along Georgia Avenue, N.W. Although some improvements are underway, many more are associated with the redevelopment of the Property. Movements related to buses, vehicles and bicycles would be assessed as part of any redevelopment. The Transportation Element encourages cross street connections, which are being implemented through the Campus Plan and would be furthered by any new development. Improvements to facilitate pedestrian movements and streetscape improvements would also be implemented to enhance the walkability of the area and discourage

Z.C. NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Z.C. CASE NO. 24-01

PAGE 12

auto-orientated uses because the proposed rezoning would result in a multitude of active uses. Further, because the Property is located along a major transit corridor near various forms of public transit, future redevelopment would provide increased access to neighborhood-serving commercial uses and institutional uses within the surrounding area.

The proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Transportation Element overall, and specifically furthers those policies listed below:

- *Policy T-1.1.4: Transit-Oriented Development*
- *Policy T-1.1.7: Equitable Transportation Access*
- *Policy T-1.2.1: Major Thoroughfare Improvements*
- *Policy T-1.2.3: Discouraging Auto-Oriented Uses*
- *Policy T-2.2.2: Connecting District Neighborhoods*
- *Policy T-2.3.2: Bicycle Network*
- *Policy T-2.4.1: Pedestrian Network*
- *Policy T-2.4.2: Pedestrian Safety*
- *Policy T-2.5.5: Natural Landscaping*
- *Policy T-2.6.1: Transportation Access*
- *Policy T-2.6.2: Transit Needs*

Housing

The Housing Element describes the importance of housing to neighborhood quality in Washington, DC, and the importance of providing housing opportunities for all segments of the population throughout Washington, DC. 10-A DCMR § 500.1. The overall goal for the District of Columbia is that a minimum of one third of all housing produced should be affordable to lower-income households. The short-term goal is to produce 36,000 residential units, 12,000 of which are affordable, by 2025. 10-A DCMR § 501.1. A multi-pronged strategy is needed to facilitate production, address regulatory and administrative constraints, and deliver a substantial number of the new units that are affordable to District residents, particularly to moderate and lower income residents. 10-A DCMR § 502.5.

The additional density through the rezoning would allow for a larger number of students to reside on campus and would therefore allow other available housing opportunities to go to other District residents. Moreover, if portions of the Property are removed from the Campus Plan and developed for non-university uses, the proposed Petition would help create additional housing at a desirable, transit-accessible location that is consistent with the city's land use and housing policies and objectives.

The proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Housing Element overall, and specifically furthers the two policies reprinted below:

- *Policy H-1.1.8 – Production of Housing in High-Cost Areas. Encourage development of both market rate and affordable housing in high-cost areas of the District, making these areas more inclusive. Develop new, innovative tools and techniques that support affordable housing in these areas. Doing so increases costs per unit but provides greater benefits in terms of access to opportunity and outcomes.*

Z.C. NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Z.C. CASE NO. 24-01

PAGE 13

- *Policy H-1.3.5 - Student Housing: Require colleges and universities to address the needs of their students and promote the use of such housing by their students.*

Environmental Protection

The Environmental Protection Element addresses the protection, conservation, and management of Washington, DC’s land, air, water, energy, and biological resources. This Element provides policies and actions for addressing important issues such as climate change, drinking water safety, the restoration of the tree canopy, energy conservation, air quality, watershed protection, pollution prevention, waste management, the remediation of contaminated sites, and environmental justice. 10-A DCMR § 600.1.

Any future development or redevelopment of the Property would be required to comply with the Green Building Act and the District’s storm water management regulations and would therefore be consistent with the Sustainable DC Plan in addition to any other requirements by the District of Columbia Department of Energy and the Environment (“DOEE”). Additionally, the developed or redeveloped buildings would be required to incorporate energy efficient systems to reduce energy use and provide alternative energy sources that would contribute to the District’s energy efficiency goals. Redevelopment of the Property would also include new landscaping and environmentally friendly enhancements to the adjoining streetscape that would meet the City’s Environmental Protection goals.

The proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Environmental Protection Element overall, and specifically furthers the policies listed below:

- *Policy E-1.1.2: Urban Heat Island Mitigation*
- *Policy E-2.1.2: Tree Requirements in New Development*
- *Policy E-2.1.3: Sustainable Landscaping Practices*
- *Policy E-3.2.2 Net-Zero Buildings*
- *Policy E-3.2.3: Renewable Energy*
- *Policy E-3.2.7: Energy-Efficient Building and Site Planning*
- *Policy E-3.2.9: Energy Efficiency for Major Employers*
- *Policy E-4.1.1: Maximizing Permeable Surfaces*
- *Policy E-4.1.2: Using Landscaping and Green Roofs to Reduce Runoff*

Economic Development

The Economic Development Element addresses the future of Washington, DC’s economy and the creation of economic opportunity for current and future District residents. It includes strategies to sustain the District’s major industries, diversify the economy, accommodate job growth, maintain small businesses and neighborhood commercial districts, and increase access to employment for District residents. 10-A DCMR § 700.1. The overarching goal for economic development in the District is to drive inclusive economic expansion and resilience by growing the economy and reducing employment disparities across race, geography, and educational attainment status. 10-A DCMR § 701.1.

The proposed Map Amendment has the potential to provide new retail, office and service opportunities in a transit-accessible area. Additional office space could allow for the expansion of healthcare and research uses associated with the University. The Map Amendment also increases the potential to create significant retail and service space to support the needs of the University and residents in the surrounding area. Furthermore, future uses can support institutional growth and programs associated with the University and can also assist in revitalizing the Georgia Avenue, N.W. corridor.

The proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Economic Development Element overall, and specifically furthers the policies listed below:

- *Policy ED-1.1.1: Core Industries*
- *Policy ED-1.1.3: Diversification*
- *Policy ED-1.1.5: Build Capacity and Opportunities*
- *Policy ED-1.1.6: Competitive Edge*
- *Policy ED-1.3.4: Leveraging and Adapting to Technological Change*
- *Policy ED-2.2.1: Expanding the Retail Sector*
- *Policy ED-2.2.3: Neighborhood Shopping*
- *Policy ED-2.2.4: Support Local Entrepreneurs*
- *Policy ED-2.2.5: Business Mix*
- *Policy ED-2.2.7: Planning For Retail*
- *Policy ED-2.2.9: Clustered Retail at Transit*
- *Policy ED-2.4.1: Institutional Growth*
- *Policy ED-2.4.2: Secondary Benefits*
- *Policy ED-2.4.3: Higher Education and Health Care Linkages*
- *Policy ED-2.4.5: Partnerships with Anchor Institutions*
- *Policy ED-3.1.1: Neighborhood Commercial Vitality*

Educational Facilities

The Educational Facilities Element addresses the location, planning, use, and design of the District's educational facilities and campuses. 10-A DCMR § 1200.1. The Educational Facilities Element focuses on the efficient use of school property and the relationship between schools and the communities that surround them. 10-A DCMR § 1200.3. The overarching goal for educational facilities is to provide facilities that accommodate population growth and its geographic distribution and inspire excellence in learning; create a safe and healthy environment for students; and help each individual achieve their fullest potential while helping to build and strengthen local communities. 10-A DCMR § 1201.1.

The University is supportive of many of the District's goals for improvement in education, preservation of the environment, encouraging and supporting the use of public transportation, and reducing the use of single-occupancy vehicles and will incorporate these measures in the future developments. The University is also heavily involved in the community and places multiple student volunteers throughout the community that will continue to serve District residents through the services they provide. Additionally, the University would continue to support opportunities that serve and address the needs

of the University as well as the surrounding community. Further, the proposed Map Amendment would allow a significant increase in on-site housing opportunities for both lower and upper-class students. Most importantly, the proposed Map Amendment would result in a level of development that is anticipated by the Campus Plan.

The proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Educational Facilities Element overall, and specifically furthers the policies listed below:

- *Policy EDU-3.2.2: Corporate Citizenship*
- *Policy EDU-3.3.2: Balancing University Growth and Neighborhood Needs*
- *Policy EDU-3.3.4: Student Housing*
- *Policy EDU-3.3.5: Transportation Impacts of Colleges and Universities*
- *Policy EDU-3.3.6: Faculty Housing*
- *Policy EDU-3.3.9: Educational Facilities and Large Site Development*
- *Policy EDU-3.3.11: Access to Recreational, Educational, and Cultural Opportunities*

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: MID-CITY AREA ELEMENT

The Petitioner and OP have concluded that the Map Amendment will further the objectives of the Mid-City Area Element and the objectives of the policy focus areas within which the Property lies.

The area included in the proposed rezoning is located within the Mid-City Area Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Mid-City Planning Area is comprised of approximately 3.1 square miles. 10-A DCMR § 2000.1. The Planning Area is one of the most diverse parts of Washington, DC. Although it is one of the smallest of the ten planning areas geographically, it is the most populous and most dense. 10-A DCMR § 2000.2. Some Mid-City neighborhoods are still facing challenging economic and social conditions, including the Georgia Avenue N.W. and Florida Avenue N.W. corridors, where some buildings continue to lie vacant. 10-A DCMR § 2000.8.

The proposed rezoning to the MU-9B and MU-10 zones would provide for increased development potential, which would enhance and support the economic vitality of the surrounding area. The proposed Map Amendment would allow for higher density growth along the Georgia Avenue, N.W. corridor, as encouraged by the Property's GPM and FLUM designations, and would help preserve the row house character of the adjacent residential neighborhoods of LeDroit Park, Shaw, and Pleasant Plain. As envisioned in the Campus Plan, the revitalization and redevelopment of properties fronting on the Georgia Avenue, N.W. corridor would provide opportunities to enhance facades and buildings, and pedestrian and bicycle connections. New development would also include improvement to stormwater infrastructure, street trees, green roofs, pervious surfaces, and bioretention areas.

There are portions of the Property that are located within two policy focus areas within the Mid-City Area Element—the *Georgia Avenue Corridor Policy Focus Area* and the *U Street/Uptown Policy Focus Area*—which include a number of tailored recommendations and development objectives. The proposed rezoning would meet the policy for the revitalization for the *Georgia Avenue Corridor Policy Focus Area* because it would enable ground-floor retail and other street-activating uses. Additionally, the Map Amendment would facilitate the development of the

Howard Town Center, an accessible area with a mix of uses that could not only serve University students, but could also serve surrounding residents and the District as a whole. The southern portion of the Property is identified as being with the *U Street/Uptown Policy Focus Area*, which is envisioned as an area that will enhance and promote the District's Black cultural history. A mixed-use center would be able to further relevant policies of the focus area, as it would accommodate uses such as arts establishments, restaurants, and shops.

Overall, the proposed Map Amendment would not be inconsistent with the Mid-City Area Element, including the two policy focus areas that cover the Property, and specifically furthers those policies and planning actions listed below:

- *Policy MC-1.1.2: Directing Growth*
- *Policy MC-1.1.3: Infill and Rehabilitation*
- *Policy MC-1.1.4: Local Services and Small Businesses*
- *Policy MC-1.1.7: Preservation of Affordable Housing*
- *Policy MC-1.1.8: Multimodal Connections*
- *Policy MC-1.1.12: Green Development Practices*
- *Policy MC-1.2.6: Neighborhood Greening*
- *Policy MC-2.1.1: Revitalization of Lower Georgia Avenue NW*
- *Policy MC-2.1.2: Georgia Avenue NW Design Improvements*
- *Policy MC-2.1.3: Howard University*
- *Policy MC-2.1.5: Cross-Town Connectivity*
- *Action MC-2.1.A: Corridor Identity*
- *Action MC-2.1.C: Howard Town Center*
- *Action MC-2.1.D: Great Streets Improvements*
- *Policy MC-2.3.2: Uptown Subareas*

SMALL AREA PLAN

A significant portion of the Property is subject to the policies and recommendations of the DUKE Plan. The Petitioner and OP have concluded that the proposed Map Amendment is not inconsistent with the DUKE Plan, the applicable Small Area Plan adopted by the D.C. Council on June 21, 2005. (Ex. 3E, 12.) Many of the DUKE Plan's policies and recommendations were adopted in the Mid-City Area Element, or the *Georgetown Avenue Corridor* and the *U Street/Uptown* policy focus areas discussed above.

The Property is located within the boundaries of two of the six sub-districts outlined in The DUKE Plan, the Howard Theatre District and the Howard Town Center Area. The Howard Theatre District is intended to "be a vibrant center focused upon a revived Howard Theatre." DUKE Plan p. 14. Properties in this sub-district should be programmed to complement and support a "complete destination with restaurants, outdoor cafes / dining, intimate music clubs, bars, bookstores, art galleries, modest priced retail and other destination uses." The proposed Map Amendment has the potential to advance this recommendation because the proposed MU-9B zone will allow a mixed-use development where it is not currently permitted by the current PDR-3 zone. The Howard Town Center Area is envisioned as a university and neighborhood district that is a highly complementary sub-district to all others, where the University and other property owners can develop their

properties in accordance with the DUKE Plan. The proposed MU-9B zone would permit the recommended height and density that is necessary to support a mixed-use development with neighborhood serving convenience retail and service uses.

In addition to the aforementioned recommendations, the DUKE Plan includes various planning and implementation principles that apply to the Property. In particular, the DUKE Plan recommends a change in the land use regulations to allow for greater density, up to 6.0 FAR, and more lot coverage to allow for a greater range of uses, including housing, affordable housing, office use, and shared parking options. The DUKE Plan further recommends ground floor retail uses along Georgia Avenue for properties north of Florida Avenue. The proposed Map Amendment would further these recommendations by rezoning the Property to zones that would allow for greater height and density and for a mix of uses, consistent with the DUKE Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING

At the public hearing on December 16, 2024, the Petitioner presented its case, and the Commission heard testimony from OP, Commissioner Larry Handerhan, SMD Representative for ANC 1B01, Matthew Fay, President of the LeDroit Park Civic Association (“LPCA”), and Paulette Matthews president of the Kelly Miller housing complex.

OP reiterated the assertions and conclusions made in the OP Reports.

Commissioner Handerhan reiterated the ANC’s support for the Map Amendment as detailed in the ANC 1B Report.

Mr. Fay expressed the LPCA’s support for the Map Amendment and expressed appreciation for the Petitioner’s partnership and community outreach as detailed in the LPCA’s Letter in Support. (Ex. 35.)

Ms. Matthews testified in opposition to the Map Amendment. She testified about the lack of information about the Petition and development plans and policies for the District, generally.

At the close of the public hearing, the Commission took proposed action on the Map Amendment.

PETITIONER’S OUTREACH AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The Petitioner provided information regarding its outreach efforts and community engagement. (Ex. 3, 14, 25.) The Petitioner initially discussed the proposed Map Amendment with ANC 1B and with ANC 1E on two occasions in the summer of 2023. The proposed Map Amendment was also discussed at the Howard Community Advisory Committee meeting on July 13, 2023, with the following community stakeholders, which are a part of the Howard University Office of External Affairs Community Advisory Council:

- Shaw Mian Street
- Lower Georgia Avenue Main Street
- Councilmember’s Office
- Florida Ave Baptist Church
- LPCA

- Georgia Avenue Thrive
- District Bridges
- Uniting Our Youth
- Pleasant Plains Civic Association
- HU Alumni-members of the OEA Community Advisory Council
- HU Interim Dean Bradford Grant – College of Architecture

After the Petition was filed on January 12, 2024, and following the Commission’s vote to set down the Petition for public hearing, the Petitioner continued its engagement with local community groups and the affected ANCs. The Petitioner met with the LPCA on several occasions, and had follow-up meetings with the Howard Community Advisory Committee on February 15, 2024, and on May 22, 2024. The Petitioner’s community engagement resulted in the execution of a Memoranda of Agreement between the Petitioner and the LPCA and between the Church and the LPCA. (Ex. 25A, 25B.) The development standards and use restrictions agreed upon by the parties are memorialized in the covenants that are filed at Ex. 32 of the case record.

CONCLUSION

Pursuant to Subtitle X § 500.3, the Commission shall find that the proposed Map Amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the Property. The Commission finds the proposed Map Amendment is not inconsistent with the maps, and the Citywide and Area Elements of the Comprehensive Plan, particularly when viewed through a racial equity lens. The increased density and height afforded by the MU-10 and MU-9B zones, coupled with the broader range of permitted uses, will facilitate redevelopment that is compatible with the Campus Plan and the surrounding neighborhood, and will further the goals of the DUKE Plan.

“Great Weight to the Recommendations of OP”

The Commission must give “great weight” to the recommendations 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 § 504.6. (*Metropole Condo. Ass’n v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 141 A.3d 1079, 1087 (D.C. 2016).)

The Commission finds OP’s recommendation that the Commission approve the proposed Map Amendment persuasive and concurs in that judgment based on the assertions and conclusions advanced in the OP Reports.

“Great Weight to the Written Report of the ANCs”

The Commission must give great weight to the issues and concerns raised in the written report of an affected ANC that was approved by the full ANC at a properly noticed public meeting 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) (2012 Repl.) and Subtitle Z § 505.1. To satisfy the great weight requirement, the Commission 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) (citation omitted).)

The ANC 1E Report expressed ANC 1E’s recommendation of support for the Map Amendment. The Commission concurs ANC 1E’s recommendation.

The ANC 1B Report expressed ANC 1B’s recommendation of support for the Map Amendment. The Commission concurs with ANC 1B’s recommendation.

PROPOSED ACTION

At its December 16, 2024, public hearing, the Commission voted to take **PROPOSED ACTION** to adopt the Map Amendment and to authorize the publication of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to amend the Zoning Map as follows:

VOTE (December 16, 2024):

4-0-1 (Robert E. Miller, Gwen Wright, Tammy M. Stidham, Anthony J. Hood to **APPROVE**; Joseph Imamura, having not participated, not voting.)

SQUARE	LOTS	MAP AMENDMENT
3060	830, 839	RA-2 zone to MU-10
3064	45, 837	RA-2 zone to MU-10
3064	44, 826	PDR-2 zone to MU-10
3065	829-831, 833, 834	PDR-3 zone to MU-10
3074	11	PDR-3 zone to MU-9B
3075	807 (western portion)	PDR-3 and RA-2 zones to MU-9B
3075	807 (eastern portion)	PDR-3 and RA-2 zones to MU-10
3078	17, 26-28, 30	PDR-3 to MU-10

The complete record in the case can be viewed online at the Office of Zoning’s Interactive Zoning Information System (IZIS), at <https://app.dcoz.dc.gov/Content/Search/Search.aspx>.

All persons desiring to comment on the subject matter of this proposed rulemaking action should file comments in writing no later than thirty (30) days after the date of publication of this notice in the *D.C. Register*. Comments should be filed with Sharon Schellin, Secretary to the Zoning Commission, Office of Zoning, through the Interactive Zoning Information System (IZIS) at <https://app.dcoz.dc.gov/Login.aspx>; however, written statements may also be submitted by mail to 441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 200-S, Washington, D.C. 20001; by e-mail to zcsubmissions@dc.gov; or by fax to (202) 727-6072. Ms. Schellin may be contacted by telephone at (202) 727-6311 or by e-mail at Sharon.Schellin@dc.gov. Copies of this proposed rulemaking action may be obtained at cost by writing to the above address.