

# EXHIBIT A

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
**Zoning Commission**



**ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
**ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 20-08**  
**ZONING COMMISSION CASE NO. 20-08**  
**Z.C. Case No. 20-08**  
**Howard University**  
**(2020-2030 Central Campus Plan)**  
**April 29, 2021**

Pursuant to notice, at its April 29, 2021 public meeting, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (the “Commission”) considered the application (the “Application”) of Howard University (the “Applicant” or “University”) for approval of its 2020-2030 Central Campus Plan (“2020 Central Campus Plan” or “Plan”) pursuant to Subtitle X, Chapter 1 of Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations. The Commission reviewed the Application pursuant to the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedures, which are codified in Subtitle Z of Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (Zoning Regulations of 2016,) (“Zoning Regulations”) to which all references are made unless otherwise specified. The public hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of Subtitle Z, Chapter 4. The Commission APPROVES the Application, subject to the conditions below.

**HEARING DATE: April 5, 2021**

**DECISION DATE: April 29, 2021**

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**Notice**

1. On January 31, 2020, the University mailed a Notice of Intent to Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 1B, and the owners of all property within 200 feet of the perimeter of the subject property as required by Subtitle Z § 302.6. (Exhibit [“Ex.”] 2C1.) In accordance with Subtitle Z § 302.8, representatives of the University presented the 2020 Central Campus Plan to the ANC after mailing notice and prior to filing of the Plan
2. On November 17, 2020, the Office of Zoning (“OZ”) sent notice of the January 25, 2021 virtual public hearing to:
  - The Applicant;
  - The affected ANC 1B;
  - The affected ANC Single Member Districts (“SMD”) 1B01, 1B02, 1B03, 1B06, 1B09, 1B10, and 1B11;
  - The Office of ANCs;
  - The Office of Planning (“OP”);
  - The District Department of Transportation (“DDOT”);

- The Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (“DCRA”);
  - The Office of the Attorney General (“OAG”);
  - The Ward 1 Councilmember and the At-Large Councilmembers; and
  - Property owners within 200 feet of the 2020 Campus Plan properties. (Ex. 7, 8, 8A.)
3. The Commission postponed the hearing from January 25, 2021 to April 5, 2021, at the request of ANC 1B and the Applicant, to allow more time for ANC 1B and the community to review the Plan. (Ex. 20, 21.)
  4. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 402.1, OZ also published notice of the January 25, 2021, virtual public hearing in the *D.C. Register* on November 6, 2020 (67 DCR 013110, *et seq.*) as well as through the calendar on OZ’s website. (Ex. 6.) OZ published notice of the April 5, 2021, rescheduled virtual public hearing in the *D.C. Register* on January 22, 2021 (68 DCR 001264, *et seq.*) as well as through the calendar on OZ’s website.
  5. On December 10, 2020, the Applicant requested a waiver of full compliance with the posting requirements set forth in Subtitle Z § 402.4 with respect to the posting of all of the interior buildings on the campus due to the fact that the campus was closed as a result of the COVID pandemic. The Commission approved the waiver. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 402.3, the Applicant posted notice of the hearing on the Property on December 11, 2020, and maintained such notice in accordance with the Zoning Regulations. (Ex. 11-13A13, 30-30A17, 43.)

### **Parties**

6. The following were automatically parties to this proceeding pursuant to Subtitle Z § 403.5:
  - The Applicant;
  - Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 1B in which boundary the subject property is located and so an “affected ANC” per Subtitle Z § 101.8.
  - The Commission received no requests for party status.

### **The Application**

7. On April 1, 2020, the University filed an application for approval of the 2020 Central Campus Plan. (Ex. 1-4.)
8. The property that is the subject of the 2020 Central Campus Plan consists of property located in Square 330, Lot 800; Square 2872, Lots 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 275, 803, 820, 823, and 824; Square 2873, Lots 1109 and 1110; Square 2882, Lots 950, 951, 952, 953, and 1037; Square 2885, Lot 889; Square 3055, Lots 15 and 821; Square 3057, Lot 92; Square 3058, Lots 834 and 835; Square 3060, Lots 41, 830, and 839; Square 3063, Lot 801; Square 3064, Lots 44, 45, 826, and 837; Square 3065, Lots 33, 829, 830, 831, 833, and 834; Square 3068, Lots 809 and 810; Square 3069, Lots 65 and 66; Square 3072, Lots 52 and 818; Square 3074, Lot 11; Square 3075, Lot 807; Square 3080, Lot 73; and Square 3094, Lot 800 (collectively, “The Property”).
9. The Property is currently subject to the 2011 Campus Plan (“2011 Campus Plan”), which was approved by the Commission in Z.C. Order No. 11-15, as amended.

10. The Applicant asserted that the 2020 Central Campus Plan satisfied the filing requirements of Subtitle X, Chapter 1 and Subtitle Z, Chapter 3. (Ex. 2 -3A9.) The approach to the 2020 Central Campus Plan is to align the University's existing and future (10-year) programmatic needs with its built environment in support of Howard's Mission, Vision, and Strategic Plan. The process includes three phases: Discovery, Synthesis, and Documentation. The central campus planning principles include supporting the academic mission; improving campus quality of life; advancing smart and sustainable urban design; improving the public realm; enhancing walkability and connectivity; fostering community engagement; and promoting sensible sustainability. The planning process identified eight capital projects as critical for Howard to achieve its interdisciplinary academic and research priorities, and student life goals over the next decade. The focus of the projects ranges from student support and services to interdisciplinary academic space to a new Howard University Hospital and medical office building. (*Id.*)
11. The University filed a supplemental statement including a list of the representatives to provide testimony at the public hearing, expert witnesses and resumes, and another copy of the Plan. (Ex. 14-15A9.) The University also submitted a revised copy of the Plan to correct typographical errors and FAR calculations, to address community input regarding green space and improved ambulance access to the proposed new hospital, and to agree to establish a subcommittee of its Community Advisory Council ("CAC") to review and monitor the University's progress towards meeting its affordable housing commitments. (Ex. 32-32B8.) In addition, the University provided a statement of compliance with the process and requirements set forth in Chapter 1 of Subtitle X and Chapter 3 of Subtitle Z of the Zoning Regulations. (*Id.*)
12. On December 28, 2020, as a part of its pre-hearing submission, the University filed a Comprehensive Transportation Review ("CTR") for the 2020 Central Campus Plan in the record of the case. The CTR was previously submitted to the District Department of Transportation ("DDOT") for review on December 11, 2020. (Ex. 17A1-17A18.)

#### **Public Hearing**

13. On April 5, 2021, the Commission held a public hearing in accordance with Subtitle Z Chapter 4. At the beginning of the public hearing, the Commission granted waivers to accept late filings to the case record, including a corrected list of lots and squares within the campus boundary, corrected FAR calculations in the University's PowerPoint presentation, and the affidavit of maintenance. (Ex. 1C, 42, and 43.) (April 5, 2021 hearing transcript ["Tr."] at pp. 7-8.) The Commission also noted the corrected lots and squares during the hearing. (*Id.*)
14. At the public hearing, representatives of the University provided testimony and evidence in support the 2020 Central Campus Plan. The University's testimony touched on academics, campus life, student enrollment, historic preservation, parking and transportation, internal campus connectivity, and the proposed development projects over the course of the Plan. (April 5, 2021 Tr. at pp. 12-40.)

15. The Commission questioned the University regarding parking and transportation generally, and regarding potential access alternatives at two of the proposed development projects. (April 5, 2021 Tr. at pp. 67, 77.) The Commission asked that the Applicant rethink the plan to use the space between the library and the new hospital for access so the existing green space could be maintained. (*Id.*) The Commission also asked for current information on the University's affordable housing goal.<sup>1</sup> (April 5, 2021 Tr. at pp. 88-91.)
16. At the public hearing, no persons or organizations appeared in support of the Application. One individual, Evanna Powell, appeared in opposition to the Application, citing the lack of an academic plan as part of the Campus Plan. (April 5, 2021 Tr. at pp. 110-112). The University responded to Ms. Powell's testimony stating that there is an academic plan though it is separate from this Plan; and more details about the academic plan can be accessed on the University's website under the Howard Forward Strategic Plan information. (April 5, 2021 Tr. at pp. 118-119.)

### **Responses to the Application**

17. The Office of Planning ("OP") submitted a report (the "OP Hearing Report") in which they recommended approval subject to the following conditions: (Ex. 35.)
  - (a) The maximum student enrollment shall be accepted at the proposed 15,000 students which includes any student taking at least one class or course;
  - (b) The 2020 Central Campus Plan shall be valid for a period of 10 years;
  - (c) A campus plan amendment and/or further processing application should be submitted if the current site of the Howard University Hospital is proposed for reuse; and
  - (d) Retain the Community Advisory Committee(CAC).
18. OP's hearing testimony noted that the Plan emphasizes education, urban form, environmental protection, multi-modal transportation opportunities, and historic preservation and has been designed to minimize impacts of noise, students, and traffic. OP also stated that the Plan is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan City-wide and Mid-City Area Elements and specific recommendations for Howard University. (April 5, 2021 Tr. at pp. 103-105.)
19. The District Department of Transportation ("DDOT") submitted a report and testified in support of the 2020 Central Campus Plan. DDOT's report also recommended a number of conditions regarding Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") and infrastructure. based on the proposed conditions of approval included in the Campus Plan. (Ex. 36.) DDOT's report also recommended potential additional mitigation measures. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The University responded to the question on the affordable housing goal indicating that the current information was in its submission at Ex. 32A in the case record. However, the University did file, in a post-hearing supplemental statement at Ex. 45, a resubmission of the information provided at Ex. 32A.

University agreed to a number of these additional measures which were included in its draft order at Ex. 47 in the case record<sup>2</sup>. (Ex. 36).

20. In response to the Commission's questioning on potential access alternatives at two of the proposed development projects, DDOT acknowledged the possibility of utilizing grade for access but stated its preference for exploring other ways to use existing access. (April 5, 2021 Tr. at pp. 105-108.)
21. The District Department of Energy and Environment ("DOEE") submitted an email to the case record dated March 30, 2021, stating that it had no formal comments regarding the Plan. (Ex. 37.)
22. ANC 1B submitted a report (the "ANC Report") stating that at its regularly scheduled duly noticed public meeting on March 4, 2021, the ANC voted 9-0-0 to support the 2020 Central Campus Plan subject to the following conditions addressing issues raised by the Pleasant Plains and LeDroit Park Civic Associations: (Ex. 31-31A.)
  - (a) The University shall maintain its commitment to continue the Community Advisory Council ("CAC") and meetings at least once in each quarter of the year;
  - (b) The University shall maintain its goal of developing a total of 50-100 affordable housing units (above the IZ requirements) at 30%-60% AMI within the extracted properties, the 2020 Central Campus Plan Boundaries and/or other Howard University properties as conditioned in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F;
  - (c) The University shall form a subcommittee within the CAC to monitor and review the progress of the goal of meeting the University's affordable housing commitment and mitigating the negative effects of the changing demographics in the surrounding neighborhood related to the University's activities;
  - (d) Green space displaced by the new Hospital will be replaced with enhancements to green space east of the Stokes Library, during Phase 1 (first 5 years). Should the latter site be developed, the aforementioned green space shall be replaced elsewhere in proximity to LeDroit Park; and
  - (e) The University will reconfigure the ambulance access to the proposed new hospital to ensure that such access is direct from Georgia Avenue, N.W. This presupposes the reconfiguration of Bryant Street, N.W. and W Street, N.W. from the current one-way to the proposed two-way orientations.
23. The Commission received three letters in support of the Application. LeDroit Park Civic Association and Pleasant Plains Civic Association submitted letters of support reiterating the concerns and conditions noted by ANC 1B in its report. (Ex. 25, 27.) Shaw Main Streets also submitted a letter in support of the Application but noted concerns about the proposed

---

<sup>2</sup> The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan, the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), and Infrastructure Improvements were also included in a Gorove Slade Transportation Memo to DDOT, filed post-hearing at Ex. 49A.

reduction in campus parking and the proposed demolition of several notable buildings that have significant historic importance. (Ex. 39.)

24. The Commission received one letter in opposition to the Application from Evanna Powell, a Howard University alumna, who opposed the Plan because of its failure to include an academic plan for the 2020-2030 time period. Ms. Powell also stated her opposition to the Plan's proposal to raze the Cathy Hughes School of Communications and to squeeze its current occupants into a smaller building. (Ex. 38.) As noted in FOF 15, Ms. Powell also testified in opposition at the public hearing.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Commission finds that the Application meets the applicable campus plan requirements of the Zoning Regulations, based on the Applicant's Statement in Support and the additional supplemental documents the Applicant submitted to the case record. The Commission concludes that the information provided in the case record and during testimony at the public hearing is sufficient for the Commission to find that the objectionable impacts associated with the 2020 Central Campus Plan are capable of being mitigated. Therefore, the Commission concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof for approval of the Plan.
2. Based on the Findings of Fact and the record before the Commission, the Commission concludes that the Applicant has satisfied all standards set forth in Subtitle X § 101; that the requested relief can be granted as being in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map; that the requested relief will not tend to adversely affect the use of neighboring property; and that the 2020 Central Campus Plan will further applicable policies of Elements of the Comprehensive Plan.
3. Based on the Findings of Fact and the record before the Commission, the Commission concludes that the Applicant has satisfied the burden of proving that the Conditions of Approval adopted in this Order will address potential objectionable impacts to neighboring property because of noise, traffic, parking, number of students, or other objectionable conditions.

### **"GREAT WEIGHT" TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF OP**

4. The Commission must 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, 1086-87 (D.C. 2016).)
5. The Commission concurs with OP's recommendation to approve the Application subject to the conditions recommended by OP to mitigate potential adverse impacts as submitted in the OP Hearing Report. (Ex. 35.).



**“GREAT WEIGHT” TO THE WRITTEN REPORT OF THE ANC**

6. The Commission must give great weight to the issues and concerns raised in the written report of an affected ANC that was approved by the full ANC at a properly noticed public meeting 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 this 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).)
7. The Commission finds the ANC Report’s support for the Application persuasive including the ANC’s recommendations regarding the CAC, University affordable housing goals, green space replacement and ambulance access from Georgia Avenue for the proposed new hospital -- all of which are addressed in the conditions of approval set forth in this Order. (Ex. 31-31A.)

**DECISION**

In consideration of the case record and the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law herein, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia concludes that the Applicant has satisfied its burden of proof for the requested relief and therefore orders **APPROVAL** of the 2020-2030 Howard University Central Campus Plan, subject to the following guidelines, conditions and standards (where compliance is required prior to, on, or during a certain time, the timing of the obligation is noted in **bold and underlined** text):

**Howard University 2020-2030 Central Campus Plan, Guidelines, Conditions and Standards:**

- A. The 2020 Central Campus Plan is approved for the period of **10 years** from the effective date of this Order.
- B. The maximum student enrollment shall be accepted at the proposed 15,000 students which includes any student taking at least one class or course.
- C. A campus plan amendment and/or further processing application should be submitted if the current site of the Howard University Hospital is proposed for reuse.
- D. The University shall maintain its commitment to continue the Community Advisory Council (“CAC”) and meetings **at least once in each quarter** of the year.
- E. The University shall maintain its goal of developing a total of 50-100 affordable housing units (above the IZ requirements) at 30%-60% AMI within the properties extracted from the 2011 Campus Plan pursuant to Z.C. Order No. 11-15F, the 2020 Central Campus Plan Boundaries and/or other Howard University properties as conditioned in ZC Order 11-15F.



- 1) The University shall form a subcommittee within the CAC to monitor and review the progress of the goal of meeting the affordable housing commitment and mitigating the negative effects of the changing demographics in the surrounding neighborhood related to the University's activities;
- 2) Green space displaced by the new Hospital will be replaced with enhancements to green space east of the Stokes Library, during Phase 1 (first 5 years). Should the latter site be developed, the aforementioned green space shall be replaced elsewhere in proximity to LeDroit Park; and
- 3) The University will reconfigure the ambulance access to the proposed new hospital to ensure that such access is direct from Georgia Avenue, N.W. This includes the reconfiguration of both Bryant and W Streets, N.W. to proposed two-way orientation.

F. The University shall comply with the following DDOT requirements:

- 1) Transportation Management Plan (“TDM”) Requirements:
  - (a) The University will continue to increase student and staff parking permit rates to help deter single-occupant driver parking and raise revenue for TDM programs;
  - (b) The University will unbundle non-University tenant parking by raising the monthly visitor parking permit rate to \$180;
  - (c) The University will continue to prohibit freshman residents from parking vehicles on campus, with exceptions for those students who need a car for medical purposes or are in the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps;
  - (d) The University will establish a maximum parking supply of 3,580 spaces (inclusive of the hospital);
  - (e) The University will establish a maximum non-hospital staff population of 4,506 staff members;
  - (f) The University will continue to invest in improving its shuttle services based on staff and student feedback, as well as in anticipation of new development projects that may alter traffic patterns and sources of demand for shuttle service. Further Processing for each building proposed in the Campus Plan will include a review of existing shuttle ridership patterns, whether the proposed building is expected to alter ridership patterns, and recommendations for improving shuttle service if applicable;
  - (g) The University will maintain existing bus routes and stops during any and all University construction events in order to avoid transit service disruptions for the University and surrounding communities. Further

Processing for parcels abutting WMATA bus routes or stops (Parcels A, E, F, and J) will include plans for maintaining bus service;

- (h) The University will coordinate with DDOT and WMATA to improve, pay for, and install bus shelter improvements across campus during Further Processing for any new building or if the TDM is found to be insufficient;
- (i) The University will continue promoting transit commuting benefits for faculty and staff via WMATA's SmartBenefits program. Currently the maximum pre-tax allowed amount is \$270/month for transit only, \$104/month for parking only, and \$374/month for transit and parking;
- (j) The University will provide space for and fund an additional two (2) 19-dock Capital Bikeshare stations on the central campus. One station is proposed be located somewhere on the southern part of campus near the new Howard University Hospital as a potential location. If this location is chosen, the University will fund the station as part of Further Processing for whichever of the hospital-related parcels (Parcels D, E, G, or H) is developed first. The second location is proposed to be located on Parcel C, with a specific location to be finalized during Parcel C's Further Processing. If either station is located on private property, the University will enter into a Memorandum of Agreement with DDOT to ensure public access to the station and bicycles;
- (k) The University will post a downloadable copy of the final TDM Plan on its website and in other University media;
- (l) The University will continue designating a TDM Coordinator, who will implement, monitor, and market the TDM programs, provide personalized commuter counseling to help members of the University population understand their options, and act as a point of contact with DDOT, goDCgo, and DCRA;
- (m) The University's Transportation Coordinator will develop, distribute, and market various transportation alternatives and options to employees and students, including promoting transportation events (i.e., Bike to Work Day, National Walking Day, Car Free Day) on relevant websites and in any relevant internal newsletters, communications, or displays. These materials will contain sections oriented to different users, including faculty/staff, students, and visitors. Any students living on-campus will be provided with a packet of information upon or prior to moving-in. New faculty/staff hires will be provided with a similar packet of information. Further Processing for each building proposed in the Campus Plan will include a discussion of building-specific TDM marketing materials, if applicable;
- (n) The University will prominently display links to commuter support websites on appropriate University webpages, including links to

CommuterConnections.com, DDOT's Washington, DC Bicycle Map, Washington Walks, nearby bicycle vendors and service providers, goDCgo.com, and WMATA;

- (o) The University will perform annual monitoring to understand student, faculty and staff mode choice in relation to TDM practices, parking pricing, and University transportation policies, and release annual monitoring reports containing this information. The purpose of this monitoring is to make data-driven decisions about which TDM measures, if any, need to be adjusted to meet the primary TDM goal of ensuring that academic parking demand per student does not rise above its current level. The monitoring reports will include the recommended survey question modifications outlined in the DDOT Report (Ex. 36). The monitoring will be used to inform future TDM and parking-related decisions to further incentivize non-auto modes and minimize impacts by the University on the surrounding community. The University will update the TDM plan as necessary if performance targets are not met. The monitoring reports will include the following:
- Mode split surveys of the campus population, broken down by students and employees;
  - Current parking inventory and occupancy on a typical weekday;
  - Number of permits sold per year;
  - Parking availability on surrounding neighborhood streets;
  - Number of registered carpools;
  - Number of people enrolled in WMATA SmartBenefits; and
  - Inventory and occupancy of bicycle racks.
- (p) The University will prepare an annual TDM and Parking report to be submitted to DDOT. These reports will focus first and foremost on documenting progress toward the TDM Plan performance targets that the University has agreed to. Further Processing for each building proposed in the Campus Plan will reference these reports, identifying trends and progress towards TDM goals and allowing these to inform parking and other transportation-related elements of the proposed buildings. The performance targets that the University has agreed to are as follows:
- By the end of the 2020 Central Campus Plan (2030), the University sets a goal of ensuring that academic parking demand per student does not rise above its current level of 0.126 peak hour-occupied parking spaces per student. This will be the primary measure of success for the Campus Plan's five transportation strategies, as this metric is the result of a direct measurement, not of surveys which may be susceptible to error. If parking demand per student increases, it will be seen as an indicator that more discretionary TDM measures are needed. A decrease in parking demand per student is an aspirational goal of the Campus Plan.
  - The University sets the following mode split goals for trips to campus by the end of the 2020 Central Campus Plan (2030), which are informed

by A) MoveDC's non-auto mode share goal for commute trips of 75%, B) the latest mode splits for both residents and employees in the campus's census Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ), and C) the 2019 cumulative student/faculty/staff mode splits of 53% auto, 30% transit, 1% bike, and 16% walk for trips to campus. While the mode splits below are identified as aspirational goals, the primary measure of success for the TDM Plan is peak parking demand per student, as noted above. The drive alone mode split goals are percentages the University aspires to reduce down to, and all other mode split goals are percentages the University aspires to increase to or exceed. The mode split goals are as follows:

- i. For students:
  - Drive alone:  $\leq 40\%$
  - Carpool:  $\geq 2\%$
  - Transit:  $\geq 50\%$
  - Bike:  $\geq 15\%$
  - Walk:  $\geq 30\%$
- ii. For faculty/staff:
  - Drive alone:  $\leq 20\%$
  - Carpool:  $\geq 2\%$
  - Transit:  $\geq 40\%$
  - Bike:  $\geq 5\%$
  - Walk:  $\geq 20\%$

- (q) The University will develop formal "Alternative Work Schedule" guidelines, which will define opportunities for telecommuting as well as maintaining non-traditional weekly work schedules. The University's Transportation Coordinator will ensure that the TDM benefits of various policy options – reducing peak-hour travel and parking demand – are considered when developing and implementing these guidelines;
- (r) The University will significantly expand the quantity and quality of bicycle parking facilities on campus, both at existing building sites and at the new University development sites identified in the Campus Plan. A more detailed discussion of proposed bicycle parking quantities and locations will be included in Further Processing for proposed buildings;
- (s) The University will install an additional 20 bicycle parking spaces every year over the course of the Campus Plan and include a bicycle parking inventory with every annual TDM report. These spaces are intended to serve existing buildings that do not have sufficient bicycle parking and does not include parking spaces added as part of new buildings;
- (t) As part of Further Processing for Parcel B or C, whichever enters further processing first, the University will coordinate with DDOT to explore

removing on-street parking spaces along 6th Street between Fairmont Street and Bryant Street to make room for multimodal improvements such as bike lanes, curb extensions, or bike/scooter parking corrals;

- (u) The University will consider and implement the following additional measures as deemed necessary based on data about progress towards TDM goals:
  - Offer new carpool incentives and rideshare matching services to campus commuters through Commuter Connections, and/or other service providers;
  - Increase Campus Shuttle frequency during peak periods to every 10 minutes, if demand is present;
  - Expand Campus Shuttle to provide rides seven days a week and operate at least 30 minutes before/after Metro opens/closes, if demand is present;
  - Offer discounted Capital Bikeshare memberships to students;
  - Increase employee participation in pre-tax transit benefits;
  - Fund and install Transit Screens in additional student common areas;
  - Provide additional carshare spaces in easily accessible locations on campus;
  - Increase parking permit fees over the increases required pursuant to paragraph (b) of this condition, which requires raising the monthly visitor parking permit rate to \$180;
  - Impose limitations on the number of parking permits issued;
  - Target access restrictions to commuter parking; and
  - Introduce new or increase existing financial incentives for alternative mode options;
- (v) The University will ensure that there is no net increase in parking supply resulting from the capital projects proposed in the Campus Plan. That is, any increased supply from new parking facilities will be offset by closures and removals of existing parking facilities. Further processing for each proposed building in the Campus Plan will include an updated inventory of existing campus-wide parking supply and proposed parking facilities for the building;
- (w) The University will explore installing on-street bike paths and bike/scooter parking facilities as made possible by reduced vehicular activity and removed parking supply in the campus core. The University will coordinate with DDOT on any such public space changes;
- (x) The University will develop a bike parking map to direct bicyclists to existing and future bike parking facilities. Further processing for each proposed building in the Campus Plan will include a commitment to display an up-to-date bike parking map in a prominent location within or outside the building;

- (y) The University will create a dedicated webpage to identify and promote its transportation benefits and resources. For the purposes of this plan, this will be referred to as the future Transportation Services webpage when describing related TDM actions. This page will be the home for all information on:
  - Parking; Transit; Carpool and Vanpool; TDM and Commuter Benefits; TDM Survey results and reporting; Transportation and parking maps; Links to supportive programs; Links to alternative mode services and vendors; and Marketing materials;
- (z) The University will explore the potential to utilize existing “Live Where You Work” programs to boost the proportion of faculty/staff and students living near campus. These programs provide low-interest mortgage loans or a cash payment to be applied at closing to those purchasing a home within a designated distance of where they work;
- (aa) As the Campus Plan is implemented, and most parking is provided within structured, access-controlled facilities, the University will explore gradually phasing out annual parking permits in favor of monthly permits and daily parking (including pay-per-use permits);
- (bb) The University will explore enrolling students in the WMATA U-Pass program;
- (cc) The University will explore strategies for reserving preferentially-located parking spaces for registered rideshare vehicles. This will require developing distinct parking permits for carpool and vanpool parking, including defining qualification criteria, and designating spaces at specific parking facilities;
- (dd) The University will explore implementing a bike repair and maintenance education program;
- (ee) As capital projects identified in the Campus Plan are developed, the University will seek to include changing and showering facilities where feasible and where concentrations of faculty and staff are expected;
- (ff) The University will implement physical improvements to the central campus’s pedestrian network to improve the appeal, safety, and effectiveness of pedestrian circulation;
- (gg) The University will explore ways to promote and enhance micro-mobility services on campus, such as providing on-street bike and scooter parking corrals; and
- (hh) During further processing for each of the proposed buildings in the Campus Plan, the University will consider additional building-specific TDM



measures including specific TDM strategies for patients/visitors at the new hospital.

2) Performance Monitoring Plan:

- (a) The University will implement a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) comprised of transportation surveys and other data to understand student, faculty and staff mode choice in relation to TDM practices, parking pricing, and University transportation policies. The University will release annual monitoring reports to DDOT containing this information. The purpose of this monitoring is to make data-driven decisions about which TDM measures, if any, need to be adjusted to meet the primary TDM goal of ensuring that academic parking demand per student does not rise above its current level. If it is found that TDM goals are not being met, it is recommended the University consider items in the Discretionary Actions section of the TDM plan above, or propose new actions for review by DDOT. The annual monitoring reports will include the information set forth in the DDOT Report; and (Ex. 36.)
- (b) The University will conduct surveys of University students and employees on typical weekdays when large, representative population samples can be found. The surveys shall include student and employee mode splits with the phrasing recommended in the DDOT Report. The University will use the data collected and conduct annual, manual auto and bicycle parking counts as recommended in the DDOT Report.

3) Infrastructure Improvements: As part of further processing case for each of the proposed buildings in the Campus Plan, the University will consider the infrastructure improvements recommended in the DDOT Report.

- G. The University is required to comply fully with the provisions of the Human Rights Act of 1977, 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 section 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 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.

**VOTE (April 29, 2021): 5-0-0**

(Peter A. Shapiro, Anthony J. Hood, Peter G. May, Robert E. Miller, and Michael G. Turnbull, to **APPROVE**)



In accordance with the provisions of Subtitle Z § 604.9, this Order No. 20-08 shall become final and effective upon publication in the *D.C. Register*; that is on April 8, 2022.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Anthony J. Hood", written over a horizontal line.

**ANTHONY J. HOOD**  
**CHAIRMAN**  
**ZONING COMMISSION**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Sara A. Bardin", written over a horizontal line.

**SARA A. BARDIN**  
**DIRECTOR**  
**OFFICE OF ZONING**

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
**Zoning Commission**



**ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**  
**ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 11-15F**  
**Z.C. Case No. 11-15F**  
**Howard University**  
**(Amendment to the Howard University Central Campus Master Plan)**  
**May 25, 2017**

Pursuant to notice, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (“Commission”) held a public hearing on May 18, 2017, in order to consider an application (“Application”) by Howard University (“Howard” or the “Applicant”), for an amendment to the Howard University Central Campus Plan, dated June 29, 2011 (“Campus Plan”), to remove several properties from the Campus Plan boundaries. The Commission considered the application pursuant to Subtitle X § 101.10 of the District of Columbia Zoning Regulations, Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (“DCMR” or the “Zoning Regulations”). The public hearing was conducted in accordance with the rules of the Board of Zoning Adjustment at Subtitle Y of Title 11 DCMR.

**HEARING DATE: May 18, 2017**

**DECISION DATE: May 25, 2017**

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. On March 9, 2017, Howard filed an application with the Commission seeking an amendment to the Campus Plan, dated June 29, 2011, (Exhibit [“Ex.”] 5 in Z.C. Case No. 11-15.) The Campus Plan proposes development for Howard’s campus with over 2,316,584 gross square feet of new construction, major renovations, and additions to existing buildings in three phases over seven years.
2. The Applicant seeks to amend the Campus Plan to extract the following properties (“Extraction Properties”) from the boundaries of the Campus Plan:
  - (a) Effingham Apartments located at 2711-2719 Georgia Avenue, N.W. (Lots 833, 834, and 835, Square 3058);
  - (b) Carver Hall located at 211 Elm Street, N.W. (Lot 830, Square 3084);
  - (c) Slowe Hall located at 1919 Third Street, N.W. (Lot 835, Square 3088);
  - (d) East Towers Parking Lot located at 2251 Sherman Avenue, N.W. (part of Lot 1101, Square 2873);

- (e) 9<sup>th</sup> and V Street Parking Lots located at 9<sup>th</sup> & V Streets, N.W. (Lot 797, Square 2873; Lots 2033, 2011, 2004, 1108, 976, 982, and 1108, Square 2875);
  - (f) Parking Lot Three located at the northwestern corner of Georgia Avenue and W Street, N.W., (Lots 62, 811, 934, 945, 968, 970, 972, 977, 979 and 1023, Square 2877); and
  - (g) Florida Avenue Townhomes located at 907 and 909 Florida Avenue, N.W. (Lots 872 and 873, Square 2873)
3. The Applicant's objective with respect to the proposed Campus Plan amendment is to remove underutilized properties which are no longer needed for university uses from the campus and from regulation under the campus plan provisions of the Zoning Regulations and to facilitate their development for private uses in accordance with area revitalization trends and City planning objectives. Such development is expected to generate capital to support the University's educational mission.
  4. The Applicant submitted a Prehearing Statement on April 28, 2017, which included a log of the University's meetings with community groups and the Applicant's transportation report. (Ex. 24).
  5. A description of the proposed Campus Plan amendment and the notice of the public hearing in this matter were published in the *DC Register* on March 31, 2017. (Ex. 8). The notice of public hearing was mailed to all property owners within 200 feet of the Property and to Advisory Neighborhood Commission ("ANC") 1B on March 21, 2016. (Ex. 9). On May 18, 2017, the Commission held a public hearing on the application. The only party to the case that appeared at the hearing was the Applicant.
  6. The Commission received letters in support from ANC 1B and ANC 5E, which are automatically parties to the Application. (Ex. 20, 30.) ANC 1B supported the application with certain specified "provisions in the application to the Zoning Commission for approval." The ANC 5E report expressed no issues or concerns.
  7. Letters in support were also received from Pleasant Plains Civic Association, the Georgia Avenue Community Development Task Force, the LeDroit Park Civic Association, and the Bloomingdale Civic Association. (Ex. 14, 22, 31.)
  8. By report dated May 8, 2017 and testimony at the public hearing, the Office of Planning ("OP") recommended approval of the requested amendment to allow the Extraction Properties to be excluded from the Campus Plan. OP also expressed its support for the University's commitment to submit a new campus plan within two years following the Commission's approval of the Application. (Ex. 27.)
  9. By report dated May 2017 and testimony at the public hearing, the District Department of Transportation ("DDOT") indicated that it has no objection to the Application with the condition that the Applicant develop an implementation mechanism to ensure the

extension and construction of the street network consistent with the Duke Plan and DDOT standards. At the public hearing, DDOT indicated that the condition proposed by the Applicant to address this issue was acceptable to DDOT. (Ex. 25.)

10. At the public hearing a number of individuals testified some testified in support of the Application, and some testified in opposition to the Application. The testimony in opposition focused on gentrification in the area and the potential for the proposed amendment to contribute to gentrification. Opposition from University students and alumni also centered on a desire for more inclusiveness in University real estate development and planning initiatives. At the end of the hearing the Commission asked the University to meet with the students and report back to the Commission on the meeting. By letter dated May 24, 2017, the University confirmed that it had met with the students who testified at the hearing and summarized the discussions that took place. (Ex. 39.)
11. The Applicant submitted proposed conditions to be included in the Commission's order approving the Application. The conditions address issues raised by DDOT, ANC 1B, and the Bloomingdale Civic Association. Relative to the gentrification concerns raised at the hearing, the University proffered a condition indicating that it would use best efforts to achieve a goal of developing a total of 50-100 units of affordable housing at 30%-60% AMI within the Extraction Properties, the Campus Plan boundaries or other Howard University property. With the exception of Condition No. 5, University accountability and compliance with the proposed conditions is proposed to rely solely on reporting requirements to the Commission in the context of future Campus Plan applications and are not intended to regulate or otherwise burden the future development of the Extraction Properties which will become subject to matter of right zoning requirements upon approval of the Application. The Commission finds that the conditions and proposed accountability through reporting requirements applicable to future Campus Plan applications to be a reasonable and acceptable response to community concerns.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Applicant is seeking special exception approval pursuant to Subtitle X § 101.14 of the Zoning Regulations, for an amendment to its campus plan. Pursuant to 11-X DCMR §§ 101.2, 101.10, and 901.2, the Commission is authorized to grant a special exception where, in the judgment of the Commission, based on a showing through substantial evidence, the special exception will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Maps and will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps.

The Commission is required under § 3 of the Comprehensive Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Reform Amendment Act of 2000, effective June 27, 2000 (D.C. Law 13-135; D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d)) to give great weight to the issues and concerns expressed in the written report of an affected ANC. In this case, ANC 1B requested that certain conditions be included in this Order, and the Commission concludes that the Applicant's proposed conditions

address ANC 1B's concerns. ANC 5E's report expressed no issues or concerns and therefore there is nothing to give great weight to. (Ex. 14E.)

The Commission is required under § 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) to give great weight to OP recommendations. For the reasons stated above, the Commission concurs with OP's recommendation for approval and has given the OP recommendation the great weight it is entitled.

The Application is subject to compliance with D.C. Law 2-38, the Human Rights Act of 1977.

### **DECISION**

In consideration of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia **ORDERS APPROVAL** of the Application subject to the following conditions:

1. Condition No. 1 is hereby amended to change the term of the 2011 Plan as follows: The University will submit an application for review of a new campus plan by March 16, 2020.
2. The University will make best efforts to meet a goal of developing a total of 50-100 housing units at 30%-60% AMI within the Extraction Properties, the Campus Plan boundaries or other Howard University property.
3. Prior to submitting an application for a building permit to develop an Extraction Property, the University or its development partner(s) will present plans for the development of the property at a public meeting of the ANC within which the property is located.
4. Howard University and community will work together to leverage economic development and tax benefits to reinvest in the community and encourage other city support and investment.
5. The University will make best efforts to work with DDOT to negotiate the terms of easements for public vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian access to the proposed rights of way to be constructed by Howard University and its development partners ("Proposed Right of Way") areas depicted in Exhibit 33 in the record. The University will record an easement for each Proposed Right of Way prior to applying for any building permits on properties abutting each specific Proposed Right of Way.
6. The University will enter into lease agreements with the developer(s) of Slowe and Carver Halls to make available up to 50 parking spaces for the residents of the renovated properties at the University garages located at the northeast and southeast corners of V and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets, N.W. The agreements will span a period not less than 10 years, subject to an annual renewal clause to allow for demand-based adjustments.


7. The University will report to the Zoning Commission on the status of the Proposed Right of Way easements and Conditions Nos. 2- 6 above in all future Campus Plan update, amendment or further processing applications. The Commission shall consider whether the University has made the requisite compliance or best efforts in determining whether to grant all future campus plan requests before it.
8. 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.


On May 25, 2017, upon the motion of Chairman Hood, as seconded by Vice Chairman Miller, the Zoning Commission took **FINAL ACTION** to **APPROVE** the application at the conclusion of its public hearing by a vote of **5-0-0** (Anthony J. Hood, Robert E. Miller, Peter A. Shapiro, Peter G. May, and Michael G. Turnbull to approve).

In accordance with the provisions of 11-Z DCMR § 604.9, this Order shall become final and effective upon publication in the *DC Register*; that is on March 16, 2018.

**BY THE ORDER OF THE D.C. ZONING COMMISSION**

A majority of the Commission members approved the issuance of this Order.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**ANTHONY J. HOOD**  
**CHAIRMAN**  
**ZONING COMMISSION**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**SARA A. BARDIN**  
**DIRECTOR**  
**OFFICE OF ZONING**

**GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Zoning Commission**



**ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 11-15H  
Z.C. Case No. 11-15H  
Howard University  
(Minor Modification/Technical Correction - Howard University  
Central Campus Master Plan)  
July 30, 2018**

Pursuant to notice, a public meeting of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (“Commission”) was held on July 30, 2018. At that meeting, the Commission approved the application (“Application”) of Howard University (“Applicant”), for a minor modification/ technical correction to Z.C. Order No. 11-15F to correct the lot numbers and property descriptions provided for the Effingham Apartments located at 2711-2719 Georgia Avenue, N.W. (“Effingham Apartments”) and the abutting landscaped lot on the corner of Georgia Avenue and Fairmont Street, N.E. (“Landscaped Lot”) The Commission considered the Application pursuant to Subtitle Z § 703 of the District of Columbia Zoning Regulations, Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (“Zoning Regulations”).

**MEETING DATE: July 30, 2018**  
**DECISION DATE: July 30, 2018**

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. On June 25, 2018, the Applicant filed an Application with the Commission seeking a minor modification/technical correction to Z.C. Order No. 11-15F, which had approved the extraction of a number of properties (“Extraction Properties”) from the Howard University Central Campus Plan, including the Effingham Apartments and the Landscaped Lot. (Exhibit [“Ex.”] 1, 2.)
2. The Application requested the following corrections to the Order:
  - (a) Lot 833 in Square 3058 to be identified as the Landscaped Lot abutting the south lot line of the Effingham Apartments, and not as part of the Effingham Apartments, as erroneously stated in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F (Finding of Fact 2);
  - (b) The Effingham Apartments to be identified as Lots 827, 828, and 829 in Square 3058, and not Lots 833, 834, and 835 as erroneously cited in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F (Finding of Fact 2); and



- (c) The Extraction Properties to be listed by lot and square in the Decision section of the Order, and not only included in Finding of Fact 2 in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F.
3. Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 703.2, “minor modifications” are those “modifications that do not change the material facts upon which the Commission based its original approval.”
  4. The Landscaped Lot was included in the Extraction Properties by Z.C. Order No. 11-15F, but not referred to as separate from, but abutting, the Effingham Apartments.
  5. The Effingham Apartments were identified as part of the Extraction Properties by name and address in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F Order but by incorrect lot numbers in Square 3058.
  6. The Applicant served a copy of the Application on Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 1B, the affected ANC in regard to the requested modification to the lots in Square 3058 that are included in the Extraction Properties. ANC 5E, which was a party in Z.C. Case No. 11-15F pursuant to Subtitle Z § 101.8 because the Extraction Properties included Lot 830 in Square 3084, directly across 2<sup>nd</sup> Street N.W. from ANC 5E, is not an “affected ANC” for this Application because the only changes are to the lot numbers in Square 3058 that is not directly across a street from ANC 5E. (Ex. 1, 2.)
  7. By report dated July 18, 2018, the Office of Planning (“OP”) recommended approval of the corrections requested by the Minor Modification. (Ex. 4.)

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Commission is required by § 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.)) to give great weight to the recommendations of OP. The Commission concurred with OP’s recommendation to approve the Application as a Minor Modification.

The Commission is required under D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d)(3)(A)(2012 Repl.) to give “great weight” to the issues and concerns contained in the written report of the affected ANC. As the affected ANC, ANC 1B did not file a report, there are no issues or concerns to which the Commission can give great weight.

At its July 30, 2018 public meeting, the Commission concluded that the corrections requested in the Application do not change the material facts upon which the Commission based its original approval of Z.C. Order No. 11-15F. Accordingly, the Commission concluded that the Application falls within the scope of a Minor Modification made pursuant to Subtitle Z § 703, and so it can be considered and voted on by the Commission without a public hearing pursuant to Subtitle Z § 703.1.

### **DECISION**

In consideration of the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia **ORDERS APPROVAL** of the minor modification/technical correction to Z.C. Order No. 11-15F, which shall be modified by amending

Finding of Fact 2 and by inserting a new Decision paragraph 1 listing the Extraction Properties as follows:

1. Finding of Fact 2 is revised to read as follows:
  2. The Applicant seeks to amend the Campus Plan to extract the following properties (“Extraction Properties”) from the boundaries of the Campus Plan:
    - (a) Effingham Apartments, 2711-2719 Georgia Avenue, N.W. (Lots 827, 828, 829 in Square 3058);
    - (b) Corner of Georgia Avenue and Fairmont Street, N.W. (Lot 833 in Square 3058<sup>1</sup>);
    - (c) Carver Hall, 211 Elm Street, N.W. (Lot 830 in Square 3084);
    - (d) Slowe Hall, 1919 Third Street, N.W. (Lot 835 in Square 3088);
    - (e) East Towers Parking Lot, 2251 Sherman Avenue, N.W. (part of Lot 1101 in Square 2873);
    - (f) 9<sup>th</sup> and V Street Parking Lots, 9<sup>th</sup> and V Streets, N.W. (Lot 797 in Square 2873; Lots 976, 982, 1108, 2004, 2011, and 2033 in Square 2875<sup>2</sup>);
    - (g) Parking Lot Three, northwestern corner of Georgia Avenue and W Street, N.W., (Lots 62, 811, 934, 945, 968, 970, 972, 977, 979, and 1023 in Square 2877); and
    - (h) Florida Avenue Townhomes, 907 and 909 Florida Avenue, N.W. (Lots 872 and 873 in Square 2873<sup>3</sup>).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Application erroneously listed this as Lot 833 in Square 3084, but the description of the Landscaped Lot in the Application clearly locates it in Square 3058. The maps showing the Extraction Properties and the revised Campus Plan (Ex. 2B, also Ex. 4A and 4B in Z.C. Case No. 11-15F) erroneously fail to include the Landscaped Lot in the Extraction Properties removed from the Howard University Central Campus Plan.

<sup>2</sup> Although the Application included proposed changes to the lot numbers in Square 2875 (to include 156, 159, 162, 167, 218-220, 284, 302, 331, 382, 383, 872, 873 instead of 2004, 20011, and 2033 that were included in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F) in the proposed modifications, these lot number changes were not included in the stated relief, and therefore were not considered by the Commission, and thus are not included in this Order.

<sup>3</sup> The Application erroneously listed this as Lots 872 and 873 in Square 287, but the street addresses, as well as the maps showing the Extraction Properties, clearly identify these properties as located in Square 2875. Moreover, these properties were correctly identified in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F, and the Application did not seek to change them.

2. New Decision 1. is added as follows:

1. The following properties are removed from the Campus Plan boundaries:

- a. Effingham Apartments, 2711-2719 Georgia Avenue, N.W. (Lots 827, 828, 829, Square 3058);
- b. Corner of Georgia Avenue and Fairmont Street, N.W. (Lot 833, Square 3058);
- c. Carver Hall, 211 Elm Street, N.W. (Lot 830 in Square 3084);
- d. Slowe Hall, 1919 Third Street, N.W. (Lot 835 in Square 3088);
- e. East Towers Parking Lot, 2251 Sherman Avenue, N.W. (part of Lot 1101 in Square 2873);
- f. 9th and V Street Parking Lots, 9th & V Streets, N.W. (Lot 797, Square 2873; Lots 976, 982, 1108, 2004, 2011, and 2033 in Square 2875);
- g. Parking Lot Three, northwestern corner of Georgia Avenue and W Street, N.W., (Lots 62, 811, 934, 945, 968, 970, 972, 977, 979, and 1023 in Square 2877); and
- h. Florida Avenue Townhomes, 907 and 909 Florida Avenue, N.W. (Lots 872 and 873 in Square 2873).


All conditions contained in Z.C. Order No. 11-15F remain in effect.


On July 30, 2018, upon the motion of Chairman Hood, as seconded by Vice Chairman Miller, the Zoning Commission took **FINAL ACTION** to **APPROVE** the Application at its public meeting by a vote of **5-0-0** (Anthony J. Hood, Robert E. Miller, Peter A. Shapiro, Peter G. May, and Michael G. Turnbull to approve).

In accordance with the provisions of 11-Z DCMR § 604.9, this Order shall become final and effective upon publication in the *D.C. Register*; that is on April 12, 2019.

**BY THE ORDER OF THE D.C. ZONING COMMISSION**

A majority of the Commission members approved the issuance of this Order.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**ANTHONY J. HOOD**  
**CHAIRMAN**  
**ZONING COMMISSION**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**SARA A. BARDIN**  
**DIRECTOR**  
**OFFICE OF ZONING**