

Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

From: Massey <e-me-massey@rcn.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2025 10:56 AM
To: DCOZ - ZC Submissions (DCOZ)
Cc: staff@clevelandparkhistoricalsociety.org
Subject: Case 25-09

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the DC Government. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know that the content is safe. If you believe that this email is suspicious, please forward to phishing@dc.gov for additional analysis by OCTO Security Operations Center (SOC).

Some people who received this message don't often get email from e-me-massey@rcn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Zoning Commission,

We are very concerned about the proposal to create the Cleveland Park Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone (Case No. 25-09). We have resided in Cleveland Park since 1968 and have been active in the consideration of proposed modifications to the criteria governing the Historic District, I believe that our efforts have produced an exceptional neighborhood. Although there are many competing desires, we believe it is essential that the neighborhood's historic buildings are protected. We also believe that there can be growth in historic districts and that historic districts, like all District neighborhoods, must contribute to affordable housing so that our community can become more diverse racially and economically.

Unfortunately, the rezoning proposal for Cleveland Park filed by the Office of Planning with the DC Zoning Commission presents an unprecedented increase in density for the commercial area that is part of the historic district. As proposed, we could see building heights of 7 stories or more, with penthouses added on top. Such construction would overwhelm the existing structures. The mammoth new ballroom being added to the White House is an example of the destruction that will occur if massive structures are permitted in historic districts.

As the Zoning Commission considers the OP proposal, I urge you to consider how the extreme change could leave our historic buildings as little more than the foundation for new construction. In addition to density, it is also important to consider that the OP proposal does not include setbacks and stepdowns to shape and soften the appearance of large new structures atop modest contributing buildings. And I also suggest you consider infrastructure needs: how will these buildings, and Cleveland Park in general, deal with sewage, electricity, and parking? These considerations should not be left to the discretion of developers and builders.

Sincerely

Mary Elen and Eugene Massey

3211 Maccomb St