

The Greater  
Washington



**Board  
of Trade**

*Linking Business and Community in The District of Columbia,  
Northern Virginia and Suburban Maryland*

COMMENTS FROM  
THE GREATER WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE  
ON  
ZONING COMMISSION CASE NO. 86-26  
REZONING PARTS OF CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW

JANUARY 25, 1988

ZONING COMMISSION

CASE No. 86-26

EXHIBIT No. 372

ZONING COMMISSION

District of Columbia

Board of Trade Building, 1129 20th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, 202-857-5906

CASE NO. 86-26  
EXHIBIT NO. 372

### MAUREEN DWYER - INTRODUCTION

My name is Maureen Dwyer. I am an attorney with the law firm of Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick, and Lane and I am here today with my colleagues representing the Greater Washington Board of Trade. The Board of Trade is a regional chamber of commerce representing 1500 firms in the District of Columbia, suburban Maryland, and Northern Virginia. Our member firms represent two-thirds of the private work force in the Washington region.

On behalf of the Board of Trade, we ask that you not adopt the proposed overlay district for the Woodley Park and Cleveland Park Metro Station areas. There are four general areas we will discuss that are the basis of our position.

First, we believe that if the proposed overlay districts are approved, they will result in a reduction of existing development potential at two Metrorail stations and that this would not be in keeping with City or Comprehensive Plan policies. Although neither of these districts is characterized as a transit overlay district, they would operate to place restrictions on development that in our opinion would not be supportive of the Metrorail system and of the type of quality development the city should encourage at Metrorail stations. While it is not our position that these areas should be developed at densities anywhere close to that found at either Rosslyn or Crystal City, we do not believe that the existing already low heights and densities should be further reduced. On the contrary, incentives should be provided to encourage the quality development needed for these areas.

Second, we believe that the proposal will have a detrimental effect on residential development in these areas. As this Commission is aware from previous cases, we believe that the revenues provided by commercial development can be used to subsidize residential development and that once you restrict

development opportunities and, in particular, reduce heights, the loss will be in the residential area, not the commercial.

Third, the proposal will likely restrict the economic vitality of these two areas and reduce the opportunity for additional neighborhood and service retail activity by placing unnecessary restrictions on development in the area.

Fourth, we also believe that the proposed height restriction will detract from, rather than enhance, the historic preservation objectives by unduly limiting the flexibility of new development to adapt to the historic character of the area and to work around existing historic structures.

I will now like to introduce the panel. On my right is Bruce Yoder, Vice President and Director of Planning with Greenhorne and O'Mara, Incorporated. To his right is Lee MacVaugh, with the Commercial Brokerage Division of Shannon and Luchs. And to his right is Shalom Baranes with the architectural firm of Shalom Baranes and Associates. Unfortunately, Mr. David Mayhood of the Mayhood Companies was unable to attend tonight's hearing due to a previous commitment. He would like the opportunity to testify in person in the event additional hearing dates are scheduled. At present, we will submit a condensed written version of his testimony which addresses the impact of the proposed overlay zones on the opportunities for residential development.

BRUCE YODER - GENERAL PLANNING ISSUES

As a professional planner and a resident and taxpayer of the District of Columbia, I don't believe that adoption of Zoning Case Number 86-26 is in the best long range interest of either the District of Columbia or the local neighborhoods that are affected.

The District's 1983 Comprehensive Plan includes numerous Objectives and Policies that encourage development at Metrorail stations in order to "fully capitalize on the development and public transportation opportunities which the stations provide."

Having worked as a planner with many City and neighborhood groups, I certainly understand the need to balance the overall City and development objectives with those of local neighborhoods. However, I don't believe that the development restrictions outlined in Zoning Case Number 86-26 are in anyone's best interest.

My proposal is that either Zoning Case Number 86-26 be amended, or a new bill prepared that provides incentives for development around Metrorail stations that would ensure quality development that provides public amenities and a pedestrian orientation while accommodating and encouraging public transportation. This is the zoning approach that is being used in Arlington, Alexandria, Fairfax County, Montgomery County, and Prince George's County. This is also the approach used in many other cities in this country.

When I served on the Committee in Prince George's County that wrote the now adopted Transit District Overlay (TDO) Zone legislation, (copy attached), we had as our goal the following intent for the Zone:

"The Transit District Overlay Zone is intended to insure that the development of land in the vicinity of Metro stations maximizes transit ridership, serves the economic and social goals of the areas, and takes advantage of the unique development opportunities which mass transit provides."

This Transit District Overlay Zone does not automatically permit any development beyond that which is provided for in the existing zoning. However, a developer has the opportunity to propose a development that meets the County's TDO Zone objectives and may receive approval for variations to the underlying zone's requirements in exchange for specific amenities that are in the public interest.

In conclusion, all of the political jurisdictions served by the Metrorail system have substantial investment in the system and have recognized the potential for quality development at Metrorail stations that supports the system and provides major public amenities. I encourage the District to review what other area potential jurisdictions have adopted regarding development at Metrorail stations and prepare new zoning legislation that is in everyone's best long range interest.

Thank you for your consideration.

## DAVID MAYHOOD - THE IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

In evaluating the potential impact on residential development by the proposed overlay zones and controls for Woodley Park and Cleveland Park, it is important to note that almost all current and proposed multifamily development in the District of Columbia has been done as a part of a mixed use development or PUD where there is a significant commercial component. As my firm has previously testified in the Miller proposal on Square 1661 and on Boston properties Square 35, the development of multifamily residential housing in the district is economically unfeasible. The rental or sales income generated typically does not justify the considerable risk.

In evaluating the new multifamily developments in the District it is not surprising to find that almost all current or proposed residential developments are associated with a commercial component to justify the risk and in some cases to subsidize potential loss. The clear indication is that future residential development in the District of Columbia will be linked to a viable commercial component or not built at all.

Specifically, pertaining to the proposed controls for Woodley Park and Cleveland Park, we believe the net effect and impact will be the elimination of the residential portion of possible mixed unit development sites. The Office of Planning in their report dated January 11, 1988 and in oral testimony indicated their belief that the current allowed FAR can be achieved with the lower height limit of 55 feet.

The reality will be that only the commercial portion at 1.5 FAR will be built and the opportunity for additional housing stock will be lost. A developer faced with forcing residential FAR of questionable economic return into a deeper, less efficient structure will opt to drop the housing altogether. The proposed height limitations will limit new development to that of strictly commercial nature.

LEE MACVAUGH - ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS ASPECTS  
OF THE PROPOSED OVERLAY ZONE

As a member of the Commercial Brokerage Division of Shannon & Luchs, and as I have worked on projects in the subject area for many years, I direct my comments to the economic and business impacts of the proposed overlay zones. I would like to make the following points:

- o The proposed overlay zone will likely lower land values, which raises the issue of fairness to existing land owners. At a minimum, the proposed changes will destabilize property values.
- o The proposal will decrease the potential growth of neighborhood retail and commercial services desired by the area's residents.
- o It will make more difficult the ability to obtain financing to buy, develop, rehab and/or lease a store or property.
- o By reducing development, the proposal will lower property tax revenue and sales tax revenue for the city, and will reduce potential employment opportunities for service and retail jobs.
- o Many of the local merchants are against the proposal's restrictions, feeling their flexibility will be limited, and the needs of the local merchants are important. Increased usage of the underutilized Cleveland Park Metro Station area will help the local merchants and encourage them to stay and not to move to the suburbs. As an example, Bob Abbo, owner of the Roma Restaurant, said that most local merchants support the Urban Group's development plans for 3501

Connecticut Avenue (Park and Shop property), feeling that the development will attract shoppers and help improve the economy of the area.

In summary, I feel that the proposed overlay zone will restrict the economic vitality of the area for merchants and residents alike. We should not only protect but enhance the existing low-scale neighborhood commercial centers and services and provide growth opportunities for development that is sensitive to the character of the area. I favor a vibrant and healthy area here and I feel the proposed restrictions will have an adverse impact on the corridor. We would be happy to work with the Office of Planning, and the Commission, to develop the right approach on these issues.



## SHALOM BARANES - ARCHITECTURE

My comments are directed to what I believe will be the impacts of this proposal on the type of development and its design within the area of these two Metro stations.

Based on my work on many projects around the city, I believe that the proposed height reductions, contrary to the assertion on page 27 of the Office of Planning's report, will in effect be a downzoning.

The zoning envelope is already extraordinarily tight and is constantly being chipped away in an innocuous way, both within and out of the zoning arena. This is happening within zoning provisions; (e.g., more restrictive interpretations of loading requirements, more restrictive parking access requirements), within the building code; (e.g., more restrictive requirements for elevators, ramps, stairs, garage ventilation requirements) and by utility companies; (e.g., electric transformer vaults).

The height reductions contained in the proposal will, if approved, result in great cost to residential development. Three examples of this are 3307 M Street (one floor reduction), 1024 Wisconsin (setbacks) and 1229 Wisconsin (limited frontage, no residential), where reduced height allowances and setback requirements imposed by the Commission of Fine Arts resulted in reduced residential density.

The proposed prohibition of second floor retail use places undue hardship on retailers with an expanding clientele. My suggestion is to allow retail to expand into the second floor and residential to continue upward with setbacks.

The limited amount of valuable first floor street frontage means that none will be given up for residential lobbies leading to

upper floors. That has been the experience in Georgetown. In summary, the zoning envelope has been extraordinarily tight in the District and is constantly being chipped away. This has reduced flexibility in design and is inhibiting optimum mix of uses. The premise that densities are not affected by height restrictions is contrary to my experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 10A.

OVERLAY ZONES

DIVISION 1. SPECIFIC OVERLAY ZONES.

Subdivision 1. T-D-O (Transit District Overlay) Zone.

Sec. 27-548.2. Introduction.

Sec. 27-548.3. Purposes.

Sec. 27-548.4. Relationship to other zones.

Sec. 27-548.5. Uses.

Sec. 27-548.6. Regulations.

- (a) Density
- (b) Buildings, landscaping, and other improvements
- (c) Parking and loading
- (d) Signs
- (e) Pedestrian open space
- (f) Air rights and below-ground development

Sec. 27-548.7. Transit District Development Plan

Sec. 27-548.8. Site Plan.

- (a) General
- (b) Contents
- (c) Required findings
- (d) Validity period
- (e) Appeal of Planning Board's decision

Sec. 27-548.9. Applicability of previous actions.

This page intentionally blank.

PART 10A. OVERLAY ZONES.

DIVISION 1. SPECIFIC OVERLAY ZONES

Subdivision 1. T-D-O (Transit District Overlay) Zone.

Sec. 27-548.2. Introduction.

(a) The Transit District Overlay Zone is intended to insure that the development of land in the vicinity of Metro stations maximizes transit ridership, serves the economic and social goals of the area, and takes advantage of the unique development opportunities which mass transit provides. The T-D-O Zone is a mapped zone which is superimposed over other zones in a designated area around a Metro station, and which may modify certain requirements for development within those underlying zones. This designated area is called a Transit District. In this zone, a Transit District Development Plan must be approved by the District Council, and all development is subject to the approval by the Planning Board of a Detailed Site Plan. The Transit District Development Plan provides both the requirements for development within a specific Transit District and a flexible forum for joint development between the public and private sectors.

(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

Sec. 27-548.3. Purposes.

(a) The specific purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone are:

(1) To enhance the development opportunities in the vicinity of transit stations;

(2) To promote the use of transit facilities;

(3) To increase the return on investment in a transit system and improve local tax revenues;

(4) To create a process which coordinates public policy decisions, supports regional and local growth and development strategies, and creates conditions which make joint development possible;

(5) To create a process which overcomes deficiencies in ordinary planning processes and removes obstacles not addressed in those processes;

(6) To minimize the costs of extending or expanding public services and facilities, by encouraging appropriate development in the vicinity of transit stations;

(7) To provide mechanisms to assist in financing public and private costs associated with development;

(8) To provide for convenient and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access to Metro stations;

(9) To attract an appropriate mix of land uses;

(10) To encourage uses which complement and enhance the character of the area;

(11) To insure that developments within the Transit District possess a desirable urban design relationship with one another, the Metro station, and adjoining areas; and

(12) To provide flexibility in the design and layout of buildings and structures, and to promote a coordinated and integrated development scheme.  
(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

#### Sec. 27-548.4. Relationship to other zones.

(a) The Transit District Overlay Zone shall be placed over other zones on the Zoning Map, and shall modify specific requirements of those underlying zones. Only those requirements of the underlying zones specifically noted in this Subdivision and elsewhere in this Subtitle are modified. All other requirements of the underlying zones are unaffected by the Transit District Overlay Zone.  
(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

#### Sec. 27-548.5. Uses.

(a) The uses allowed on a lot in a Transit District Overlay Zone shall be the same as those allowed in the underlying zone in which the lot is classified, except as is modified by the Transit District Development Plan.

(b) The Transit District Development Plan may not allow uses prohibited in the underlying zone, but the Plan may restrict a lot to specific uses or general use types which are allowed in the underlying zone.

(c) If a use is permitted in the underlying zone by Special Exception, approval of a Special Exception (Part 4) need not be obtained and the use may be allowed by right, if it is provided for on the Transit District Development Plan. Where a Special Exception use is not provided for on the Transit District Development Plan, amendment of the Plan shall be required to permit the use. If the underlying zone requires that specific uses or general use types be present in every development within that zone, the Transit District Development Plan shall reflect those uses and any specified mix or ratio of the uses. In the case of the M-X-T Zone, the amount of square footage devoted to each use shall be in keeping with the purposes of that zone.  
(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

## Sec. 27-548.6. Regulations.

### (a) Density

(1) Development within a Transit District shall not exceed the specified maximum residential density and any floor area ratio (FAR) requirements of the underlying zones, as those requirements would normally be applied if the property were not zoned T-D-O. If an underlying zone has provisions for awarding increased density or FAR above base requirements through furnishing amenities or benefit features, those provisions shall still apply within the T-D-O Zone and shall be applied when the Transit District Development Plan is approved.

### (b) Buildings, landscaping, and other improvements

(1) The location, size, and lot coverage of all structural improvements, and the location, quantity, and type of landscaping, open spaces and green areas shown on an approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the regulations for these improvements and landscaping within the Transit District. The corresponding regulations of the underlying zones do not apply to property in the T-D-O Zone, unless so specified elsewhere in this Subtitle. Detailed Site Plan approval is not required for television receiving antennas attached to dwellings.

### (c) Parking and loading

(1) The requirements of Part 11 concerning the minimum number of spaces in, and design of, off-street parking and loading areas shall not apply within a Transit District. Instead, a methodology for determining the number of off-street parking and loading spaces to be required for specific uses shall be established on the Transit District Development Plan. The Prince George's County Parking Authority shall be provided an opportunity to review any proposed parking methodology prior to transmittal of a Development Plan by the Planning Board to the District Council. The methodology shall, at least, address the following:

(A) The nature of each use proposed, including type, size, and location;

(B) The peak parking demand characteristics of the proposed uses;

(C) Uses involved in multipurpose trips;

(D) Provisions for mass transit, such as rapid rail, carpool, bus, vanpool, and developer-provided services, which would make off-street parking unnecessary;

(E) Parking or loading spaces to be provided by public agencies; and

(F) Existing provisions for parking established within a Parking District (see Section 27-585(a)).

(2) If the uses shown on the Transit District Development Plan are not specific enough to determine the precise parking requirements at the time of the Plan's approval by the District Council, the requirements shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan review by the Planning Board, using the same methodology as established for the Development Plan.

(d) Signs

(1) The regulations of Part 12 governing signs shall not apply to property in the T-D-O Zone. No signs shall be permitted (except signs within a building and not generally visible from outside the building), except upon a finding that a given sign is reasonably necessary. In considering a sign proposal, the Planning Board shall be guided by the design standards of Part 12 and the purpose to be served by the proposed sign. The Planning Board may restrict the location, size, and type of signs in such a manner as to provide adequate identification of a given use, while assuring compatibility with other structures and uses in the Transit District. All signs shall be approved by the Planning Board at the time it approves the Detailed Site Plan or an amendment thereof.

(e) Pedestrian open space

(1) The pedestrian system within a Transit District shall be oriented toward serving the Metro station, as well as other development within the District.

(f) Air rights and below-ground development

(1) Private buildings and other structures may be located within the air space above, or in the ground below, public rights-of-way.

(g) Boundaries of zone

(1) The boundary of a Transit District Overlay Zone shall encompass an area in proximity to an existing or proposed Metro Station. The area shall be contiguous and shall follow property lines, streets, or permanent and readily identifiable natural features of the landscape. A boundary shall not split an individual property unless there is a clear and compelling reason to do so.  
(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

Sec. 27-548.7. Transit District Development Plan.

(a) Within every Transit District Overlay Zone, a Transit District Development Plan shall be prepared and approved, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Part 3, Division 2, Subdivision 5.



(b) All approved Transit District Development Plans shall be binding upon the property owners, their successors, assigns, and heirs. The Plan shall control the use and development of all land and structures in a Transit District, and the issuance and validity of all permits within the Transit District.

(c) The Transit District Development Plan shall include the following:

(1) A description of the area within the Transit District, including a location map showing the boundaries of the Transit District (with north arrow and scale) and a description of the existing improvements within those boundaries;

(2) Existing zoning and use of properties within and adjacent to the Transit District;

(3) Existing and proposed right-of-way widths of internal and adjoining streets;

(4) The proposed vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems;

(5) A description of the methods to be used for storm water management;

(6) The location, size, and description of known proposals for public and private improvements within the proposed Transit District;

(7) The type and location of any specific uses which are proposed, and the distribution and maximum square footage/density anticipated to be devoted to each;

(8) The methodology to be used in determining the amount, location, and arrangement of off-street parking and loading areas; and

(9) Reports and analyses necessary to describe the area's public facilities' infrastructure requirements, and to prioritize them.

(d) The Transit District Development Plan may include the following:

(1) A proposed sequence of development;

(2) The location, quantity, and type of landscaping and screening, and location and size of open space;

(3) Reports and analyses necessary to identify public and private funding sources to finance the areas's public facilities' infrastructure improvements;

(4) Proposed changes of existing underlying zoning; and

(5) Any other pertinent information.

(e) In order to maximize the flexibility of the Transit District Overlay Zone and protect the public interest, the elements and requirements contained in the Transit District Development Plan (Subsections (c) and (d), above) may be in any of the following forms:

(1) Mandatory requirements, such as specific setbacks for structures or required street improvements, which the Detailed Site Plan shall completely reflect and be in conformance with; or

(2) Guidelines and criteria for development which the Planning Board shall use in reviewing a Detailed Site Plan.  
(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

#### Sec. 27-548.8. Site Plan.

##### (a) General

(1) Prior to the issuance of any grading, building, or use and occupancy permit for the construction on, or use of, any land in a Transit District, a Detailed Site Plan for individual development proposals shall be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Part 3, Division 9. A Detailed Site Plan shall be approved prior to, or concurrently with, any final plat of subdivision. A final plat of subdivision for roads only, however, may be approved prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan. The Site Plan may include any portion of the Transit District, and may only be submitted by the owner of the property concerned (or his authorized representative).

##### (b) Contents

(1) In addition to the information required by Part 3, Division 9, for Detailed Site Plans, the following additional information shall be included for Plans in the T-D-O Zone:

(A) The number, floor area, and type of dwelling units;

(B) The gross floor area devoted to commercial and industrial uses and the floor area devoted to other nonresidential uses;

(C) The density and floor area ratios proposed, and how they were calculated;

(D) A description of the relationship between vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems;

(E) Provisions for sediment control and storm water management;

(F) An exterior lighting plan, showing exterior lighting of all buildings, parking areas, driveways, and pedestrian ways, including the heights, number, and type of fixtures. The plan shall also show the amount of glare upon adjoining properties in terms of level of illumination (measured in footcandles) and cut-off angle;

(G) The location, design, size, lighting, and all other features of signs (except signs within, and not generally visible from outside of, buildings);

(H) A statement of planning objectives to be achieved by the development through the particular approach proposed by the applicant. This statement shall include a description of the character of the proposed development and the rationale behind the assumptions and choices made by the applicant; and

(I) A development schedule indicating the approximate dates when construction can be expected to begin and to be completed.

(c) Required findings

(1) The findings required by Section 27-285(b) shall not apply to the T-D-O Zone. Instead, the following findings shall be made by the Planning Board when approving a Detailed Site Plan in the T-D-O Zone:

(A) The Transit District Site Plan is in strict conformance with any mandatory requirements of the Transit District Development Plan;

(B) The Transit District Site Plan is consistent with, and reflects the guidelines and criteria for development contained in, the Transit District Development Plan;

(C) The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone, and applicable regulations of the underlying zones;

(D) The location, size, and design of buildings, signs, other structures, open spaces, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, and parking and loading areas maximize safety and efficiency, and are adequate to meet the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone;

(E) Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures and uses in the Transit District, and with existing and proposed adjacent development.

(d) Validity period

(1) A Transit District Site Plan shall remain valid for a period of six (6) years following the date of its approval.

(e) Appeal of Planning Board's decision

(1) For the purpose of making an appeal (in accordance with Section 27-290), a person of record shall include any person of record in the creation of the Transit District Overlay Zone and approval of the Development Plan, and any person of record in the Site Plan approval process.  
(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

Sec. 27-548.9. Applicability of previous actions.

(a) Except in the Comprehensive Design and M-X-T Zones, and except for map amendments (not including conditions placed on the approval), all actions of the District Council, Zoning Hearing Examiner, Planning Board, or Board of Zoning Appeals which were taken in accordance with this Subtitle and which affected property prior to its being classified in the Transit District Overlay Zone, are null and void with respect to future development within the Transit District, except as addressed by this Subdivision and Part 3, Division 2, Subdivision 5. In the Comprehensive Design and M-X-T Zones, any plans approved prior to the property being classified in the Transit District Overlay Zone remain in full force and effect, unless the property owner indicates (in writing) that the plans may be changed and that the requirements of the Transit District Overlay Zone may be fully applied to the property. Actions with respect to a Transit District Overlay Zone shall not invalidate any approved subdivision plat.

(CB-2-1984; CB-33-1985)

#### MAUREEN DWYER - CONCLUSION

This concludes the presentation by our panel of witnesses regarding the proposed overlay zones. One final point that we would like to address is the question whether Planned Unit Developments should be subject to the same controls as those proposed for matter of right development in the overlay districts. We believe that PUDs should be considered separately from matter of right development in these zones just as they are so considered in every other zone in the District of Columbia. Even in the Capital Interest District, which is an overlay zone, the traditional Planned Unit Development procedures, including height and density incentives, still apply and we see no basis for changing that consistent application in these cases. The PUD process already involves extensive city and community participation and there is ample opportunity through the process to review height and use issues and to safeguard against those projects that the city views as inappropriate.

To summarize, we believe that the existing zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that the proposed overlay districts will, in effect, provide disincentives to needed improvements and revitalization in these neighborhoods. We offer as an alternative approach, the concept of a transit overlay zone that provides incentives for development, including perhaps even height incentives, in order to allow more flexible development and the creation of desired public spaces and other amenities at street level. Greater attention should also be paid to fashioning a zone that promotes city policies for Metrorail stations and at the same time balances the community's interest in quality development and specific services. Ideally these zones could be mapped at other Metrorail locations through the City and would provide uniform treatment and consistent application. We would be happy to work with city and community officials to develop this type of zone for Metrorail stations in

the District.

Thank you for your attention. We appreciate your consideration of our position.

Connecticut Avenue Corridor - Office of Planning Recommendations  
SUMMARY prepared by BOT-CDB January 25, 1988

**WOODLEY PARK commercial area:**

<u>CURRENT ZONING</u>	<u>PREDOMINANT USE</u>	<u>FAR</u>	<u>HEIGHT LIMITATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED HEIGHT LIMITATION</u>
C-2-A	Community business center - med-density	2.5	50 FEET	55 FEET
REMARKS - Non-residential FAR limited to 1.5; residential lot occupancy limited to 60 percent.				
C-2-B	Community business center - med-density	3.5	65 FEET	55 FEET
REMARKS - Non-residential FAR limited to 1.5; residential lot occupancy limited to 80 percent.				

O.P. RECOMMENDED OVERLAY CONTROLS

Overlay controls would essentially change zoning to C-2-A. Overlay controls identical to proposed Cleveland Park controls with the following additions:

1. The limit for eating and drinking establishments would be slightly higher due to already higher concentration of this type of use.
2. Prohibition on fast food restaurants, allowed in C-2-B.
3. Prohibit hotel use.

Connecticut Avenue Corridor - Office of Planning Recommendations  
SUMMARY prepared by BOT-CDB January 25, 1988

CLEVELAND PARK commercial area:

<u>CURRENT ZONING</u>	<u>PREDOMINANT USE</u>	<u>FAR</u>	<u>HEIGHT LIMITATION</u>	<u>PROPOSED HEIGHT LIMITATION</u>
C-2-A	Community business center - med-density	2.5	50 FEET	40 FEET

REMARKS - Non-residential FAR limited to 1.5;  
residential lot occupancy limited to 60 percent.

O.P. RECOMMENDED OVERLAY CONTROLS

1. New buildings can be no more than twice the height of its abutting buildings with a maximum height limit of 40 ft.
2. Commercial redevelopment controls.
  - a. Prohibit the conversion of upper stories of housing to commercial uses.
  - b. Require ground floor space to be devoted to retail and service uses, not office space.
  - c. Restrict drive-throughs and curb cuts. Encourage car access via alleys.
  - d. Restrict street frontage for eating and drinking establishments to 25 % of total street frontage.