

June 23, 2026

VIA IZIS

Anthony J. Hood, Chairman
Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 200S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: **Z.C. Case No. 25-18**
Applicant's Post-hearing Submission

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission:

On behalf of Champlain Street Partners, LLC (“**Applicant**”), the applicant in the above-referenced application for approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development and related Zoning Map Amendment from RA-2 to RA-3 for property located at 2384 Champlain Street, NW (Square 2560, Lot 827), we hereby submit the following post-hearing materials that were requested by the Zoning Commission (“**Commission**”) at the conclusion of the public hearing on May 21, 2026:

- A copy of the signature page from the executed development agreement between the Applicant and the existing tenant association, 2384 Champlain NW Tenant Association, Inc. (“**TA**”);
- A response to DHCD’s suggestion that the Commission consider establishing an appropriate minimum level of IZ affordability; and
- Update on coordination with Ms. Shelby Dewirs regarding pedestrian safety concerns along Champlain Street.

TOPA development agreement signature page

At setdown, the Commission had requested a copy of the TOPA development agreement that has been established between the Applicant and the existing TA. As part of its prehearing statement, the Applicant stated it is unable to submit a copy of the development agreement due to its confidential nature. The Commission acknowledged this at the public hearing, and inquired whether the Applicant could submit at least the signature page to the development agreement. A copy of the signature page to the executed development agreement attached as **Exhibit A**.

Response to DHCD suggestion for minimum level of IZ affordability

The Office of Planning’s hearing report to the Commission at Exhibit 23 of the case record includes comments from DHCD. In its comments, DHCD stated that “due to the highly competitive nature of the LIHTC and Housing Production Trust Fund (HPTF), there is no guarantee that a project will be selected for long-term affordable housing financing – in addition to said subsidies expiring after 30 to 40 years.” As such, DHCD suggested that the Commission consider establishing an appropriate minimum level of IZ affordability that is comparable to other market rate PUD approvals administered through the IZ program.

In response to DHCD’s comment, the Applicant noted at the hearing that it is committed to keeping the project 100% affordable. The Applicant also is bound by the TOPA development agreement with the TA, which requires preservation of all existing affordable dwelling units. The Applicant fully understands the realities of the competitive nature of the LIHTC and HPTF programs it is pursuing for the project. These known constraints are the reason why the Applicant requested flexibility in its prehearing statement to vary the affordability level assigned to dwelling units within the building to ensure alignment between the affordability requirements of the project’s financing structure and the affordability commitments set forth in the TOPA at an average income level of no more than 60% MFI for a minimum of 30 years.

In light of the above and in response to DHCD’s suggestion, the Applicant has developed a condition that provides the certainty sought by DHCD and the Commission while providing the flexibility needed by the Applicant. The language of the condition is provided below, which has been discussed with the Office of Zoning Legal Division (“OZLD”) staff. The condition will require the entire project to be devoted to affordable housing consistent with the MFI levels set forth in the record by the Applicant, as may be modified in accordance with the requested flexibility. This will be required for a minimum period of 30 years, consistent with the new affordability covenants that will be required for the public financing being sought. Should the Applicant be unable to adhere to this portion of the condition, either due to lack of financing or any other reason, the Applicant would need to return to the Commission to modify the PUD. If the Applicant is able to adhere to the condition, then after the minimum 30-year affordability period expires the PUD condition will require a minimum of 15% of the project’s residential gross floor area to be devoted to IZ affordable housing for households earning no more an average income level of 60% MFI for the remaining life of the project. In addition to being responsive to DHCD’s suggestion, this is consistent with what is already required under the IZ regulations for projects that are temporarily exempt from IZ due to another mandatory affordable housing requirement that meets or exceeds IZ, with a heightened IZ set aside of 15% per to the PUD order. The language of the affordable housing condition that will be included in the PUD order is as follows:

For the life of the Project, the Applicant shall set aside residential floor area of the project to affordable housing, as follows:

- a. **For the first 30 years of the Project**, the Applicant shall devote 100% of the residential floor area of the project to affordable housing in accordance with the following table, as may be modified in accordance with the flexibility granted by the Commission to ensure alignment between the affordability requirements of the project's financing structure and the affordability commitments set forth in the development agreement between the Applicant and the existing tenant association, provided that under any scenario all dwelling units within the project shall be devoted to affordable housing at an average income level of no more than 60% MFI.
- b. **For the remaining life of the Project**, the Applicant shall devote a minimum of 15% of the residential floor area of the project to IZ affordable housing to households earning no more than 60% MFI.

Update on coordination with Ms. Shelby Dewirs regarding pedestrian safety concerns along Champlain Street

Prior to the hearing, Ms. Shelby Dewirs had submitted comments to the record expressing concerns regarding pedestrian safety along Champlain Street. See Exhibit 20 of the case record. Ms. Dewirs resides in a condominium building located at 2363 Champlain Street, across the street from the Applicant's proposed development. In her comments, Ms. Dewirs mentions two ongoing development projects on the east side of the block that appear to be stalled and have closed off the adjacent sidewalks for an extended period of time. Ms. Dewirs also provided similar comments at the public hearing. In response, the Applicant noted that construction of the proposed project is anticipated to start in approximately 18 – 24 months due to the need to secure public financing and approvals, develop construction drawings, and obtain building permits. By that time, the two ongoing development projects on Ms. Dewirs' side of the block will likely be complete or, at minimum, accessibility to the sidewalks adjacent to these developments will likely be restored. For the proposed project, construction will require using the adjacent sidewalk for staging and safety precautions. Prior to beginning construction, the Applicant and its transportation consultation will need to obtain a DDOT-approved traffic control plan that will include all necessary measures to ensure pedestrian safety during construction. The Applicant will be required to adhere to this plan throughout construction, which will also have a main point of contact in the event neighbors have any issues.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission asked the Applicant to have a follow-up discussion with Ms. Dewirs to see if there is anything else the Applicant can do to address the concerns over pedestrian safety. Since the hearing, the Applicant has had a further discussion with Ms. Dewirs, where the anticipated project timeline was reiterated along with the requirements for a DDOT-approved traffic control plan. The Applicant also reiterated that there will be a main point of contact during construction of the proposed project and also provided Ms. Dewirs with their

June 23, 2026

4

personal contact information. To the extent they are able, the Applicant offered to assist Ms. Dewirs with trying to gain answers as to the status of the two unrelated development projects along the block.

The Applicant looks forward to the Commission's final action on this matter. Please feel free to contact the undersigned with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/
Jeff Utz

/s/
Shane Dettman, Urban Planner

cc: Hillary Lovick
Brian Lampert
Office of Zoning Legal Division
hillary.lovick@dc.gov
brian.lampert@dc.gov

June 23, 2026

5

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on or before June 23, 2026, a copy of the foregoing document was delivered via e-mail to the addresses listed below.

Radhika Mohan
Joshua Mitchum
Office of Planning
radhika.mohan@dc.gov
joshua.mitchum@dc.gov

Erkin Ozberk
Noah Hagen
District Department of Transportation
erkin.ozberk1@dc.gov
noah.hagen@dc.gov

ANC 1C
1C@anc.dc.gov

ANC 1C03
Commissioner Peter Wood, Chairperson
1C03@anc.dc.gov

ANC 1C07
Commissioner Jean Evans
1C07@anc.dc.gov

/s/ Shane L. Dettman
Shane L. Dettman, Urban Planner