

**Appendix - Comprehensive Plan Quotations:**

**Affordable Housing (General)**

The rising cost of housing is one of the most pressing and critical issues facing the District and the region. To achieve our goal of an inclusive city, we must meet the challenge of providing housing for a variety of household types, including families, the elderly, and the homeless; housing for owners and renters; housing for existing and new residents; workforce housing; and housing affordable at all income levels. Tied in with housing cost issues are deeper concerns about displacement, the impacts of gentrification, and long term competitiveness. *CP § 206.1*

Recognize the importance of balancing goals to increase the housing supply, including affordable units, and expand neighborhood commerce with parallel goals to preserve historic resources, advance environmental and sustainability goals, and further Fair Housing. The overarching goal to create vibrant neighborhoods in all parts of the District requires an emphasis on conserving units and character in some neighborhoods and revitalization in others, including inclusive and integrated growth and meeting communities and public facility needs. All neighborhoods have a role to play in helping to meet broader District-wide needs, such as affordable housing, public facilities, and more. *CP § 310.10*

However, as Washington, DC remains attractive to and retains higher income households, rising demand and competition has and will put upward pressure on rents and a greater number of lower-income households will experience greater pressure from rising housing costs, leading to residents leaving or bearing a housing burden. Thus, greater public action is needed to fulfill the vision of an inclusive District. *CP § 500.4*

Housing issues affect every facet of the Comprehensive Plan. They influence land use and density decisions, shape infrastructure and community service needs, determine transportation demand, and even drive employment strategies for District residents. At the most basic level, it is the availability of safe, decent, affordable housing across all neighborhoods that will determine whether the District’s vision for an inclusive District will be realized. The type of housing constructed or preserved, the cost of that housing, and where it is built will influence whether the District can attract and retain families with children, maintain neighborhood diversity, improve health and educational outcomes, and provide economic opportunity for all. *CP § 500.6a*

Rents have also risen, making it more difficult for many to afford to live in the District. Between 2006 and 2017, at 3.4 percent per year, rents in Washington, DC rose faster than the MFI of the region, which grew by only 1.8 percent per year. Much of the increase in rents was due to new amenity-rich buildings that attracted higher income households to the District. However, even rents in buildings built prior to 2006 rose at a rate of 2.7 percent per year. As a result, between 2006 and 2017, nearly 18,300 fewer affordable units were available to households earning equal to or less than 60 percent of the MFI (See Figure 5.10b Change in Supply of Rental Units by Affordability). There are many reasons in addition to rising rents for the overall reduction in the number of lower cost units, including demolition of older buildings and conversion to condominiums. *CP § 500.18*

The overarching goal for housing is to provide a safe, decent, healthy, and affordable housing supply for current and future residents in all of Washington, DC’s neighborhoods by maintaining

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

and developing housing for all incomes and household types. 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, between 2019 and 2025. *CP § 501.1*

Expanding the housing supply is a key part of the District’s vision to create vibrant neighborhoods. Along with improved transportation and shopping, better neighborhood schools and parks, preservation of historic resources, and improved design and identity, the production of market rate and affordable housing is essential to the future of the neighborhoods. It is also a key to improving the District’s fiscal health. The District will work to facilitate housing construction and rehabilitation through its planning, building, zoning, permitting, inspection, and taxation programs, recognizing and responding to the needs of all segments of the community to achieve an adequate and diverse housing supply. The first step toward meeting this goal is to ensure that an adequate supply of appropriately zoned land is available to meet expected housing needs. Public investment in high-quality public infrastructure, including transportation, public space, schools, and libraries, is also critical to ensuring that all neighborhoods provide a high degree of access to opportunity. Regulatory processes should encourage, not discourage, the creation of new housing. *CP § 503.1*

Proactively plan and facilitate affordable housing opportunities and make targeted investments that increase demographic diversity and equity across Washington, DC. Achieve a minimum of 15 percent affordable units within each Planning Area by 2050. Provide protected classes (see H-3.2 Housing Access) with a fair opportunity to live in a choice of homes and neighborhoods, including their current homes and neighborhoods. *CP § 504.17*

**Need for Affordable Housing in Rock Creek West**

Housing in the District must also be understood through a racial equity lens. Forty-nine percent of white households are owner-occupied, while only 35 percent of Black and 30 percent of Latino households are owner occupied, and the median value of Black-owned homes is less than that of white homeowners. Black and Hispanic households have the greatest rent burdens, at 35 and 39 percent. These gaps are a result of historic, systemic practices such as redlining, racial covenants, and predatory lending that limited access to housing, restricted wealth building opportunities for communities of color, and created highly segregated development patterns. Even while the District has grown in population, the District’s low-income residents have experienced displacement pressures. Of adults experiencing homelessness, 86 percent are Black, while only 47 percent of District residents are Black. While this element often uses income to describe groups and provides overall averages, it is critical to disaggregate data to understand housing considerations experienced by different race, age, and gender groups, and to consider and implement housing policies and actions in this racial equity context to address historic gaps and current challenges. *CP § 500.5*

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. *CP § 503.10*

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

The demand for housing remains consistently strong in Rock Creek West...Growth has resulted from a combination of factors, including relatively low crime rates, numerous neighborhood amenities, accessible neighborhood retail, convenient Metrorail (Metro) access, active community organizations, relatively high-performing public schools with strong parental support, and numerous private schools. *CP §2300.08*

Although there are opportunities for new housing development in the area, there continues to be a substantial unmet need for new affordable units and a need to preserve existing affordable and moderate-income options. Increasing the production of affordable and moderate-income units in Rock Creek West is a priority. *CP § 2300.9*

The Rock Creek West area has significant economic potential, leading to past and present concerns about the community impacts of development. The combination of a relatively high-income population, transportation options, high-opportunity and attractive neighborhoods, high-quality retail, and a limited supply of vacant land has led to very strong market demand. The desire to thoughtfully guide growth, while trying to preserve neighborhoods, remains a top priority throughout the community and is a major theme of this element. *CP § 2300.7*

The demand for housing remains consistently strong in Rock Creek West. During the 1980s and 1990s, when Washington, DC was losing residents, neighborhoods west of Rock Creek Park continued to add households. Growth has resulted from a combination of factors, including relatively low crime rates, numerous neighborhood amenities, accessible neighborhood retail, convenient Metrorail (Metro) access, active community organizations, relatively high-performing public schools with strong parental support, and numerous private schools. *CP § 2300.8*

Given its largely built-out land area, Rock Creek West is projected to be among the slowest growing areas of Washington, DC over the next 30 years. About 7,000 additional households are forecast for the 2017-2045 period, increasing from 41,061 to approximately 48,100 in 2045. The population of the area is expected to increase from 92,399 in 2017 to 113,151 by 2045. Most of the growth is expected to consist of multi-family housing in mixed-use projects along the avenues. *CP § 2306.1*

Pursue the opportunity for additional housing, including affordable and moderate-income housing, with some retail and limited office space on Wisconsin Avenue and underdeveloped sites west of the Friendship Heights Metro station. *CP § 2312.7*

**PUDS, Incentives & Leveraging Density for Affordable Housing**

The rising cost of housing is one of the most pressing and critical issues facing the District and the region. To achieve our goal of an inclusive city, we must meet the challenge of providing housing for a variety of household types, including families, the elderly, and the homeless; housing for owners and renters; housing for existing and new residents; workforce housing; and housing affordable at all income levels. *CP § 206.1*

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

Specific public benefits are determined through each PUD application and should respond to critical issues facing the District as identified in the Comprehensive Plan and through the PUD process itself. In light of the acute need to preserve and build affordable housing, described in Section 206, and to prevent displacement of on-site residents, the following should be considered as high-priority public benefits in the evaluation of residential PUDs:

- The production of new affordable housing units above and beyond existing legal requirements or a net increase in the number of affordable units that exist on-site;
- The preservation of housing units made affordable through subsidy, covenant, or rent control, or replacement of such units at the same affordability level and similar household size;
- The minimizing of unnecessary off-site relocation through the construction of new units before the demolition of existing occupied units; and
- The right of existing residents of a redevelopment site to return to new on-site units at affordability levels similar to or greater than existing units. *CP § 224.9*

When a development project depends on public subsidies, surplus land, and/or entitlements such as Zoning Map or Future Land Use Map amendments, Planned Unit Developments, variances, tax increment financing, and tax abatements, the District should leverage the enhanced value of the land that results. The enhanced value shall meet the equity needs of DC's neighborhoods in the form of deeply affordable housing and other priorities detailed in the Comprehensive Plan. The leverage can take the form of deeply affordable housing units in excess of the Inclusionary Zoning requirements, special assessment cash contributions or increased tax rates, or other tools supported by the Comprehensive Plan. As an example, transit infrastructure investments, such as a new station, should be aligned with land use policies that support uses, densities, and connections that support transit-oriented development. The primary goal of this equity leveraging effort is to ensure that land-use policies and actions align with the public investment and that District residents' interests are balanced with the developers' interests. *CP § 229.3*

With public input, develop and use zoning incentives to facilitate new and mixed-use development, and particularly the provision of new housing, and new affordable housing in high opportunity areas to address more equitable distribution. *CP § 307.20*

Provide zoning incentives, such as through the PUD process, to developers proposing to build affordable housing substantially beyond any underlying requirement. Exceeding targets for affordable housing can refer to exceeding the quantity or depth of affordability otherwise required. The affordable housing proffered shall be considered a high priority public benefit for the purposes of granting density bonuses, especially when the proposal expands the inclusiveness of high-cost areas by adding affordable housing... *CP §504.15*

Provide zoning incentives, such as through the PUD process, to developers proposing to build affordable housing substantially beyond any underlying requirement. Exceeding targets for affordable housing can refer to exceeding the quantity or depth of affordability otherwise required. The affordable housing proffered shall be considered a high priority public benefit for the purposes of granting density bonuses, especially when the proposal expands the inclusiveness of high-cost areas by adding affordable housing. When density bonuses are granted, flexibility in development

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

standards should be considered to minimize impacts on contributing features and the design character of the neighborhood. *CP § 504.14*

**Need for More Deeply Affordable Housing**

The rising costs have continued a crisis of affordability, particularly for the District’s lowest-income residents. Over 20 percent (56,700) of all households in 2017 were severely burdened by housing costs, and another 16 percent (44,600) of households were burdened. Residents must set aside a growing share of their earnings for housing and utilities, leaving less disposable income for health care, transportation, food, other basic needs, and the ability to set aside savings to prepare for the future. The greatest share of burdened and severely burdened households are the 39,500 rental households earning less than 30 percent of the MFI. The market has also become more segmented, with dwindling housing choices for working families and the middle class in general. Expanded housing options for lower- and middle-income households have become limited, and the opportunity for many residents to build individual wealth through homeownership has become more difficult. Racial representation differs across income groups, and communities of color are disproportionately impacted by increasing housing costs and diminishing supply of affordable options. The District’s Black and Hispanic households experience higher levels of rent burden that increase the likelihood of displacement. *CP § 500.19*

**Need for Moderate Income Housing**

As prices have risen, the percentage of residents able to comfortably afford the median priced home or apartment has dropped. In 2001, 34 percent of the District’s for-sale housing would have been affordable to a family supported by a full-time schoolteacher. By 2004, that figure had dropped to just 16 percent. By 2017, the percentage of homes in the District that a full-time schoolteacher could afford had partially recovered to 19 percent. This was due to a variety of factors, including higher wages, decreasing interest rates, the drop in values after 2007, and the increasing availability of condominiums that are less expensive than single-family homes. Nevertheless, the tightening availability of moderately priced housing is hindering the District’s ability to retain and attract moderate- income households. *CP § 500.15*

The production and preservation of affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households is a major civic priority, to be supported through public programs that stimulate affordable housing production and rehabilitation throughout all District neighborhoods. *CP § 504.8*

In addition to programs targeting persons of very low and extremely low incomes, develop and implement programs that meet the housing needs of those earning moderate incomes with wages insufficient to afford market rate housing in the District. *CP § 504.13*

As housing prices have outpaced income growth in many U.S. cities, housing advocates and policy makers have called for initiatives to provide moderate- income housing. Moderate-income housing refers to housing designed for people in professions that are essential to a community but do not offer sufficient wages to afford market rate housing. These professions include administrative support, clerical occupations, and service jobs, and account for one-third of the jobs in the American workforce. In the District, Black residents hold the majority of service jobs, at 54 percent, highlighting the need to also address housing barriers from a racial equity perspective. *CP § 513.13a*

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

Even with two working parents in the service industries, a family would have a difficult time purchasing a home or renting a suitable apartment in the District. Janitors, schoolteachers, licensed nurses, police officers, childcare professionals, and other service workers have been priced out of the District market and many other markets across the country. New programs, such as employer assisted housing and down payment assistance for public sector employees, are being pursued to provide more options and keep these essential workers in Washington, DC. *CP § 513.13b*

**Need for Family Sized Units**

One of the critical issues facing Washington, DC is how to retain and create more housing units that are large enough for families with children. In 2006, 21 percent of District households were composed of families with children. By 2017, households with children had fallen to below 20 percent because they experience difficulty finding units they can afford. This percentage is substantially lower than the 33 percent rate for the region and 31 percent rate for the nation. However, other cities, such as San Francisco, New York, and Boston, also experienced declines in the percentage of households with children since 2006. *CP § 500.29*

Family households with children need larger housing units with more bedrooms. Of the existing housing stock, only 34 percent of the units have three bedrooms or more, which is a slight decline from 2006, when 35 percent of units had three or more bedrooms. Eighty-nine percent of recent new construction has been apartments, of which only two percent had three or more bedrooms.<sup>xiii</sup> Of new condominium units built since 2006, less than 10 percent had three or more bedrooms.<sup>xiv</sup> Because the vast majority of Washington, DC's capacity for growth is in multi-family development, the District will need to look to apartment buildings to add larger family-sized units. *CP § 500.30*

Encourage and prioritize the development of family-sized units and/or family-sized housing options which generally have three or more bedrooms, in areas proximate to transit, employment centers, schools, public facilities, and recreation to ensure that the District's most well-resourced locations remain accessible to families, particularly in areas that received increased residential density as a result of underlying changes to the Future Land Use Map. Family-sized units and/or family-sized housing options include housing typologies that can accommodate households of three or more persons and may include a variety of housing types including townhomes, fourplexes and multi-family buildings. To address the mismatch between meeting the needs of larger households and the financial feasibility of developing family-sized housing, support family-sized housing options through production incentives and requirements that address market rate challenges for private development that may include zoning, subsidies or tax strategies, or direct subsidy and regulatory requirements for publicly owned sites. *CP § 503.11*

**Transportation Oriented Development**

Much of the planning during the last decade has focused on making better use of transit station areas. Plans have been developed for Columbia Heights, Takoma, Anacostia, Georgia Avenue-Petworth, Brookland, Deanwood, Hill East, Southwest, Maryland Avenue NE, Rhode Island Avenue NE/NW, Florida Avenue Market, H Street NE, and Shaw/Howard University. In each case, the objective was to identify ways to better capitalize on Metrorail and more efficiently use land in the station vicinity. One objective of these initiatives has been to strengthen transit stations as

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

neighborhood centers and attract new investment to business districts facing economic challenges. Another important objective has been to accommodate growth in a way that minimizes the number and length of auto-trips generated and reduce household expenses on transportation by providing options for car-free (or one car) living. *CP § 307.3*

Build housing adjacent to Metrorail stations that serves a mix of incomes and household types, including families, older adults, and persons with disabilities, and prioritize affordable and deeply affordable housing production. Leverage the lowered transportation costs offered by proximity to transit to increase affordability for moderate and low-income households. *CP § 307.11*

Encourage growth and development along major corridors, particularly priority transit and multimodal corridors. Plan and design development adjacent to Metrorail stations and corridors to respect the character, scale, and integrity of adjacent neighborhoods, using approaches such as building design, transitions, or buffers, while balancing against the District’s broader need for housing. *CP § 307.14*

Encourage developments in and around Metro station areas to exceed the affordable units required by the Inclusionary Zoning Program, with appropriate bonus density and height allowances. Exceeding targets for affordable housing can refer to exceeding the quantity or depth of affordability otherwise required. *CP § 307.21*

Transportation within the District shall be accessible and serve all users. Residents, workers, and visitors should have access to safe, affordable and reliable transportation options regardless of age, race, income, geography or physical ability. Transportation should not be a barrier to economic, educational, or health opportunity for District residents. Transportation planning and development should be framed by a racial equity lens, to identify and address historic and current barriers and additional transportation burdens experienced by communities of color. *CP § 403.13*

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) fosters sustainability and resilience. Concentrated residential housing combined with a mix of other uses around Metro stations and high-capacity surface transit corridors reduces District residents’ reliance on automobiles, thereby reducing GHG emissions. It is also proven to reduce a household’s combined cost of housing and transportation. This can free up disposable income to increase the rate at which households save for future needs. Affordable housing near public transit can ensure that low-income households also receive these benefits. A 2011 study conducted for the District by the Center for Neighborhood Technology found that, on average, District households spent 26 percent less on transportation than the rest of the metropolitan area. It is important to consider this in the context of the differing transportation modes available to and used by lower income residents, as well as the potential benefits to them from TOD development. The reduction in transportation costs provides greater affordability for the typical household living in the District than one living farther out, where housing is less expensive but more dependent on automobiles. Finally, housing in pedestrian-friendly, transit-rich environments proved to be more resilient to the price fluctuations caused by the foreclosure financial crisis. This protected homeowner equity from significant damage. *CP § 508.4*

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

The Tenleytown and Friendship Heights Metro stations are important multimodal transit hubs that serve as termini for crosstown bus lines, as well as private institutional shuttles. Both station areas offer opportunities for transit-oriented redevelopment to improve streetscapes, create convivial public spaces, diversify the shopping experience, and create new housing, including affordable housing. Friendship Heights is a regional center, and Tenleytown is a multi-neighborhood center, each with opportunities for new retail and residential uses. Given the high land values in the neighborhoods along Wisconsin Avenue NW, redevelopment projects are an opportunity to increase the limited number of affordable and moderate-income housing units in the Rock Creek West Planning Area. *CP § 2312.4*

Friendship Heights and Tenleytown are transit-accessible neighborhoods that will contribute to the sustainable and equitable growth of Washington, DC as new development arrives along Wisconsin Avenue NW. Thus, several core issues must be addressed as plans for any of the sites around the Metro stations or along the corridor move forward. Any redevelopment along the corridor should promote walkability and create a more attractive street environment. The impact of new development on traffic, parking, infrastructure, and public services should be mitigated to the greatest extent feasible. The scale and height of new development on the corridor should transition appropriately to nearby single-family homes, while the design of new buildings should reflect their urban transit-oriented context. *CP § 2312.5*

**Neighborhood Conservation/Mitigating Impacts of Added Density**

Neighborhood Conservation areas have little vacant or underutilized land. They are generally residential in character. Maintenance of existing land uses and community character is anticipated over the next 20 years. Where change occurs, it will typically be modest in scale and will consist primarily of infill housing, public facilities, and institutional uses. Major changes in density over current (2017) conditions are not expected but some new development and reuse opportunities are anticipated, and these can support conservation of neighborhood character where guided by Comprehensive Plan policies and the Future Land Use Map. Neighborhood Conservation Areas that are designated “PDR” on the Future Land Use Map are expected to be retained with the mix of industrial, office, and retail uses they have historically provided. *CP § 225.4*

The guiding philosophy in Neighborhood Conservation Areas is to conserve and enhance established neighborhoods, but not preclude development, particularly to address city-wide housing needs. Limited development and redevelopment opportunities do exist within these areas. The diversity of land uses and building types in these areas should be maintained and new development, redevelopment, and alterations should be compatible with the existing scale, natural features, and character of each area. Densities in Neighborhood Conservation Areas are guided by the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan policies. Approaches to managing context-sensitive growth in Neighborhood Conservation Areas may vary based on neighborhood socio-economic and development characteristics. In areas with access to opportunities, services, and amenities, more levels of housing affordability should be accommodated. Areas facing housing insecurity (see Section 206.4) and displacement should emphasize preserving affordable housing and enhancing neighborhood services, amenities, and access to opportunities. *CP § 225.5*

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

**OAG Comments in Support – July 3, 2025**  
**PUD Application – Harrison Wisconsin Owner, LLC – Friendship Heights**  
**Z.C. Case No. 24-12**

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. 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. *CP § 225.114*

Washington is a city of distinctive neighborhoods. The terms “neighborhood character” and “historic character” are used extensively in the Land Use Element and other elements. Neighborhood “character,” however, has been a term associated with exclusion and discrimination by race, income, religion, and other categories. As used in the comprehensive plan, neighborhood “character” and historic “character” reflect the sense of place defined by neighborhood architecture, visual landmarks and vistas, streets, public spaces, and historic or cultural places; for instance, the differences between the Anacostia and Bloomingdale neighborhoods. This term must not be construed to refer to the characteristics of people living and working in these areas. Many policies referencing neighborhood character also speak to the interest in improving affordability and racial equity, recognizing the potential balance needed between policy objectives. *CP § 304.6*

Future development along Wisconsin Avenue NW should be architecturally sensitive to adjoining residential neighborhoods. Use a variety of means to improve the interface between mixed-use districts and lower-scale residential uses, such as architectural design, the stepping down of building heights away from the avenue, landscaping and screening, and additional green space improvements. *CP § 2312.11*