

July 13, 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**
Draft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission:

On behalf of the Applicant, we respectfully submit the enclosed draft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in connection with the above-referenced application for approval of a Consolidated Planned Unit Development and related Zoning Map amendment at 2384 Champlain Street, NW (Square 2560 Lot 827).

We appreciate the Commission's attention to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/_____
Jeff Utz

/s/_____
Shane Dettman, Urban Planner

Encl.

June 23, 2026

2

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on or before July 13, 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

ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 25-18
Z.C. Case No. 25-18

Champlain Street Partners, LLC
(Consolidated PUD and Related Zoning Map Amendment @ Square 2560, Lot 827)
June 25, 2026

Pursuant to notice, at its May 21, 2026 public hearing, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia ("Commission") considered the application of Champlain Street Partners, LLC (the "Applicant") pursuant to Subtitle X, Chapter 3 and Subtitle Z, Chapter 3 of the Zoning Regulations (Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations ("DCMR"), Zoning Regulations of 2016, to which all references are made unless otherwise specified) for the review and approval of a consolidated planned unit development ("PUD") and a related Zoning Map amendment from the RA-2 Zone to the RA-3 Zone (collectively, the "Application") for Lot 827 in Square 2560 (the "Property"). The Applicant also requested: (i) a waiver of the minimum land area requirement for a PUD in the RA-3 zone pursuant to Subtitle X § 301.3; (ii) flexibility pursuant to Subtitle X § 303.1 from the lot occupancy, closed court, minimum vehicle parking, and parking screening requirements of Subtitle F §§ 210.1, 209.1 and Subtitle C §§ 701.5, 714; and (iii) such other design flexibility as are set forth in the Conditions hereof.

The Commission reviewed the Application pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedures, which are codified in Subtitle Z. For the reasons set forth below, the Commission hereby **APPROVES** the Application.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. BACKGROUND

PARTIES

1. In addition to the Applicant, the only other party to this case was Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("ANC") 1C, in which the Property is located.
2. There were no requests for party status in support or opposition to the Application.

NOTICE

3. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 300.7, the Applicant mailed a Notice of Intent ("NOI") to file the Application on June 14, 2024, to ANC 1C and the owners of all property within 200 feet of the Property. On August 2, 2024, Z.C. Order No. 22-25 went into effect, which amended the pre-filing NOI requirement for PUDs to include each lessee having a lease with the owner for all or part of any building located on a property involved in a PUD application. As such, on March 5, 2025, the Applicant provided a copy of the Notice to all existing tenants of the Property. (Exhibit ["Ex."] 3E.)

4. On March 18, 2026, the Office of Zoning (“OZ”) sent notice of the May 21, 2026, virtual public hearing to:

The Applicant;
The affected ANC, ANC 1C;
The Office of the ANCs;
The Ward 1 Councilmember;
The Chair and At-Large members of the D.C. Council
The Office of Planning (“OP”);
The Department of Buildings (“DOB”);
The Department of Energy & Environment (“DOEE”);
The District Department of Transportation (“DDOT”);
The Office of Zoning Legal Division (“OZLD”); and
Property owners within 200 feet of the Property.

(Ex. 18, 19.)
5. OZ published notice of the public hearing in the *D.C. Register* on March 27, 2026 (73 DCR 5122, *et seq.*) (Ex. 17.)
6. The Applicant submitted evidence that it had posted notice of the public hearing as required by Subtitle Z § 402.3 and maintained such notice in accordance with Subtitle Z § 402.10 (Ex. 21.)

THE PROPERTY AND SURROUNDING AREA

7. The Property is located at 2384 Champlain Street, NW, in Ward 1 of the District of Columbia, within the Adams Morgan neighborhood and within the boundaries of ANC 1C. The Property consists of approximately 7,348 square feet of land area and is generally bounded by Champlain Street, NW, on the east, private property improved with residential uses on the north and south, and a 16-foot-wide public alley on the west. The Property has approximately 50 feet of frontage along Champlain Street, NW, and approximately 51 feet of frontage along the public alley to the rear. The Property is currently zoned RA-2. (Ex. 3.)
8. The use and development pattern of the area surrounding the Property is characterized by a varied mix of commercial, residential, and mixed-use developments with institutional uses such as public schools and religious institutions interspersed throughout. The segment of Champlain Street where the Property is located contains a mix of multifamily rental and condominium buildings ranging between two (2) to four (4) stories. Just north of the Property is the eight (8)-story Line Hotel. Other commercial and mixed-use developments are located further north of the Property along Columbia Road. To the east, the area is characterized by a mix of rowhomes and mid- and high-rise apartment buildings. To the west, across the sixteen (16)-foot public alley at the rear of the Property, is the 18th Street commercial corridor which contains one (1) to three (3) story retail, service, and eating and drinking establishment uses. A mixture of rowhomes and mid- and high-rise apartment

buildings exist further west of the 18th Street corridor. Additional single- and multifamily residential uses and the Marie Reed Elementary School and Recreation Center exist to the south of the Property. (Ex. 3.)

9. The Property is well served by Metrobus, with the 90, 92, and 96 bus routes running along 18th Street, one block west of the Property, and the 42 and 43 bus routes running along Columbia Road to the north. There are also several Capital Bikeshare stations within walking distance of the Property. (Ex. 3.)
10. The Property is currently improved with a 32-unit apartment building that was constructed in approximately 1941. The existing units within the building are primarily micro-units, comprised of sixteen (16) efficiency units, fourteen (14) one (1)-bedroom units, and two (2) two (2)-bedroom units, with an average unit size of approximately 430 square feet. (Ex. 3.)
11. The existing building is subject to a ten (10)-year affordability covenant that expires in 2029, under which all units are devoted to households earning up to 80% of the D.C.-area Median Family Income ("MFI"). Despite improvements made by the Applicant since its acquisition of the Property in 2019, the existing building needs major modernization given its age, inadequate micro-unit configuration, and inefficient layout and systems. (Ex. 3.)
12. In 2019, the Applicant acquired the Property and completed critical improvements to address pre-existing fire and life safety code violations. The Applicant's acquisition was a result of the existing tenants assigning their first right to purchase the Property under the D.C. Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Act ("TOPA"). Since then, the Applicant has stabilized the Property and brought it up to code. Despite these improvements, the existing building is still in need of major modernization and improvement given its age and inadequate micro-unit configuration and related inefficient layout and systems. (Ex. 3.)
13. In connection with the PUD, the Applicant has engaged HousingToHome ("HTH"), a national relocation firm, to develop and implement a comprehensive tenant relocation plan for the existing residents of the Property. The relocation plan provides permanent relocation assistance in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 ("URA"), including advisory services, comparable replacement housing, and full payment of moving expenses at no cost to the residents. The Applicant has also entered into a development agreement with the 2384 Champlain NW Tenant Association, Inc. (the "Tenant Association"), which provides existing tenants with a guaranteed right of return to a comparable unit in the newly constructed Project at similar leasing terms up-on completion of construction. (Ex. 3L, 14, 33A.)
14. The Property is located in a Neighborhood Conservation Area on the Generalized Policy Map ("GPM"). Neighborhood Conservation Areas "are generally residential in character" and "where change occurs, it will typically be modest in scale and will consist primarily of infill housing." 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. (10-A DCMR § 225.4, 225.5.) (Ex. 3, 3D.)

15. The Property is designated Moderate Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map ("FLUM") of the Comprehensive Plan (Title 10-A DCMR). The Framework Element notes that this designation is used to define neighborhoods generally, but not exclusively, suited for row houses as well as low-rise garden apartment complexes, and that density typically ranges up to 1.8 FAR, although greater density may be possible when complying with Inclusionary Zoning or when approved through a Planned Unit Development. (Ex. 3, 3D.)

II. THE APPLICATION

THE PROJECT

16. On September 19, 2025, the Applicant submitted the Application for a consolidated PUD and related Zoning Map amendment from the RA-2 zone to the RA-3 zone for the Property. (Ex. 2, 3.)
17. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing building on the Property and construct a new five (5)-story, approximately 44-unit, 100% affordable multifamily residential building with surface parking (the "Project"). The Project will contain approximately 28,731 square feet of gross floor area ("GFA") of residential use, for a floor area ratio ("FAR") of approximately 3.91, and a maximum building height of approximately 50 feet, plus a 15-foot rooftop screened mechanical area. The Project will have a maximum lot occupancy of approximately 80%. (Ex. 3, 3G1, 3G2, 14B.)
18. The footprint of the proposed building will be shaped like a shallow "U" with a closed court on its north side. Vehicle parking will be located directly off the public alley at the rear of the Property. The ground level of the building will be slightly recessed from the front lot line along Champlain Street to provide additional pedestrian circulation space and prevent the lobby entry door from swinging into public space. (Ex. 3, 3G1, 3G2, 14B.)
19. The ground floor contains the residential lobby, leasing office, amenity space trash room, and a small number of dwelling units. Four (4) vehicle parking spaces will be provided at the rear of the building that are accessed directly from the public alley. (Ex. 3, 3G1, 3G2, 14B.)
20. Four (4) floors of residential units will be located above the ground floor, each containing approximately nine (9) units. Access to the upper floors will be provided via an elevator and stairs that are located on the south side of the building. (Ex. 3, 3G1, 3G2, 14B.)
21. At the roof level, a fifteen (15)-foot elevator override and twelve (12)-foot screened mechanical area will be situated in the middle portion of the roof, set back from the front and rear building walls. The remaining east and west portions of the roof will contain solar panels mounted over a green roof. Additional solar panels are proposed over the screened mechanical area. Overall, the roof level will contain approximately 1,000 square feet of rooftop solar panel array area. Two (2) lightwells will also be located on the roof and extend down through the building to provide light into the proposed dwelling units. (Ex. 3, 3G1, 3G2, 14B.)

22. The exterior of the Project will be comprised brick, punched window openings, and copper-colored window frames and ground floor “storefront.” The recessed ground floor will create a shallow overhang that will provide weather protection and will also widen the sidewalk adjacent to the Property. Above the ground floor, the Applicant is proposing copper colored extruded window frames which will create a shadow effect and give depth to the façade. Randomized copper-colored decorative screen panels will also be installed on the upper floors on the Champlain Street frontage. At the roof level, the enclosure around the screened mechanical equipment and elevator override will be similar in color to the copper-colored window frames and screening along Champlain Street. (Ex. 3, 3G1, 3G2, 14B.)
23. The Project is designed according to Enterprise Green Communities Certification standards, and the Applicant is designing for near Net Zero energy consumption, with the goal of achieving full Net Zero for the Project. The Project will also be certified through Energy Star Multifamily New Construction. Specific sustainable design features include approximately 1,000 square feet of rooftop solar panel array area; approximately 3,000 square feet of green roof; and full building electrification. (Ex. 3, 3G1, 3G2, 14B.)

PUBLIC BENEFITS AND PROJECT AMENITIES

24. The Application identified the following public benefits and project amenities:
- Superior Urban Design and Architecture (Subtitle X § 305.5(a)): The Project's high-quality design utilizes dark ironspot brick, copper-colored metal detailing, and decorative perforated metal screening, which provides a subtle gesture toward the character of the existing 1940s building on the Property and complements the surrounding neighborhood. The Project is scaled to the general development pattern along the 2300 block of Champlain Street, NW, and the ground-level setback provides additional pedestrian comfort along the narrow sidewalk;
 - Housing and Affordable Housing in Excess of Matter-of-Right Requirements and at Deeper Levels of Affordability (Subtitle X § 305.5(f) and (g)(1) and (2)): The Project will provide 44 units of permanent affordable rental housing, comprising 32 replacement units and twelve (12) new units, all devoted to households earning between 30% and 60% MFI for a minimum of 30 years, far exceeding what would otherwise be required under matter-of-right development; and
 - Environmental and Sustainability Benefits Exceeding Regulatory Standards (Subtitle X § 305.5(k)): The Project is designed to meet Enterprise Green Communities Certification standards and is designed for near Net-Zero energy consumption. Specific sustainable benefits include approximately 3,000 square feet of green roof and approximately 1,000 square feet of rooftop solar panel array area.

(Ex. 3, 14, 31.)

FLEXIBILITY REQUESTED

25. The Property is zoned RA-2, which provides for areas developed with predominately moderate density residential. (Subtitle F § 300.3.) The Applicant seeks a PUD-related map amendment, pursuant to Subtitle X § 303.12, to re-zone the Property to the RA-3 zone. The Project's proposed height of approximately 50 feet is consistent with the matter-of-right height permitted under existing RA-2 zoning and thus does not gain any additional height through the PUD. The Project's proposed density of approximately 3.91 FAR is a gain of 2.11 FAR when compared to matter-of-right density permitted under existing RA-2 zoning (maximum 1.8 FAR), and a gain of 1.75 FAR when compared to the density permitted under existing RA-2 zoning for an IZ development (maximum 2.16 FAR with IZ). (Ex. 3.)
26. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 301.1, the minimum land area for a PUD in the RA-3 zone is 15,000 square feet. The Property contains approximately 7,348 square feet of land area. Accordingly, the Applicant requests a waiver of the minimum land area requirement pursuant to Subtitle X § 301.3, which permits the Commission to waive the minimum land area requirement to no less than 5,000 square feet upon a finding that the proposed PUD is of exceptional merit and is in the best interest of the District of Columbia, and that at least 80% of the GFA of the development shall be used exclusively for dwelling units and uses accessory thereto. (Ex. 3.)
27. The Project is consistent with the Zoning Regulations with respect to all development standards applicable to the RA-3 zone except with respect to the following, for which the Applicant seeks flexibility pursuant to Subtitle X § 303.1:
- Lot Occupancy (Subtitle F § 210.1): to allow the Project to have a maximum lot occupancy of 80%, an increase of 5% above the maximum 75% permitted in the proposed RA-3 zone;
 - Closed Court (Subtitle F § 209.1): to allow the Project to have a closed court width of approximately 8.33 feet and a closed court area of approximately 393 square feet, where a minimum width of approximately 20.67 feet and a minimum area of approximately 854 square feet are required;
 - Minimum Vehicle Parking (Subtitle C § 701.5): to allow the Project to provide four (4) vehicle parking spaces, where the minimum parking requirement for the Project is thirteen (13) spaces; and
 - Parking Screening (Subtitle C § 714): to allow no screening along the rear lot line of the Property that directly abuts the public alley, in order to allow unimpeded access to the proposed vehicle parking spaces.¹
- (Ex. 3, 14.)

¹ Since the filing and approval of this application, the Zoning Commission published Z.C. Order No. 25-12, which removed the requirement to provide screening for parking spaces accessed directly from an alley, as is the case here.

Z.C. Order No. 25-18

Z.C. Case No. 25-18

Page 6

ADDITIONAL FILINGS

28. On March 6, 2026, the Applicant filed a prehearing statement that addressed comments and questions raised by the Commission and OP at the January 15, 2026, setdown meeting, including: confirmation of areas of minor design flexibility; additional information regarding proposed affordability levels; additional information regarding the tenant relocation and return plan; additional information regarding conversations held with existing residents; information on the financing stack and affordability term; information on the development agreement with the Tenant Association; and an update on community outreach. The pre-hearing statement also included a Transportation Statement prepared by Gorove Slade Associates, Inc. in coordination with DDOT, and a revised ground floor plan showing the addition of a compact loading space at the rear of the Property. (Ex. 14.)
29. On June 17, 2026, the Applicant filed its proposed proffers and conditions of approval pursuant to Subtitle X § 308.6. (Ex. 31.)
30. On June 23, 2026, the Applicant filed its post-hearing statement providing additional materials requested by the Commission including the signature page from the TOPA development agreement between the Applicant and the Tenant Association, a response to DHCD's suggestion for a condition that establishes a minimum level of IZ affordability, and an update on coordination with Ms. Shelby Dewirs regarding pedestrian safety concerns along Champlain Street. (Ex. 33.)

III. RESPONSES TO THE APPLICATION, OP REPORTS AND TESTIMONY

OFFICE OF PLANNING REPORTS

31. On January 5, 2026, OP filed a report (the "OP Setdown Report") recommending that the Commission set down the Application and explaining that the proposed PUD, with the related map amendment, was not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan maps, Citywide Elements, and the Mid-City Area Element, including when viewed through a racial equity lens. (Ex. 11.)
32. By report dated May 11, 2026, (the "OP Hearing Report"), OP recommended approval of the Application and concluded that the Application met the requirements of the Zoning Regulations and would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as analyzed through a racial equity lens. (Ex. 23.)
33. The OP Hearing Report stated that the Application was not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the FLUM and GPM; is consistent with the purpose of the PUD process; and would result in a positive contribution to the preservation and expansion of affordable housing for households of varying income levels. The OP Hearing Report stated no objection to the Applicant's requested design flexibility and flexibility from the lot occupancy, closed court, minimum parking, and parking screening requirements. The OP Hearing Report further stated that the proposal's all-affordable housing program, superior design and architecture, sustainability features, and tenant relocation plan with

guaranteed right of return are sufficient proffers commensurate with the related map amendment and flexibility requested through the PUD. (Ex. 23.)

34. The OP Hearing Report evaluated the Application using the Commission's Racial Equity Tool and found that the proposal would further a number of policies related to equity, including policies from the Land Use, Transportation, Housing, and Environmental Protection Citywide Elements, as well as the Mid-City Area Element. OP's analysis of disaggregated data from the Mid-City Planning Area found that the proposal could help to alleviate various degrees of inequity as it relates to housing availability and reducing the number of families that are housing cost burdened. OP noted that the Mid-City Planning Area has exceeded the Mayor's 2025 affordable housing goal (154.2% of the target goal), and that the Project would further contribute to meeting both housing and affordable housing goals for the District as a whole. (Ex. 23.)

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REPORT

35. By report dated May 8, 2026, DDOT noted no objection to the Application, subject to the following condition:
- Implementation of the Applicant's proposed Transportation Demand Management Plan as proposed in the January 6, 2026, Transportation Statement (Ex. 14A) for the life of the Project.

(Ex. 22.)

ANC REPORTS AND TESTIMONY

36. By letter dated October 18, 2024, ANC 1C stated that at a duly noticed public meeting held on October 9, 2024, with a quorum present, ANC 1C voted 7-0-0 to support the proposed PUD and related Zoning Map amendment for the Property. (Ex. 4.)
37. On February 5, 2026, ANC 1C submitted a second letter stating that at a duly noticed public meeting held on February 4, 2026, with a quorum present, ANC 1C voted 6-0 to again support the proposed PUD and related Zoning Map amendment for the Property. The ANC's letter noted that the Applicant had returned to the ANC following the setdown meeting to provide an updated presentation on the Project. (Ex. 13.)

OTHER AGENCIES, PERSONS, OR GROUPS

38. On March 30, 2026, Shelby Dawirs, a resident of 2363 Champlain Street, NW, submitted written comments (Ex. 20) expressing concerns not in opposition to the Project itself, but regarding pedestrian safety along Champlain Street, NW, during construction, given the simultaneous presence of two other ongoing construction projects on the block that have closed portions of the sidewalk. Ms. Dawirs testified at the May 21, 2026, public hearing and reiterated these concerns. (Tr. from May 21, 2026, public hearing.)
39. In response to Ms. Dawirs' concerns, the Applicant committed to coordinate with her and with DDOT to ensure that the required traffic control plan ("TCP") for the Project is

developed and implemented in a manner that maintains safe pedestrian access along Champlain Street, NW, throughout the construction period. The Applicant noted that construction of the Project is not anticipated to commence until approximately 2028, by which time the other ongoing construction projects on the block will likely be complete. The Applicant reiterated this timeline in its post-hearing statement update on coordination with Ms. Dewirs. (Ex. 33.)

PUBLIC HEARING

40. At the May 21, 2026, public hearing, the Applicant presented the Project and responded to questions from the Commission. The Commission expressed support for the Project's design, affordability program, sustainability features, and community engagement efforts. The Commission also requested that the Applicant provide, prior to final action: (1) the signature page of the TOPA development agreement with the Tenant Association or a letter of support from the Tenant Association; (2) a response to DHCD's suggestion for a condition establishing a minimum IZ set aside in case the Project does not receive public financing; and (3) an update on coordination with Ms. Dewirs regarding pedestrian safety concerns along Champlain Street.
41. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 408.11, at the close of the hearing, the Commission took proposed action to approve the Application, including the waiver of the minimum land area requirement pursuant to Subtitle X § 301.3.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION ("NCPC")

42. On May 28, 2026, the Commission referred the PUD and related map amendment to the National Capital Planning Commission ("NCPC") for review and comment pursuant to the District of Columbia Home Rule Act of 1973, as amended, 87 Stat. 790, Pub. L. No. 93-198, D.C. Code Section 1-201 *et seq.* (Ex. 28.)
43. By report dated May 28, 2026, NCPC found that the proposed Project is exempt from NCPC review because it meets the requirements of exception 12 in Chapter 8 of NCPC's Submission Guidelines. (Ex. 30.)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Pursuant to the authority granted by the Zoning Act of 1938, approved June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 797, as amended; D.C. Official Code § 6-641.01 (2018 Repl.)), the Commission may approve a Consolidated PUD consistent with the requirements of Subtitle X, Chapter 3, and Subtitle Z § 300, a PUD-related map amendment pursuant to Subtitle X § 303.12, a waiver of the minimum land area requirement pursuant to Subtitle X § 301.3, and flexibility from all other development standards pursuant to Subtitle X § 303.1.
2. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 300.1, the purpose of the PUD process is to provide for higher quality development through flexibility in building controls, including building height and density, provided that a PUD:

- (a) *Results in a project superior to what would result from the matter-of-right standards;*
 - (b) *Offers a commendable number or quality of meaningful public benefits; and*
 - (c) *Protects and advances the public health, safety, welfare and convenience and is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.*
- 3. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 304.3, in evaluating a proposed PUD, the Commission shall judge, balance, and reconcile the relative value of the public benefits and project amenities offered, the degree of development incentives requested and any potential adverse effects according to the specific circumstances of the case.
- 4. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 304.4, to approve a proposed PUD, the Commission must determine that the proposed development:
 - (a) *Is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the subject site;*
 - (b) *Does not result in unacceptable project impacts on the surrounding area or on the operation of city services and facilities but instead shall be found to be either favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable given the quality of public benefits in the project; and*
 - (c) *Includes specific public benefits and project amenities of the proposed development that are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the subject site.*
- 5. Pursuant to Subtitle X §§ 305.2, 305.3, 305.4, and 305.12, the PUD's benefits and amenities must "benefit the surrounding neighborhood or the public in general to a significantly greater extent than would likely result from development of the site under the matter-of-right provisions," and, in relevant part, "meet the following criteria: (a) Benefits shall be tangible and quantifiable items; (b) Benefits shall be measurable and able to be completed or arranged prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy; (c) Benefits may primarily benefit a particular neighborhood or area of the city or service a critical city-wide need; ..." Moreover, a PUD "may qualify for approval by being particularly strong in only one (1) or a few categories [of public benefits], but must be acceptable in all proffered categories and superior in many."
- 6. Pursuant to Subtitle X § 301.3, the Commission may waive the minimum land area requirement for a PUD in the RA-3 zone to no less than 5,000 square feet upon a finding, after the public hearing, that the proposed PUD is of exceptional merit and is in the best interest of the District of Columbia, and that the development is to be located outside the Central Employment Area and at least 80% of the gross floor area of the development shall be used exclusively for dwelling units and uses accessory thereto. The Commission finds that the Application satisfies these criteria. The Application is of exceptional merit and in the best interest of the District because it will preserve existing affordable housing and create new affordable housing, which fully aligns with the Mayor's housing goals and the Housing Element policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The Property contains approximately 7,348 square feet of land area, which exceeds the 5,000 square feet absolute minimum threshold. The Project is located outside the Central Employment Area, and

100% of the GFA of the Project will be used exclusively for dwelling units and uses accessory thereto. Accordingly, the Commission grants the Applicant's request for a waiver from the minimum land area requirement.

7. The Comprehensive Plan Act of 1984 (DC Law 5-75; DC Official Code § 1-306.01(b)) established the Plan's purposes as:
- (a) *To define the requirements and aspirations of District residents, and accordingly influence social, economic, and physical development;*
 - (b) *To guide executive and legislative decisions on matters affecting the District and its citizens;*
 - (c) *To promote economic growth and jobs for District residents;*
 - (d) *To guide private and public development in order to achieve District and community goals;*
 - (e) *To maintain and enhance the natural and architectural assets of the District; and*
 - (f) *To assist in conservation, stabilization and improvement of each neighborhood and community in the District.*
8. In determining whether a PUD is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Commission shall balance the various elements of the Plan. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals discussed this balancing test in its review of the PUD and related Map Amendment for the redevelopment of the McMillan Reservoir Slow Sand Filtration Site (ZC Order No. 13-14(6)):

“The Comprehensive Plan is a ‘broad framework intended to guide the future land use planning decisions for the District.’ *Wisconsin-Newark Neighborhood Coal. v. District of Columbia Zoning Comm’n*, 33 A.3d 382, 394 (D.C. 2011) (internal quotation marks omitted). ‘[E]ven if a proposal conflicts with one or more individual policies associated with the Comprehensive Plan, this does not, in and of itself, preclude the Commission from concluding that the action would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as a whole.’ *Durant v. District of Columbia Zoning Comm’n*, 65 A.3d 1161, 1168 (D.C. 2013). The Comprehensive Plan reflects numerous ‘occasionally competing policies and goals,’ and, ‘[e]xcept where specifically provided, the Plan is not binding.’ *Id.* at 1167, 1168 (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus ‘the Commission may balance competing priorities’ in determining whether a PUD is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as a whole. *D.C. Library Renaissance Building/West End Library Advisory Grp. v. District of Columbia Zoning Comm’n*, 73 A.3d 107, 126 (D.C. 2013). ‘[I]f the Commission approves a PUD that is inconsistent with one or more policies reflected in the Comprehensive Plan, the Commission must recognize these policies and explain why they are outweighed by other, competing considerations.’” (*Friends of McMillan Park v. District of Columbia Zoning Comm’n*, 149 A.3d 1027, 1035 (D.C. 2016).)

9. The Comprehensive Plan also requires the Commission to evaluate all zoning actions through a racial equity lens. 10-A DCMR § 2501.8. Consideration of equity is intended to be based on the policies of the Plan and part of the Commission's consideration of whether the PUD in this case is "not inconsistent" with the Plan, rather than a separate determination about a zoning action's equitable impact.
10. The Comprehensive Plan's 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.)
11. The Comprehensive Plan's Implementation Element provides guidance for the Commission in applying a racial equity lens to its decision making. Specifically, the Implementation Element states that "[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 difference areas in the District." (10-A DCMR § 2501.6.) In addition, the Implementation Element suggests to prepare and implement tools to use as a part of the Commission's evaluation process. (10-A DCMR § 2501.8.)

PUD EVALUATION STANDARDS

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan (Subtitle X §304.3(a))

12. The Commission considered whether the PUD and PUD-related Map Amendment are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and concludes the Project is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the GPM and FLUM, for the following reasons:
 - (a) The GPM indicates that the Property is located in a Neighborhood Conservation Area ("NCA"). The Framework Element states that NCA's are generally residential in character with little vacant and underutilized land. Existing land uses are assumed to be maintained, and any changes are expected to be modest in scale. The guiding philosophy in NCAs is to conserve and enhance established neighborhoods, but not preclude development, particularly to address city-wide housing needs. Densities within NCAs are guided by the FLUM and relevant Comp Plan policies. The Framework Element contemplates context-sensitive growth in NCAs that 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 and displacement should emphasize preserving affordable housing and enhancing services, amenities, and access to opportunities. The Project is compatible with existing neighborhood development.

While the proposed RA-3 zone allows up to 75 feet under a PUD, the height of the proposed building will remain within the 50-foot height that is permitted as a matter of right under the site's existing RA-2 zone. The height and lot occupancy are also compatible with the scale, pattern, and character of the surrounding neighborhood. Notably, the 50-foot (5 stories) and approximate 80% lot occupancy of the Project falls within the ranges of heights and lot occupancies found along the 2300 block of Champlain Street. Further, the Project provides infill housing for a population in need, preserves the residential character of the Property, and will help address citywide housing needs. Most notably, the Project will preserve all existing affordable housing on the Property as well as create new affordable housing.

- (b) The FLUM indicates that the Property is appropriate for Moderate Density Residential use, which is described in the Framework Element as defining "neighborhoods generally, but not exclusively, suited for row houses as well as low-rise garden apartment complexes. The designation also applies to areas characterized by a mix of single-family homes, two- to four-unit buildings, row houses, and low-rise apartment buildings." The mix of residential uses in the surrounding Adams Morgan neighborhood is reflective of this varied development pattern.

While the proposed RA-3 zone is not one of the zones expressly referenced by the Framework Element as being consistent with the Moderate Density Residential FLUM designation, the Commission does not consider this to be an inconsistency with the Comp Plan. The Framework Element expressly states that even if a zone is not identified in a FLUM category description it can still be permitted after the Commission "considers and balances the competing and sometimes conflicting aspects of the Comprehensive Plan, including the policies and text; the intent of the [FLUM] land use category; and the [FLUM] and [GPM]." 10-A DCMR § 227.2. In the case of a PUD, the development "should not result in unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area." *Id.* In this case, the Commission has concluded that the Project will not result in any unacceptable impacts.

The FLUM is intended to be read and applied broadly by area rather than on a property-by-property basis, particularly when considering a PUD-related Zoning Map amendment. Density in Moderate Density Residential areas is typically calculated either as the number of dwelling units per minimum lot area, or as a FAR up to 1.8, although greater density may be possible when complying with IZ or when approved through a PUD. 10-A DCMR § 227.6. The Framework Element FLUM category descriptions provide general guidance on typical matter-of-right densities and do not prescribe limits on height and density for PUDs. The Framework Element states, "the goal of a PUD is to permit development flexibility greater than specified by matter-of-right zoning, such as increased building height or density...the Zoning Commission may include a zoning map amendment for the purpose of the PUD, which is applicable only for the duration of the PUD, and subject to PUD condition." 10-A DCMR § 224.7. The reason for this wide range of flexibility for height and density under a PUD is because the PUD process affords the Commission the ability to evaluate a specific project design and program to ensure that it does not result in unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area. Additionally, the Commission has broad authority to grant a PUD-related Zoning

Map amendment that it might not otherwise approve as a standalone map amendment because "[a] PUD map amendment is thus a temporary change to existing zoning, that does not begin until a PUD covenant is recorded, ceases if the PUD is not built, and ends once the PUD use terminates. This being the case, the Commission may grant a PUD-related map amendment in circumstances where it might reject permanent rezoning.... A PUD applicant seeking a related map amendment must still demonstrate that public health, safety, and general welfare goals of the zoning regulations would be served by the amendment." *See* Z.C. Order No. 05-42.

The height, density, massing, and scale of the Project are compatible with adjacent uses and are appropriate given the heights and densities of the surrounding context. For height, although the proposed RA-3 zone permits a maximum height of 75 feet under a PUD, the Project has a maximum height of 50 feet, which is consistent with the matter-of-right height permitted under the site's existing RA-2 zoning (a zone that is specifically referenced in the Framework Element as being consistent with the Moderate Density FLUM category). For density, when evaluating a proposed zone the Commission considers, in part, the intent of the FLUM, which reflects typical densities of all contiguous properties on a block that may contain buildings with higher or lower individual densities. 10-A DCMR 228.1(c). While the Project's density (3.91 FAR) on its own site could be described as medium density residential, the average density of all contiguous properties along the block – including the Project – is approximately 2.31 FAR, which is well within the 2.592 FAR that is permitted under a PUD in the moderate-density RA-2 zone and for an area designated for moderate density residential use on the FLUM.

- (c) The Project would advance policies of the Citywide Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Environmental Protection, and Urban Design Elements, as well as the Mid-City Area Element. Specifically, the Project's addition of density will be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood; it will provide streetscape improvements and has been designed with minimal surface parking; it will preserve and expand the housing supply and provide affordable housing opportunities in an area where there is a significant need for such housing; and it incorporates sustainable and thoughtful design elements that will advance the District's sustainability and climate resilience goals.
- (d) The Applicant's Comprehensive Plan evaluation provided a detailed discussion of the Project's consistency with applicable Citywide and Area Element policies, including several policies that are specifically aimed at advancing racial equity. The Applicant also detailed its substantial community outreach, which included meetings with existing tenants, the Tenant Association, ANC 1C, adjacent property owners, tenants within adjacent rental properties, and neighborhood organizations.
- (e) The Commission concludes that, when examined through a racial equity lens, the Project advances racial equity as a process, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, 10-A DCMR § 213.6, by preserving and expanding affordable housing and creating a sustainable Project with an appropriate height and massing that was informed by the Applicant's extensive community engagement efforts, as evidenced by the ANC's consistent, unanimous support for the Project. The Commission notes that the

disaggregated race and ethnicity data provided by OP reveals that the Mid-City Planning Area has experienced demographic changes, including a declining share of Black residents, and that the Project would help existing residents of color remain in the neighborhood. Thus, the Commission finds that the Application responds to the District's racial equity goals as the Applicant utilized community outreach and engagement guidance, considered the Project's potential impact on existing racial disparities as informed by OP's disaggregated race and ethnicity data for the Planning Area, and revised the design of the Project accordingly. The Project will advance many desired Comprehensive Plan policies and themes identified in the Commission's Racial Equity Analysis Tool.

Potential Adverse Impacts – How Mitigated or Outweighed (Subtitle X § 304.4(b))

13. The Commission concludes that the Project will not result in any unacceptable adverse impacts, but rather any adverse impacts that may occur are acceptable and sufficiently mitigated for the following reasons:
 - (a) The Project will require the temporary displacement of the existing tenants of the Property during construction. However, the Applicant has developed a comprehensive tenant relocation plan in coordination with the Tenant Association and HTH that provides for permanent relocation assistance, comparable replacement housing, and full payment of moving expenses at no cost to the residents. The Applicant has also entered into a development agreement with the Tenant Association that provides existing tenants with a guaranteed right of return to a comparable unit in the newly constructed Project at similar leasing terms. The Commission therefore concludes that the temporary displacement impacts have been sufficiently mitigated;
 - (b) The Project will require flexibility from the minimum parking requirement. However, the Property is in a neighborhood that is pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly, and well-served by transit with multiple Metrobus routes and Capital Bikeshare stations within a quarter mile of the Property. DDOT has found the proposed parking supply to be appropriate given the Project's size, distance from transit, and walkability of the neighborhood. The Applicant's TDM plan will further mitigate any transportation impacts. Therefore, the Commission believes these impacts are acceptable given the quality of public benefits provided; and
 - (c) A community member raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety along Champlain Street, NW, during construction. The Applicant committed to work with the community member and DDOT to develop and implement a traffic control plan that maintains safe pedestrian access within the public space adjacent to the Property throughout construction of the Project. In addition, the timeline for construction of the Project is unlikely to overlap with the two other ongoing construction projects on the block and thus access to the public space adjacent to those projects should be restored by the time construction of the Project begins.

PUD Flexibility Balanced Against Public Benefits and Potential Adverse Effects (Subtitle X §§304.4(c) and 304.3)

14. The Commission acknowledges the Project requires flexibility through the PUD process for the requested map amendment, the minimum land area waiver, and flexibility from the lot occupancy, closed court, minimum parking, and parking screening requirements, as well as general design flexibility.
15. The Commission recognizes the public benefits provided by the Project, including its superior urban design and architecture, its preservation of 32 existing affordable units and provision of twelve (12) new affordable units at deeper levels of affordability than currently exist on the Property, and its commitment to Enterprise Green Communities Certification standards and near Net-Zero energy consumption. The Commission concludes that the Project's public benefits are sufficient to justify the development incentives requested and any adverse effects of the Project as required by Subtitle X § 304.3.
16. The Commission thus concludes that the PUD will provide public benefits that are commensurate with the flexibility requested, thus satisfying Subtitle X § 304.3.
17. The Commission further concludes that the PUD and related map amendment are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including when viewing the Project through a racial equity lens, and provides benefits and amenities commensurate with the requested flexibility, including the map amendment, minimum land area waiver, and flexibility from the lot occupancy, closed court, minimum parking, and parking screening requirements, as detailed in the Application and in OP's reports. (Ex. 3, 11, 14, 23.)

Evaluating the Public Benefits (Subtitle X § 305)

18. The Commission concludes that the Project includes specific public benefits and amenities that are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or other policies relevant to the Property. The Commission evaluated the benefits proffered by the Applicant, pursuant to Subtitle X § 305, and concludes that the public benefits benefit the surrounding neighborhood to a significantly greater extent than development of the site as a matter-of-right would. Namely, the increased density gained through the PUD-related map amendment will enable the preservation of all 32 existing affordable units on the Property and the provision of twelve (12) new affordable units, all at deeper levels of affordability than currently exist, and the Project will incorporate thoughtful and sustainable design elements and streetscape improvements in an area of the District where there is a significant need for affordable housing. (Ex. 31; see also FF No. 24.)
19. Based upon the record before the Commission, the Commission concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof pursuant to Subtitle X § 300 et seq. and Subtitle Z § 300 and that the requested PUD, related map amendment, and minimum land area waiver can be granted.

“GREAT WEIGHT” TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF OP

20. The Commission is required to give "great weight" to the recommendation 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 § 405.8. (*Metropole Condo. Ass'n v. D.C. Bd. of Zoning Adjustment*, 141 A.3d 1079, 1087 (D.C. 2016).)
21. The Commission finds OP's analysis of the Application, its conclusion that the Application satisfies the PUD evaluation requirements and is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan Maps and the Citywide and Area Elements, including when viewed through a racial equity lens, and its recommendation to approve the Application persuasive and concurs with OP's recommendation.

“GREAT WEIGHT” TO THE ANC REPORTS

22. The Commission must give "great weight" to the issues and concerns raised in the written report of the affected ANC(s) 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 § 406.2. 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).)
23. ANC 1C voted unanimously in support of the Application on two separate occasions: first on October 9, 2024 (7-0-0), and again on February 4, 2026 (6-0), after the Applicant returned to the ANC to provide an updated presentation on the Project. The Commission finds ANC 1C's support for the Application persuasive and consistent with the Commission's own conclusions regarding the Project's merits. The Commission therefore concludes that ANC 1C's issues and concerns have been addressed and resolved.

DECISION

In consideration of the record, and the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order, the Zoning Commission concludes that the Applicant has satisfied its burden of proof and, therefore, **APPROVES** the Application, subject to the following guidelines, conditions, and standards for:

- A consolidated PUD and related Zoning Map amendment to rezone the Property from the RA-2 zone to the RA-3 zone;
- Flexibility from the following technical zoning requirements:
 - Lot occupancy (Subtitle F § 210.1);

- Closed court (Subtitle F § 209.1);
- Minimum parking (Subtitle C § 701.5);
- Parking screening (Subtitle C § 714); and
- Such other conditions and flexibility as set forth in the conditions hereof:

A. Project Development

1. The Project shall be built pursuant to the RA-3 zone district in accordance with the architectural plans and drawings dated September 18, 2025 (Ex. 3G1–3G2), as modified by the revised ground floor plan dated March 6, 2026 (Ex. 14B) (collectively, the "Final Plans"), and as further modified by the guidelines, conditions, and standards herein.
2. The PUD site shall be redeveloped with a new multifamily residential building containing approximately 44 affordable dwelling units with a maximum density of approximately 3.91 FAR, and a maximum height of approximately 50 feet (excluding penthouses and roof structures).
3. The Applicant shall have design flexibility in the areas enumerated in Subtitle Z § 702.15 and, as modified and supplemented by the following:
 - a. Exterior Materials – Type: To substitute cementitious panel cladding in place of brick on the Project's closed court walls and along portions of the north and south party walls, as shown on the approved Plans;
 - b. Exterior Details – Projections and Encroachments: To make minor refinements to architectural trim and any other building projections and encroachments into the public right-of-way that are necessary to comply with applicable DDOT public space regulations and requirements governing projections and encroachments under Chapter 32 of the Building Code (Title 12 DCMR) or as the result of the related review and permitting process;
 - c. Affordability Levels: To vary the affordability level assigned to each dwelling unit 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 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 for a minimum of 30 years;
 - d. Penthouse and Roof Structures: To adjust the size, height, location, and configuration of the penthouse and mechanical roof structure and equipment elements, and to accommodate any additional or alternative mechanical equipment that is necessary to achieve the desired sustainability

and green construction objectives, provided that the Project meets all applicable penthouse height, enclosing walls, setback, and area requirements set forth in Subtitle C, Chapter 15; and

- e. Sustainable Features: To vary the approved sustainable features of the Project, including the location and configuration of the green roof areas and solar panels, provided the Project meets all applicable requirements and other sustainability requirements set forth in these Conditions.

B. Public Benefits

1. The Applicant shall provide affordable housing as set forth in this condition:
 - 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 for households earning no more an average income level of 60% MFI.

Affordable Housing Summary Table						
Residential Unit Type	Residential GFA (sf)	Units	Income Level (MFI)	Affordable Control Period	Affordable Unit Type	Notes
Residential Total	28,731	44				
Market Rate	0	0	N/A			
Affordable (non-IZ)	28,731	44	30% - 80%	30 years (minimum)	Rental	Income levels may be adjusted in accordance with flexibility granted by the Commission, provided that under any scenario dwelling units within the project shall be devoted to affordable housing at an income level that averages no more than 60% MFI.

Affordable (IZ)	4,310	TBD	60%	Project duration (after initial non-IZ term)	Rental	Commences after expiration of 30-year affordable housing financing control period. The number of IZ units will be determined based upon the allocation of the required amount of GFA and the proportionality requirements of the IZ program.
------------------------	-------	-----	-----	--	--------	--

2. The 30-year control period established under this condition shall commence upon the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for the Project.
3. The affordable housing described in Condition B.1.a above assumes the Applicant will obtain the financing necessary to be able to provide the affordable housing required under Condition B.1.a, as may be adjusted in accordance with the flexibility granted by the Commission. Should the Applicant be unable to provide the affordable housing required under Condition B.1.a (except as otherwise provided in this Order) due to an inability to secure necessary financing or any other reason, the Applicant will need to return to the Commission to seek a modification to the approved PUD before it can proceed with any other development on the Property.
4. **Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the Project**, in accordance with the requirements in Subtitle X § 305.5(k)(5), the Applicant shall provide the Zoning Administrator with evidence that the Project will meet Enterprise Green Community Certification design standards.
5. **Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the Project**, the Project shall include approximately 3,000 square feet of green roof and approximately 1,000 square feet of rooftop solar panel arrays, as may be modified by the flexibility in sustainable elements granted by the Commission.

C. Transportation Mitigation

1. **Following the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Project and for the life of the Project**, the Applicant shall adhere to the following Transportation Demand Management plan measures:
 - a. Identify a Transportation Coordinator for the planning, construction, and operations phases of development. The Transportation Coordinator will function as the point of contact with DDOT, goDCgo, and Zoning Enforcement and will provide their contact information to goDCgo.com;

- b. Transportation Coordinator will conduct an annual commuter survey of building residents onsite, and report TDM activities and data collection efforts to goDCgo once per year;
- c. Develop, distribute, and market various transportation alternatives and options to residents, including promoting transportation events (e.g., Bike to Work Day, National Walking Day, Car Free Day) on the property website and in any internal building newsletters or communications;
- d. Direct the Transportation Coordinator to subscribe to goDCgo's residential newsletter and receive TDM training from goDCgo to learn about the transportation conditions for this project and available options for implementing the TDM Plan;
- e. Provide welcome packets to all new residents that should, at a minimum, include the Metrorail pocket guide, brochures of local Metrobus lines, carpool, and vanpool information, CaBi coupon or rack card, Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) brochure, and the most recent DC Bike Map;
 - Brochures can be ordered from DDOT's goDCgo program by emailing info@godcgo.com;
- f. Provide residents who wish to carpool with detailed carpooling information and will be referred to other carpool matching services sponsored by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) or other comparable service if MWCOC does not offer this in the future;
- g. Post all transportation and TDM commitments on the building website, publicize availability, and allow the public to see what has been promised;
- h. Offer a SmarTrip card and one (1) complimentary Capital Bikeshare coupon good for a free ride to every new resident;
- i. Provide at least two (2) short- and sixteen (16) long-term bicycle parking spaces, meeting or exceeding ZR16 minimum requirements for at least two (2) short- and fifteen (15) long-term bicycle parking spaces; and
- j. Accommodate non-traditional sized bikes including cargo, tandem, and kids bikes, with a minimum 5% of spaces (minimum of 2) designed for longer cargo/tandem bikes, and a minimum of 10% of spaces designed with electrical outlets for the charging of electric bikes and scooters.
 - There will be no fee to the residents for use of the bicycle storage room and strollers will be permitted to be stored in the bicycle storage room.

2. **Following the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Project**, the Transportation Coordinator will submit documentation summarizing compliance with the transportation and TDM conditions of the Order (including, if made available, any written confirmation from the Office of the Zoning Administrator) to the Office of Zoning for inclusion in the IZIS case record of the case.
3. **Following the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Project**, the Transportation Coordinator will submit a letter to the Zoning Administrator, DDOT, and goDCgo every five (5) years (as measured from the final Certificate of Occupancy for the Project) summarizing continued substantial compliance with the transportation and TDM conditions in the Order, unless no longer applicable as confirmed by DDOT. If such letter is not submitted on a timely basis, the building shall have sixty (60) days from date of notice from the Zoning Administrator, DDOT, or goDCgo to prepare and submit such letter.

D. Miscellaneous

1. No building permit shall be issued for the PUD until the Applicant has recorded a covenant in the land records of the District of Columbia, between the Applicant and the District of Columbia, that is satisfactory to the Office of Zoning Legal Division and the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. Such covenant shall bind the Applicant and all successors in title to construct and use the Property in accordance with this Order, or amendment thereof by the Commission. The Applicant shall file a certified copy of the covenant with the records of the Office of Zoning.
2. The PUD shall be valid for a period of two years from the effective date of this Order within which time an application shall be filed for a building permit. Construction must begin within three years of the effective date of this Order.
3. The Applicant is required to comply fully with the provisions of the Human Rights Act of 1977, D.C. Law 2-38, as amended, and this Order is conditioned upon full compliance with those provisions. In accordance with the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended, D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.01 *et seq.*, ("Act") the District of Columbia does not discriminate on the basis of actual or perceived: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, personal appearance, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, familial status, family responsibilities, matriculation, political affiliation, genetic information, disability, source of income, or place of residence or business. Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination that is also prohibited by the Act. In addition, harassment based on any of the above protected categories is also prohibited by the Act. Discrimination in violation of the Act will not be tolerated. Violators will be subject to disciplinary action.

On May 21, 2026, upon the motion of Commissioner Imamura, as seconded by Commissioner Wright, the Zoning Commission took **PROPOSED ACTION** to **APPROVE** the Application, including the waiver of the minimum land area requirement pursuant to Subtitle X § 301.3, at the

close of the public hearing by a vote of 4-0-1 (Joseph S. Imamura, Gwen Wright, Robert E. Miller, and Anthony J. Hood to **APPROVE**; Tammy Stidham not present, not voting).

On June 25, 2026, upon the motion of Commissioner Hood, as seconded by Commissioner Stidham, the Zoning Commission took **FINAL ACTION** to **APPROVE** the Application at its public meeting by a vote of 5-0-0 (Joseph S. Imamura, Gwen Wright, Robert E. Miller, Tammy Stidham to **APPROVE**).

In accordance with the provisions of Subtitle Z § 604.9, this Z.C. Order No. 25-18 shall become final and effective upon publication in the *District of Columbia Register*; that is, on [REDACTED], 2026.

ANTHONY J. HOOD
CHAIRMAN
ZONING COMMISSION

SARA A. BARDIN
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF ZONING

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE § 2-1401.01 ET SEQ. (ACT), THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF ACTUAL OR PERCEIVED: RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS, PERSONAL APPEARANCE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY OR EXPRESSION, FAMILIAL STATUS, FAMILY RESPONSIBILITIES, MATRICULATION, POLITICAL AFFILIATION, GENETIC INFORMATION, DISABILITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, OR PLACE OF RESIDENCE OR BUSINESS. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IS A FORM OF SEX DISCRIMINATION WHICH IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. IN ADDITION, HARASSMENT BASED ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROTECTED CATEGORIES IS PROHIBITED BY THE ACT. DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE ACT WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. VIOLATORS WILL BE SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINARY ACTION.