

From: [MaryAnn Nash](#)
To: [DCOZ - ZC Submissions \(DCOZ\)](#)
Subject: Zoning Case 25-09
Date: Thursday, March 26, 2026 6:45:03 PM

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 mornnash@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Chairman Hood and members of the DC Zoning Commission,

I am a long-time Washingtonian who has lived in the Cleveland Park for the nearly 27 years. I want to comment on the Office of Planning's Supplemental Report on Zoning Case 25-09.

The Commission asked at the December hearing why front setbacks were excluded and suggested OP add language subjecting new construction to HPRB review. I find OP's stated opposition to this language cavalier given the stakes for one of the city's most intact historic districts. Setbacks are an important tool to prevent new buildings from overwhelming their neighbors and ensure additions remain secondary to existing structures. The Commission should stick with its initial impulse and include the language on setback requirements.

Cleveland Park's commercial corridor sits at the edge of one of the city's most intact residential historic districts. The transition from low to moderate density here is not incidental — it is part of what makes the neighborhood coherent, and the Commission should memorialize it in the development standards.

I also question whether the proposed zoning designation is the best fit for this corridor. The contributing structures along Connecticut Avenue, the history of this commercial strip, and the permanent visual impact of extreme height differentials all deserve more weight than they appear to have received. There are other zone classifications consistent with the Comprehensive Plan that warrant consideration.

Finally, I find it highly unlikely that increased density on the corridor will result in a meaningful increase in affordable housing. But given that this density is driven by a stated need for more affordable housing, the community should not be asked to accept increased density without binding affordability commitments.

The proposed standards are not yet ready for approval, and further work is necessary.

Thank you for your continued attention to this case.

MaryAnn Nash

3456 Newark Street NW