



ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION 3C
GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CATHEDRAL HEIGHTS • CLEVELAND PARK
MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE HEIGHTS
MCLEAN GARDENS • WOODLEY PARK

Single Member District Commissioners
01-Lee Brian Reba; 02-Gwendolyn Bole; 03-David Valdez
04- Arthur Barkmann; 05- Margaret Siegel; 06-Carl Roller
07- Victor Silveira; 08-Catherine May; 09-Nancy MacWood

P.O. Box 4966
Washington, DC 20008
Website <http://www.anc3c.org>
Email all@anc3c.org

ANC 3C Resolution No. 2016-037

Resolution on Report of ANC3C on Set Down on ZC Case No. 16-14 (Wardman Hotel, LLC) and ZC Case No: 16-15 (Wardman Park Residential, LLC and Wardman Hotel, LLC)

WHEREAS, pursuant to Subtitle Z, section 400.7 ANC3C hereby submits the attached Set Down Report on the above-named Zoning Commission (“ZC”) cases; and

WHEREAS, a public meeting was held on July 18th with this Report as an agenda item;

WHEREAS, proper notice of the public meeting was given one week in advance;

WHEREAS, five of the nine Commissioners constitute a quorum and six were present;

WHEREAS, six of the six Commissioners voted to adopt the Report of ANC3C;

WHEREAS, the attached Report expresses the issues and concerns of the ANC about the applications, as related to the standards against which the application shall be judged;

WHEREAS, the Report outlines the legal standards not met by the applications for a Consolidated Planned Unit Development (“PUD”) and related map amendments in ZC Case No. 16-14 and for a First Stage PUD and related map amendments in ZC Case No. 16-15;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that ANC3C adopts ZC forms 129 and 130 as completed and with attachments applicable for both cases;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that ANC3C strongly opposes the Set Down of both applications. (ZC Case No. 16-14 and No. 16-15) and attaches our comments;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chair and the Commissioners for ANC3C09 and ANC3C02, or their designees, are authorized to represent ANC3C in this matter.

Attested by

Catherine May
Vice-Chair, on July 18, 2016

This resolution was approved by a roll-call vote on July 18, 2016 at a scheduled and noticed public meeting of ANC 3C at which a quorum (a minimum of 5 of 9 commissioners) was present.



BEFORE THE ZONING COMMISSION AND
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



FORM 129 – ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION (ANC) REPORT

Before completing this form, please review the instructions on the reverse side.

Pursuant to Subtitle Z § 406.2 and Subtitle Y § 406.2 of Title 11 DCMR Zoning Regulations, the written report of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) shall contain the following information:

IDENTIFICATION OF APPEAL, PETITION, OR APPLICATION:

Case No.:	ZC No. 16-15	Case Name:	WardPark Residential LLC / Wardman Hotel LLC
Address or Square/Lot(s) of Property:	2660 Woodley Rd NW		
Relief Requested:	No Set Down		

ANC MEETING INFORMATION

Date of ANC Public Meeting:	07/18/16	Was proper notice given?:	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Description of how notice was given:	Email + USPS 6/29 dated		
Number of members that constitutes a quorum:	5	Number of members present at the meeting:	6

MATERIAL SUBSTANCE

The issues and concerns of the ANC about the appeal, petition, or application as related to the standards of the Zoning Regulations against which the appeal, petition, or application must be judged (a separate sheet of paper may be used):

see attached report combining objections to ZC No. 16-15 and ZC No. 16-14

The recommendation, if any, of the ANC as to the disposition of the appeal, petition, or application (a separate sheet of paper may be used):

see attached report referenced above

AUTHORIZATION

ANC	Recorded vote on the motion to adopt the report (i.e. 4-1-1):	6-0
Name of the person authorized by the ANC to present the report:	Nancy McLeod, Grandolyn Boba, Cecilia	
Name of the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson authorized to sign the report:	Carl Potter, Chair Catherine May, Vice Chair	
Signature of Chairperson/ Vice-Chairperson:		Date: 7/18/16

ANY APPLICATION THAT IS FOUND TO BE INCOMPLETE MAY NOT BE ACCORDED "GREAT WEIGHT" PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR SUBTITLE Z § 406 AND SUBTITLE Y § 406.



**BEFORE THE ZONING COMMISSION AND
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**



FORM 130 – ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION (ANC) SETDOWN FORM

Before completing this form, please review the instructions on the reverse side.

Pursuant to Subtitle Z §§ 400.7 and 400.8 of Title 11 DCMR Zoning Regulations, the ANC Setdown Form shall contain the following information:

IDENTIFICATION OF PETITION OR APPLICATION:

Case No.:	2C No. 16-15	Applicant Name:	Wardman Park Residential LLC / Wardman Park Hotel LLC
ANC (ex. 1A):	3 C	Date Referred to ANC:	7/1/16 mail
Date Setdown Form Due:	7/31/16		

ANC MEETING INFORMATION

Date of ANC Public Meeting:	07/18/16	Was proper notice given?:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Description of how notice was given:	email and USPS dated 6/29/16		
Number of members that constitutes a quorum:	5	Number of members present at the meeting:	6
Does the ANC recommend the application/petition to be set down for public hearing?:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Recorded vote on the motion to adopt the report (i.e. 4-1-1):	6-0		

MATERIAL SUBSTANCE

Please provide feedback below on whether the above case should be set down for hearing or not (a separate sheet of paper may be used):

see attached report combining objections for 2C cases 16-15 and 16-14A

AUTHORIZATION

Name of the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson authorized to sign the form:	Carol Rolton Chair Catherine May Vice Chair
Signature of Chairperson/ Vice-Chairperson:	Date: 7/18/16

Setdown Report of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3C on Zoning Commission Case No. 16-14 and Case No. 16-15 Submitted by JBG, Inc. for a Planned Unit Development at 2660 Woodley Road, NW, the Wardman Marriott Hotel Property

July 20, 2016

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3C (“ANC3C”) submits this report to the Zoning Commission for great weight consideration during the meeting on setdown of JBG’s application for a consolidated Planned Unit Development (“PUD”), Case No. 16-14, including a map amendment, and first stage PUD, Case No. 16-15, at the Marriott Wardman Hotel property, 2660 Woodley Road, NW.

RECOMMENDATION

The ANC recommends that both PUD applications be denied setdown for hearing. The property is 16 acres that is largely developed. The historic landmark Wardman Tower occupies 3 1/3 acres and The Woodley, which was recently built by JBG, occupies another 3 1/3 acres. The former property will be owned by a condo association and the latter property has been sold. The consolidated PUD would occupy 2.4 acres in between the Wardman Tower and The Woodley, and it’s occupancy of the site would be 7 times greater than the Wardman Tower’s site occupancy and 5 times greater than The Woodley’s site occupancy. The first stage PUD is entirely speculative since it cannot be built unless a long-term lease with the Marriott Hotel is broken and the hotel is demolished. In fact, the only pathway to more new construction at 2660 Woodley Road is via a PUD because The Woodley construction consumed all the available lot occupancy. Now JBG proposes to change the zoning and use a PUD to permit them to sandwich another building onto the Woodley Road frontage. They propose to do this while maintaining the hotel use. However, JBG also wants the Zoning Commission to approve the speculative site plan and first stage PUD application that is premised on their hope that they will be able to buy out the Marriott Hotel’s long term lease and demolish the hotel which will free up land to build the proposed first stage PUD.

The proposals do not conform to the Comprehensive Plan, which links the Generalized Policy Map, the Future Land Use Map (“FLUM”), and the public policies together to form a picture of what is acceptable development on this site. The site is a Neighborhood Conservation Area, as are all of the surrounding residential neighborhoods.

The FLUM designates most of the site area for the consolidated PUD medium density residential. The zoning for this area is R-5-B, which is consistent with medium density and 4-7 story multi-family buildings. Indeed, the adjoining properties to the west are developed with 5 story multi-family buildings and have the same FLUM designation and zoning. The balance of the property where the hotel now exists is designated high density residential, which typically indicates that high rise (8 stories and above) development is the predominate use. Since most of the site where the hotel sits is zoned R-5-B, the ANC believes that it was noted during the 2006 Comprehensive Plan rewrite that the over 10 stories high hotel was

non-conforming and that it would be less inconsistent if the FLUM acknowledged what was there and designated it accordingly. The small portion of the hotel that is zoned R-5-D is consistent with the high density residential designation and with the adjoining properties on Calvert Street. The maps demonstrate that there was no anticipation that the hotel use would change on this lot. This is verified by the absence of any policies in the Rock Creek West Element suggesting that this large site might be redeveloped, or suggesting that high rise apartment buildings should co-exist with the hotel use.

The ANC finds that both PUD applications are in conflict with the Generalized Policy Map that shows only minimal changes to existing conditions. The ANC further finds that the FLUM high density designation for part of the site represents the existing hotel use and should not be used to authorize the proposed massive development absent a Land Use Change designation on the Generalized Policy Map and guidance for development and redevelopment in the Rock Creek Area Element. The area element anticipates approximately 5,200 new residents from 2005-2025 in the area that models Ward 3, and less than 3,000 new households over the same period. Most of that growth was projected at St. Patrick's single family housing development on Foxhall Road and multi-family housing on Connecticut Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue. This project would add nearly 50% of the total expected growth in households over a 25-year span, and could add 4,000 or more new residents. If this level of massive growth at one location were anticipated, the Generalized Policy Map would have noted it as a Land Use Change Area and the area element would have provided detailed guidance about development.

Because this massive development proposal has appeared out of nowhere, the ANC is particularly concerned that there have been no discussions with the community prior to the creation of this project. Unlike other large site developments, like Walter Reed, there is no small area plan and not one meeting organized to discuss what level of development could be absorbed into the small Woodley Park community. No analysis of the capacity of the local public schools, the infrastructure, the roadways or services to absorb an expansion of the community from approximately 4,290 housing units¹ to 6,689, or another 1,399 housing units, was conducted. This is a development-driven proposal that is unplanned and unanticipated. In the ANC's considered view, using the PUD process to rezone this property in order to facilitate massive redevelopment that could destabilize a very successful neighborhood would be a distortion of the purpose of waiving zoning regulations in order to achieve an exemplary project that will benefit the city. Below we will discuss these issues in more detail.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND PUBLIC POLICIES

The applications must not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with public policies (Sec. 2403.4)

¹ 2010 Census

Generalized Policy Map

The entire Property is designated Neighborhood Conservation Area. In fact, all of Woodley Park and the surrounding neighborhoods are designated Neighborhood Conservation Areas. The only other designation is a small Main Street area mapped on Connecticut Avenue.

A Neighborhood Conservation Area is anticipated to maintain existing land uses and neighborhood character. Where change occurs, it is expected to be modest in scale and scattered. The land use planning goal for this area is to conserve and enhance established neighborhoods.

ANC 3C finds that these applications are in conflict with the Generalized Policy Map since they would create a high rise apartment enclave in a predominately low density, single family detached and row house neighborhood. The effect of this unprecedented level of development in Woodley Park would potentially destabilize the neighborhood school, significantly increase vehicular congestion, and stress existing retail services designed to serve a small community and a transient hotel population. The addition of potentially 4,000 or more new residents would transform this close-knit community of approximately 6,715² residents from a mix of 5-story apartment buildings, single family detached and row house neighborhood into a predominately high rise community. These applications propose intense and dense residential development that is neither modest in scale nor scattered in random infill sites.

Future Land Use Map (FLUM)

The Property is split with the hotel and the existing Wardman Tower in the High Density Residential category and the balance of what was undeveloped when the Comprehensive Plan was approved in the Medium Density Residential category. The adjoining lots that are developed with 5-story apartment buildings are also in the Medium Density Residential category.

High Density Residential is anticipated to include 8 story or more apartment buildings as the predominate use. This designation is consistent with the existing use of the 8-story historic Wardman Tower (32 units) and the existing Marriott Wardman Hotel. But without a Land Change Use designation on the Generalized Policy Map there is no guidance about whether the High Density Residential designation on the FLUM authorizes the same density for a residential use. Since the entire Rock Creek West area is intended to grow over 25 years by approximately 5,200 residents, it is unreasonable to ignore these projections and conclude that despite the seemingly contradictory designation in the FLUM it alone can be used to find that these PUD applications are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

² 2010 Census

Medium Density Residential typically describes areas with mid-rise, 4-7 story, apartment buildings as the predominate use. This category is also consistent with the existing land use of 5-story apartment buildings. The R-5-B zoning for the entire Medium Density Residential area allows 50 foot buildings and 60% lot occupancy, which is consistent with the existing use and the character of the neighborhood. The outlier in this Medium Density Residential area is the JBG-constructed residential building, The Woodley, which rises to 90 feet because it is setback from all lot lines by 90 feet. If the requested R-5-D map amendment is approved the predominate use will be 5 buildings as large or larger than The Woodley.

ANC 3C finds that these applications are in conflict with the Future Land Use Map because when the designations are considered with the policy map and other Comprehensive Plan policies there is no evidence that a high rise residential development is planned for this Property. It is clear that the split designations were intended to reflect current uses so existing development on this Property would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan FLUM. It takes a leap of reason to conclude there was ever any consideration that the High Density Residential category was intended to underpin the demolition of the hotel and the construction of 5 high rise apartment buildings.

Comprehensive Plan Policies, Land Use Element

This is the preeminent group of policies. The PUD submission's list of policies that support the application skip the first and significant policy. A number of the policies offered to support the application do not apply³. A significant number of polices that do apply are not listed by the applicant and the ANC finds that in most cases the PUD submission is in conflict with the applicable policies.

Polices that Apply, But Are Not Listed

LU-1.3.1 - Each metro station is unique. Polices promoting development around metro stations do not outweigh other land use policies that call for neighborhood conservation. FLUM expresses desired intensity and mix of uses around each station.

³ **Listed Policies, But Do Not Apply or Are in Conflict with Application:**

LU-1.3.2 and 1.3.3, both listed in the PUD submission, are in conflict with the application. The former describes underutilized metro areas, and Woodley Park metro is highly used, and this policy promotes minimizing car use whereas this proposal plans to offer almost 5 times the required parking for the development size. Clearly, the proposal either does not apply or it's in conflict with LU-1.3.2. The latter policy supports senior and starter housing around metro stations and no senior housing is proffered and the prices given the amenities and luxury features and the history of The Woodley belie that this submission will include starter housing.

The next 3 polices listed, LU-1.3.4, 1.3.5, and 1.4.1 do not apply to this application. The first two apply to development at metro stations. The third policy relates to vacant land and this Property is hardly vacant since it is developed with a hotel. The Framework Element identifies vacant land throughout the city and also underutilized sites that are defined as commercially or industrially zoned.

-ANC 3C finds that the applicant is requesting maximum development based largely on the existence of a metro station. But this policy makes it clear that the Comprehensive Plan does not expect or promote one-dimensional development with metro trumping all other considerations. The commercial area adjacent to the Woodley Park metro station is historic and is designated in FLUM Low Density Commercial. Does it make planning sense that land use and development policies in the Comprehensive Plan anticipated that this Property could be transformed into a high density apartment complex with the adjoining commercial area low density commercial? What is intended is that the Neighborhood Conservation Area designation and the low density commercial designation would link to maintain the scale and character of the Woodley Park neighborhood, while not interfering with the continuing use of a hotel on the adjoining Property.

LU-1.3.7 TOD Boundaries: Tailor development to specific conditions. Presence of historic districts and conservation areas should be a significant consideration.

-The entire area is Neighborhood Conservation Area and the commercial area to the east of the Property is a historic district, the Wardman Tower and its landscape is historic landmark, and the Woodley Park Historic District is directly to the north of the Property. While the submission highlights this application as fulfilling TOD goals, it does not consider the unique conditions of the metro station, such as the historic, low density commercial area, nor does it even mention that there is a very significant historic building and grounds on the Property, or that a historic neighborhood is adjacent. Since this proposal will overwhelm the current special siting of the historic Wardman Tower on the site and offers no explanation how it could enhance the historic districts, the ANC finds it is inconsistent with LU-1.3.7.

LU-1.4.3 Zoning of Infill Sites: Ensure it's compatible with prevailing development pattern in surrounding neighborhoods. This is particularly important in single family and row house neighborhood that are currently zoned multi-family.

-ANC 3C maintains that this is not infill development, but since the applicant states that it is, including in its list of favorable impacts on the neighborhood (See Wardman Park I, page 14), the application should not be inconsistent with LU-1.4.3. Five densely sited apartment buildings rising between 8 -14 stories are not compatible, in our view, with the prevailing development pattern of the single family and row house neighborhood that exists. The Property is surrounded by R-1-B zoned single family homes to the southwest and west and with R-3 row houses to the north. No effort has been made to adapt the proposal to the existing neighborhood scale or development pattern. On the contrary the application demonstrates that the effort has been to maximize the existing development envelope with a PUD and seek map changes to permit maximizing development even more.

LU-2.1.5 Conservation of Single Family Neighborhoods: Protect the District's stable, low density neighborhoods. Carefully develop vacant land in and adjacent to single family neighborhoods to protect low density character, preserve open space, and maintain neighborhood scale.

As stated above, the ANC does not consider this Property vacant land as the Comprehensive Plan uses the term. But the applicant states the open space on the Property is actually vacant land so this policy should apply. There is no evidence that this proposal resulted from a consideration of the low density residential character and scale of the neighborhood. There is ample evidence that such elements as the monolithic maximum height requested for every building in this proposal resulted from using all the development potential zoning would permit. The existing open space that created a buffer between the hotel and the residential neighborhood would be reduced by a new high rise building. The ANC finds that the application is inconsistent with this policy.

Transportation Element⁴

Policies that Apply, But Are Not Listed

T-3.1.3 Car Sharing: Encourage as alternative to private vehicle ownership.

-ANC has not found any reference to car sharing in the submissions. Since this PUD would be near a metro station it is reasonable to expect that car sharing would be incorporated into the proposal. Instead, the PUD would create more than 990 new parking spaces and offer 1,180 parking spaces when the entire project is built.

Housing Element⁵

Policies that Apply, But Are Not Listed

H-1.2.2 Production Targets: work toward goal of 1/3 of new housing built over next 20 years (2205-2025) should be affordable to persons earning 80% or less of AMI.

-ANC finds that this submission will meet the minimal IZ requirement of 10% set aside, split between 50% and 80% of AMI in the consolidated PUD, and 8% set aside in the first stage PUD. This is a very disappointing demonstration of a lack of commitment to create affordable housing in a neighborhood that prides itself on income diversity. One of the most often heard criticisms of the proposal is that it will transform Woodley Park

⁴ Listed Policies, but Do Not Apply

T-1.1.4 applies to metro stations not residential developments but even if it did, this application is not proposing transportation improvements at the metro station. Similarly, T-1.2.3 is not anticipating the elimination of curb cuts for the sake of having a minimal number if that plan makes no transportation safety sense. As will be discussed later, the circulation pattern proposed for this PUD is premised on unreasonably comingling multiple users into a single circulation pattern.

⁵ Policies that are Listed, But Are in Conflict with Application

H-1.1. and 1.1.1 are informed by the Rock Creek West Area Element. District land use policies and objectives for the Rock Creek West Area Element are not consistent with the density and level of housing proposed by this PUD.

H-1.1.3 applies to new housing on surplus, vacant and underutilized land and this Property is none of those.

into a high income area, which is not the type of housing the city needs nor what this community desires.

Environmental Protection Element⁶

Polices that Apply, But Are Not Listed

E-1.3.1 Grading and Vegetation: Encourage retention of natural topography and vegetation on new development sites. Grading of hillsides should be minimized and graded slopes should be quickly revegetated for stabilization.

-ANC notes that this site rises more than 70 feet from Calvert Street to the ridge where it begins to descend to Woodley Road. We don't know if there are slopes greater than 20%, which would be highly erodible areas, and if there is any ability to retain the natural topography given the applicant's plan to densely build particularly in the area between Calvert Street and the ridge. It would appear that the site will be completely transformed with buildings and walkways with vegetation limited to landscaping these elements. Thus, it appears that this policy should apply to this project but that the amount of building will prevent its implementation.

E-3.4.3 Environmental Impacts: Ensure full and meaningful compliance with DC Environmental Policy Act and other environmental regulations. Ensure reviews of major development projects include all pertinent information about effects of projects on human environment, including existing conditions, projected impacts, and mitigation measures. This information should be available when development is proposed and available to the public.

-ANC finds that this policy should apply to this application. There is no information in the submission that the applicant has complied with this policy provision.

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element⁷

⁶ Listed Polices, But Do Not Apply

E-4.3.2: Reduction of Vehicle Noise. There is nothing in this application that offers to mitigate or minimize noise from truck traffic, cars, buses or other associated traffic noises. Instead the project would increase the amount of car and truck traffic to service multiple residential buildings. Instead of the centralized hotel bus and truck loading locations, this project would have multiple locations for truck and vehicle traffic. The inclusion of a landscaping plan does not address the context of this policy.

⁷ Listed Policies that Do Not Apply

PROS-1.2.2.: Improving Access to major parks and open space through pedestrian safety and street crossing improvements, etc.

-ANC finds that adding thousands of new residents and creating walkways between buildings that are supposed to be one building for zoning purposes is not what was intended by this policy.

PROS-1.4.3: Parks on Large Sites: Include new neighborhood or community parks on large sites that are developed for housing.

-ANC believes that this policy was intended to apply to the large public sites, like McMillan and Walter Reed, but even if it should apply to this 16 acres site the project

Urban Design Element

Policies that should Apply, But Are Not Listed

UD-1.2.4 View Protection: Recognize the importance of views to quality of life in the city and the identity of DC and its neighborhoods.

UD-2.2.4 Transitions in Buildings Intensity: Establish gradual transitions between large scale and small scale development. Relationships between taller, more visually prominent building and lower, smaller buildings (single family, row houses) can be more pleasing when transition is gradual rather than abrupt. Reduce apparent size by recessing upper floors to relate to lower scale of surrounding neighborhood.

US-2.3.2 Large Site Scale and Block Patterns: Superblocks with no thru streets should be avoided in favor of finer-grained street grid that is more compatible with the texture of Washington's neighborhoods. This also allows for more appropriately scaled development and avoids large internalized complexes or oversized structures.

Education Element

Policies that Apply, But Are Not Listed

EDU-2.2.2: Educational Facilities in Local Plans: Involve the District of Columbia Public Schools in District government land use and transportation planning activities. Local principals, faculty, students, and parents should be invited and encouraged to participate in decisions that impact school facilities and their surroundings.

-ANC notes that the submission does not include any Education Element policies. Since the in-boundary public schools, including Oyster Elementary School, which is a bi-lingual school with special enrollment requirements, are at capacity it is relevant that any new family housing should be planned with DCPS and the ANC so that there are adequate resources and facilities to ensure program stability. None of that has occurred in anticipation of this proposal. In fact, the submission states that discussions with DCPS must occur at some point in the future, which is a backwards approach to fulfilling this Comprehensive Plan policy.

does not comply with this policy. There is no DC playground, recreation center or community center in Woodley Park. Residents have long used the front lawn of the Marriott Wardman Hotel for passive and some active recreation. The space was reduced when the underground parking garage was built about 10 years ago, and this application proposes to further reduce the available open space. The proposed 27,000sf, or ½ acre, open space is also the site for a bioretention area and will be the only open space for the 1,400 new households created by this project. For context, the Rosedale lawn which is open to the public through a conservancy is 3 acres and the typical DC dog park is a minimum of 10,000sf for a maximum of 30 dogs. The space around The Woodley and the Wardman Tower is private property. Woodley Park certainly needs dedicated public parks but it's inconceivable that this less than 27,000sf of open space will ever be the park space that the community needs.

PROS-3.1.6 Compatibility with Parkland refers to the Mall, memorials, and Ft. Circle Parks and not private development.

Rock Creek West Area Element⁸

Policies that Should Apply, But Are Not Listed

RCW-1.1.1 Neighborhood Conservation: Protect low density, stable residential neighborhoods. Development must address infrastructure constraints and protect and enhance the existing scale, function and character of the neighborhood.

-ANC finds that these applications do not have a reasonable and workable vehicle circulation plan that can be safely implemented on narrow Woodley Road or 24th Street. There appears to be no effort to protect and enhance existing scale (note no section exhibits showing existing houses until ANC requested them) or character of neighborhood.

RCW-1.1.6 Metro Station Areas: Each station should be treated as unique place that is integral part of the neighborhood around it. Careful transitions from development along the avenues to nearby low scale neighborhoods must be provided.

RCW-1.1.12 Congestion Management Measures: Ensure that land use decisions do not exacerbate congestion and parking problems in already congested areas such as the Friendship Heights, Tenleytown, and Connecticut/Van Ness Metro stations. When planned unit developments are proposed in these areas, require traffic studies which identify the mitigation measures that must occur to maintain acceptable transportation service levels— and secure a commitment to implement these measures through transportation management plans. Traffic studies and mitigation plans should consider not only the impacts of the project under consideration but the cumulative impact of other projects which also may impact the community, as well as the impact of non-resident drivers using local streets.

-ANC expects that the cumulative impact of this application and other recently completed or nearly constructed new multi-family buildings on Connecticut Avenue will be studied and will include the impact on congestion during rush hours. But the ANC also thinks that the level of potential adverse effects on congestion from adding so many new households and residents requires more planning than a traffic study to comply with PUD requirements. Connecticut Avenue is a congested area and one of only a few main commuter routes. With at least 1,180 parking spaces proposed for this site, this is not a question of mitigation or a Transportation Management Plan. Planning that involves multiple District agencies, the ANC and the community should be required and we hope the Zoning Commission will refuse to setdown these applications for hearing.

RCW-1.2.8 Schools and Libraries: The fact that a majority of the schools in this Planning

⁸ Policies Listed that Do Not Apply

RCW-1.1.4 Infill Development refers to commercial zones, not residential zones.

Area are operating at or above capacity should be considered in DCPS facility planning, and in the approval of any residential development that could further exacerbate school overcrowding.

Action RCW-2.1.B Large Hotel Sites: Carefully monitor future proposals for the Omni-Shoreham and Marriott Wardman Park hotels to ensure compliance with the Zone regulations and prevent adverse effects on the adjacent residential community.

-ANC finds that this application is not complying with the R-5-B regulations and that development cannot occur on this site until and unless the existing hotel use is terminated and that building is either partly or completely demolished. The lot occupancy for the lot has been exceeded by recent development by this owner, JBG, and they are now seeking to change the zoning so that they can continue to develop the property in conflict with current zoning and with no apparent planning to avoid adverse impacts on the local school, the low scale neighborhood, the existing difficult transportation patterns, air quality, or the remaining open space.

Zoning

The majority of the property is zoned R-5-B. There is a small slice on the south side of lot that is zoned R-5-D. The applicant is requesting a map amendment to change the R-5-B designation to R-5-D.

The applicant has shown a willingness to develop matter of right under the R-5-B regulations. The Woodley was constructed a few years ago as a matter of right project that was built to 90 feet based on Sec. 400.7. That project absorbed all the available lot occupancy (60%) for this site that has a large hotel and the Wardman Tower already on the lot. The applicant knew that they could not develop the property further without a PUD or without demolishing part or the entire hotel, which they don't have the legal right to do per the long term lease with the Marriott Hotel Corporation.

Using a height measuring point that appears to be at the front door of the consolidated PUD building, which is at the highest elevation on a property that descends approximately 70 feet from that spot to Calvert Street, the first stage PUD project proposes a range of heights that will vary from 8 stories to 14 stories - all with the addition of 20 foot penthouses. All will top out at 302 feet above sea level, presenting a monolithic expanse of dense structures. It should be noted that The Woodley and the Wardman Tower also top out at 302 feet, but the Wardman Tower is at the crest of a hill surrounded by green space.

It is clear that the only way this massive development proposal can be built is with the revision to the zoning designation and even then it couldn't be built if the Wardman Tower and The Woodley did not have substantial open space on their sites. The PUD proposals will consume over 50% of the lot that already has two multi-story buildings that will remain. With R-5-D zoning they are limited to 75% lot occupancy even with a PUD. The proposal is to build 5 multi-story buildings much denser than even the R-5-D zone would permit by borrowing the available lot occupancy around The Woodley and the Wardman Tower.

The ANC does not support changing the zoning to R-5-D because it would permit a concentration of excessive building heights and a predominately intense level of density that is unprecedented in Woodley Park. We also think the change in zoning would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan intentional policy and density designations for the site

PUD Evaluation Standards

The purpose and standards for PUDs outlined in 11 DCMR, Chapter 24. Section 2400.1 and 2400.2 state that, “the PUD process is designed to encourage high quality developments that provide public benefits....The overall goal is to permit flexibility of development and other incentives, such as increased building height and density; provided, that the project offers a commendable number or quality of public benefits and that it protects and advances the public health, safety, welfare, and convenience.”

The ANC found no creditable public benefits proffered in the submissions. The announced favorable aspects of the PUDs were, upon analysis, not what they appeared.

- 1) New market rate and affordable housing - Based on the sale prices and the rents of the Wardman Tower and The Woodley, both controlled by JBG, these buildings will have exorbitant rents that will be affordable to a very small percentage of District residents. The market rate description has come to mean unaffordable for most DC residents. The affordable housing component is the minimum required by IZ and does not come close to being an actual benefit, as opposed to a requirement that must be met.
- 2) Residential units that are larger than typical—The submissions only detail the unit sizes for the consolidated PUD. Of the 120 units, the 3- and 4-bedroom units will be limited and they will be located in optimal locations on upper floors and will certainly be expensive units. The majority of 2-bedrooms are sized from 1,000 sf to 1,687sf - in many new developments these sizes are typical for studios or 1-bedroom units, with only the top end of the proposed range matching the typical 2-bedroom size.
- 3) Infill development and concentration of housing close to Metro station—If the goal is to build on every available square foot of green space then this project complies. But the Comprehensive Plan does not guide us to do that. Rather it promotes infill development on industrial and commercial land. And as the ANC explained above, the Comprehensive Plan does not take a one-size-fits-all approach to development near Metro Stations. There has been no study of how much development or what type of development is reasonable in Woodley Park near the low density commercial area and the low density residential neighborhoods.
- 4) High quality publicly-available open space—This project proposes to eliminate nearly all the open space by building densely on the hotel and remaining undeveloped portions of the lot. The actual remaining open space is largely around the privately-owned Wardman Tower and The Woodley. The proffered lawn in front of the consolidated PUD building is an area that has been systematically reduced for neighborhood enjoyment and would be further reduced by the consolidated PUD.

These benefits should be tangible superior features that benefit the surrounding neighborhood and the city to a substantially greater degree than matter of right development. This standard can't be evaluated because the matter of right development has already occurred. The applicant is asking the Zoning Commission to apply a virtual standard. But even using that bogus concept the market rate and affordable housing would happen with a market rate project; most of the unit sizes would be typical of a matter of right project and the larger units would be found in matter of right luxury housing, which this appears to be; infill development near a metro station can happen without a PUD; and the open space might be eliminated with matter of right development, but the community might welcome the trade-off for smaller building footprints and less density.

The evaluation standards also require that the PUDs be very strong in a few of the proscribed public benefits and project amenities listed in Sec. 2403.10 and acceptable in all and superior in many. We have discussed the applicant's mediocre proffer for housing, affordable housing, and preservation of open space, and we address the remaining features below.

Urban Design and Architecture—The Neo-Gothic design with its fine grained details is likely to overwhelm the Neo-Georgian Wardman Tower in size and formality. Squeezing in such a strongly designed building next to The Woodley (that has been nicknamed the cruise ship in the neighborhood) will present a fortress of housing in contrast to the elegant and comfortably-sited Wardman Tower.

Site Planning and Economical Land Utilization—As we described above, the ANC finds the site plan overly dense and lacking in any useable green space, with the exception of the front lawn. The proposal maximizes development on the hotel and undeveloped parts of the lot and expects the Zoning Commission to credit the site planning for the Wardman Tower and The Woodley as meriting a favorable review for the lack of site planning in these PUD submissions.

Environmental and Sustainable Benefits—There are small green roofs proposed on several floors of the consolidated PUD and there is a proposed bio-retention pond on the front lawn that is potentially going to be removed at some point. The ANC expects more, and would certainly urge the applicant to seek LEED Silver accreditation -- we do not support the notion that applicants get credit for an informal satisfaction of the LEED requirements.

Uses of Special Value—The expansion of the property tax revenues and potentially the income tax revenues is typically received as a benefit for the city. But the ANC asks the Zoning Commission to consider that this project will result in the loss of all the hotel jobs, which we believe is at least 600 jobs. Furthermore, it is speculative to assume that people living in these high rent housing units will be working in the District and won't be using this housing as a temporary DC residence. But most importantly, the ANC believes that the city has developed a large portfolio of high-end housing to accommodate those DC residents and others who seek that type of housing, and that now it is critical that PUDs not be used to continue to increase the imbalance of the number of affordable units vs. those that few can

afford. Increasing tax revenues at the expense of achieving a diverse city is not, in our view, the purpose of the PUD regulations.

Employment Opportunities—The PUD submissions do not mention this public benefit likely because the project will not create permanent jobs, but will significantly result in the loss of jobs. The Marriott Wardman Hotel employs at least 570 people, many of whom have a long-term union contract with the hotel. These jobs will be lost when, and if, the hotel closes to accommodate this project.

Effective and Safe Vehicular Access—The PUD submissions also do not mention this public benefit. As mentioned above the ANC finds the proposed circulation pattern for the consolidated PUD amazingly unworkable and unsafe. Well considered traffic separation on the site from Woodley Road would be abandoned for a singular 2-way traffic pattern even though the number of users would be greatly increased. The proposal for loading and garage access/egress overlaps and both residential and hotel users would converge under the hotel canopy to leave the site. It is unclear how the first stage PUD would circulate trucks and cars since there would be several options, but typically we find drivers find a preferred route and abandon other options. Whether pedestrians would be safe is speculative, but we feel certain that the proposed plans must be revised.

For all the reasons stated above, ANC 3C urges the Zoning Commission to find the ZC Case No.16-14 and Case No. 16-15 are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and public policies, and further that they do not meet the minimal requirements for a favorable PUD evaluation and thus, should not be setdown for hearing.