

Introduction to D.C. Comprehensive Plan Amendments

What Changes Is the Office of Planning Proposing in the Land Use, Housing, and Rock Creek
West Elements for Cleveland Park?

December 3, 2019

Nancy MacWood, ANC 3C09

What is Comp Plan?

- 20-year city plan laying out how we will use our land to achieve our mutual goals for the type of city we want to live in and leave for future generations - 2006 plan scheduled to be rewritten in 2025
- 13 city wide chapters or elements, including Transportation, Economic Development, and Infrastructure
- 10 area chapters that somewhat align with wards

Comp Plan Amendment Cycles Typically Result in Few Changes

- Mayor Bowser and OP want to accelerate new development
- Reason given is fast increasing population pattern
- Equity, gentrification and displacement became a theme of the Framework Element and will likely affect consideration of remaining Comp Plan amendments

[Housing] These issues affect every facet of the Comprehensive Plan. They influence land use and density decisions, shape infrastructure and community service needs, determine transportation demand, and even drive employment strategies for District residents. ...The type of housing constructed or preserved, and the cost of that housing, and where it is built will influence whether we as a city can attract and retain families with children, maintain neighborhood diversity, and provide economic opportunity for all. 500.3

-according to the U.S. Census American Community Survey 2017, a total of 3, 653 more children ages 1-17 moved out than moved into D.C.

-according to same source, the percentage of children under 18 living in RCW has increased 5% points since 2006

-Number of large households greatest in Ward 4 (7,200), and Wards 3, 5, and 8 also have more than 5,000 large households (CHNED/UI Study)

Between 2006 and 2017 there were nearly 18,300 fewer units affordable to households earning equal to or less than 60 percent of the MFI.

The greatest share of burdened and severely burdened households are the 39,500 rental households earning less than 30 percent of the MFI.

-at 30% MFI almost all housing subsidized, including public housing, HPTF-funded projects, and locally-funded rent vouchers

-Ward 3 has one public housing development for 160 senior women; 7,384 units citywide in 56 developments; 21 units in Ward 4 and 1,868 in Ward 6

-Ward 3 had 96 households renting with local vouchers in 2018; Ward 2 had 19 and Ward 8 had 1, 077

The Inclusionary Zoning program has now delivered almost 600 affordable units as of Fiscal Year 2017, with another 800 expected over the next several years at pace of close to 200 affordable units per year.

-according to FY18 IZ annual report 792 units built or under construction

-Ward 3 has produced or has under construction or in planning 187 IZ units in 10 projects (UIP project deleted from list because now AU dorm)

-ANC 3C area has 3 projects (Cathedral Commons, Fannie Mae, and 4000 Wisconsin) producing 1, 587 housing units of which 129 are or will be IZ

One of the critical issues facing the city is how to retain and create more housing units that are large enough for families with children.... Of the city's existing housing stock, only one-third 34 percent of the units have three bedrooms or more, which is a slight decline from 2006 when 35 percent of units had three or more bedrooms.

-according to the Coalition for Non-profit Housing and Economic Development (CHNED) and Urban Institute study, Wards 3, 4, and 5 have the greatest number of large units, at least 15,000 in each ward; $\frac{3}{4}$ are in for sale housing as opposed to rental housing

The District must **increase its** sustain a high rate of housing production if it is to meet current and projected needs through 2025 and remain an economically vibrant city. Over the next 20 years through 2035, the District's housing stock is forecast to increase from a base of about **280,000** 310,000 in **2005** 2015 to **335,000** 397,000 units in **2025** 2035. Between **2005** 2015 and **2010** 2020, **10,000** 23,000 **new** additional units are expected to be built, based on projects that are now under construction, **or** soon to break ground, or by conversion to smaller units. The Housing Goal accelerates that rate of production between 2018 and 2025 to achieve 36,000 new units needed by 2025 to improve affordability and the long term balance between demand and supply.

502.2

-446% increase in Class A housing units from 2006-2018; 4.6% increase in all other housing units; effective average rent for Class A is \$2,570/mo, for Class B is \$1,818/mo, for Class C is \$1,357/mo (Co-Star, 1st Q 2019)

-according to D.C. Fiscal Policy Institute, Class B units renting for \$800/mo decreased from 60,000 units to 33,000 units between 2002 and 2013

-according to Delta Associates (D.C. Office of Revenue Analysis) since 2018 Class A space outpacing demand; March 2019 – 2022 adding 16,679 msf and demand will account for 11,550 msf

-according to Co-Star, since 2010 inventory of housing units in multi-family buildings has grown at faster rate than D.C. population

-D.C. population growth peaked in 2013 with 15,000 new residents; in 2018 the net growth was 6,700 about 1% growth

-Moody's and IHS Markit (D.C. Office of Revenue Analysis) forecast 7,000-7,200 new residents in 2018; in 2019, they forecast 4,275-6,678; in 2020, 3,850-6,482 new residents

Policy H-1.1.2: Production Incentives Provide suitable regulatory, tax, and financing incentives to meet housing production goals. These incentives should continue to include zoning regulations that permit greater building area for commercial projects that include housing than for commercial projects that do not include housing and relaxation of height and density limits near transit. 503.3

Policy H-1.1.3: Balanced Growth Strongly encourage the development of new housing on surplus, vacant and underutilized land in all parts of the city. Ensure that a sufficient supply of land is planned and zoned to enable the city to meet its long-term housing needs, including the need for low-and moderate-density single family homes as well as the need for higher-density housing. 503.4

-806 acres of underutilized land (built to less than 30% of current zoning capacity); 53 acres of zoned vacant land

-estimated 60, 800 potential units between vacant and underutilized land (Framework Element)

Policy H-1.1.4: Mixed Use Development Promote moderate to high density mixed use development **including** that includes affordable housing on commercially zoned land, particularly in neighborhood commercial centers, along Main Street mixed use corridors, and high capacity surface transit corridors, and around appropriate Metrorail stations. 503.5

Policy H-1.1.6: Housing in the Central City Absorb a substantial component of the demand for new high-density housing in Central Washington and along the Anacostia River. Absorbing the demand for higher density housing within these areas is an effective way to meet housing demands, maximizes infrastructure and proximity to jobs, create mixed-use areas, and **conserve** minimizes the cost pressure on existing **single family** residential neighborhoods throughout the city. Market rate and affordable **Mixed** mixed income, higher density downtown housing also provides the opportunity to create vibrant street life, and to support the restaurants, retail, entertainment, and other amenities **that are desired and needed** in the heart of the city. 503.7

-OP and Zoning Commission have consistently resisted applying IZ to downtown. Only two very small zones in the large downtown area are included in IZ.

-OP amendment to FLUM includes high density residential on Connecticut Avenue in Cleveland Park from Macomb St. to Porter St. Currently, zoned for low density commercial with 40 feet height limit plus 12 foot penthouse. High density permits 90 feet in height and 20 foot penthouse.

NEW Policy H-1.1.8: Production of Housing in High Cost Areas Encourage development of both market rate and affordable housing in high cost areas of the city making these areas more inclusive. Develop new innovative tools and techniques that support affordable housing in these areas. Doing so increases costs per unit but provides greater benefits in terms of access to opportunity and outcomes.

NEW Action H.1.1.D: Research New Ways to Expand Housing Continue research to expand market rate and affordable housing opportunities in Washington,DC such as expanding existing zoning tools and requirements. Consider a broad range of options to address housing constraints which could include updating the Height Act of 1910, a federal law, outside of the monumental core if it can promote housing production.

Policy H-1.2.2: Production Targets Consistent with the Comprehensive Housing Strategy, work toward a goal that one-third of the new housing built in the city over the next 20 years, or approximately 29,000 units, should be affordable to persons earning 80 percent or less of the area wide median family income **(AMI)** **(MFI)**. Newly produced affordable units should be targeted towards low-income households in proportions roughly equivalent to the proportions shown in Figure 5.23. 504.7

-Figure 5.23, which is carryover from 2006, sets goals of 40% 0-30%; 30% 31-60%; and 30% 61-80%.

Policy H-1.2.3: Mixed Income Housing Focus investment strategies and affordable housing programs to distribute mixed income housing more equitably across the entire city, **taking steps** by developing goals and tools for affordable housing, establishing a minimum percent affordable by planning area **to avoid further concentration of poverty within areas of the city that already have that create housing options in high cost areas, avoid** **substantial** further concentrations of affordable housing, and meet fair housing requirements. 504.8

NEW Action H-1.2.I: Leveraging Inclusionary Zoning Examine and propose greater Inclusionary Zoning requirements when zoning actions permit greater density or change in use. Factors supporting a greater requirement may include high cost areas, proximity to transit stations or high capacity surface transit corridors, and when increases in density or use changes from Production Distribution and Repair to Residential or Mixed-Use. Consider requirements that potentially leverage financial subsidies such as Tax Exempt Bonds.

NEW Action H-1.2.J: Establish Affordability Goals by Area Element Establish measurable housing production goals by planning area through an analysis of best practices, housing conditions, impediments, unit and building typology, and forecasts of need. Include a minimum percent share of 15 percent affordable housing by 2050 along with recommendations for incentives and financing tools to create affordable housing opportunities in order to meet fair housing requirements, particularly in high housing cost areas.

NEW Action H-3.2.D: Overcoming Impediments to Fair Housing Develop strategies to overcome impediments and obstacles to the delivery of affordable housing in high cost areas such as rapid site acquisition, risk reduction, and expedited project selection and processing.

-DHCD reported to HUD in 2018 on Impediments to Furthering Fair Housing citing

-the rapidly shrinking supply of affordable housing,

-that more than ¼ of D.C. renters spend more than 50% of income on rent,

-that more than 1/3 of affordable housing was lost between 2000 and 2010,

-the need to preserve and expand affordable in gentrifying neighborhoods, and

-that much of subsidized housing is in racially and economically segregated areas of D.C.

NEW Action H-1.2.L: Priority of Affordable Housing Goals Prioritize public investment in the new construction of, or conversion to, affordable housing in planning areas with high housing costs and few affordable housing options. Consider land use, zoning, and financial incentives where the supply of affordable units is below a minimum of 15 percent of all units within each area.

The affordability of the District has been declining rapidly over the past five years, even though funding for affordable units has increased. This has been due to a combination of both through the expiration of federal subsidies and through rising market rents and sales prices. In 2005, the DC Fiscal Policy Institute indicated that rising rents alone caused a loss of 7,500 units with rent levels under \$500 a month between 2000 and 2004. Between 2006 and 2017 the number of rental units affordable to households earning less than 60 percent of the MFI decreased by close to 18,300 units. Table 5.5 also shows that the number of rental units affordable to those earning more than 60 percent increased by approximately 44,800.

Action H-1.4.C: DCHA Improvements Continue the positive momentum toward improving the District's existing public housing and Housing Choice Voucher and Local Rent Supplement Programs programs, including the use of sub-market rents to increase use of vouchers in high cost neighborhoods, the RAD program, and effective training of public housing residents in home maintenance skills. In addition, residents should be involved in management and maintenance and the effective renovation, inspection, and re-occupancy of vacant units. 506.15

-Ward 3 has most neighborhoods in city where vouchers can be used. All are providing the maximum sub-market rents based on HUD fair market rent guidance.

Looking to the future, the city will need to strengthen existing and add new programs to preserve its affordable stock, particularly its subsidized rental units... In 2006, A proposal for a District-sponsored rent subsidy program (similar to Section 8) called the Local Rent Subsidy Program has been included in the Comprehensive Housing Strategy was implemented to offset the expiring federal subsidies and help other households who are cost-burdened. The proposal **calls** called for direct rental assistance to 14,600 extremely low income renters. The program has been expanded over the past several years from 2,800 households to over 5,700 and a total cost of \$100 million per year. 509.4

-LRSP has been used entirely for housing the homeless with tenant-based vouchers

-the absence of budget requests for new sponsor or project-based vouchers has partly contributed to the difficulty HPTF has been having in meeting its mandate to spend at least 40% of its funding for housing at the 0-30% MFI level

-LRSP vouchers have been controversial in Ward 3, including in ANC 3C, because some of the participants struggle to live independently and there aren't adequate resources to help them

Policy H-2.1.1: Protecting Affordable Rental Housing Recognize the importance of preserving rental housing affordability to the well-being of the District of Columbia and the diversity of its neighborhoods. Undertake programs to protect the supply of subsidized rental units and low-cost market rate units with an emphasis on preserving affordable units in high cost or rapidly changing neighborhoods where the opportunity for new affordable units is limited. 509.5

Policy H-2.1.6: Rent Control Maintain rent control as a tool for moderating the affordability of older rental properties and protecting long-term residents, especially the elderly older adults, low-income households, and those with disabilities. 509.10

-Ward 3 has the second most, nearly 13, 000, rent control housing units in the city.

Policy LU-1.3.1: Station Areas as Neighborhood Centers Encourage the development of Metro stations as anchors for residential, economic and civic development and to accommodate population growth with new nodes of residential development, including affordable housing in all areas of the District in order to create great new walkable places and to enhance access and opportunities for all District residents. **in locations that currently lack adequate neighborhood shopping opportunities and employment.** The establishment and growth of mixed use centers at Metrorail stations should be supported as a way to provide housing opportunities at all income levels reduce automobile congestion... This policy must be balanced with **policy should not be interpreted to outweigh other land use policies which call for** include conserving neighborhoods conservation. **Each Metro station area is unique and must be treated as such in planning and development decisions.** At the same time, there are standards for achieving levels of population and employment density to levels of transit service to guide, but not decisively determine, thresholds of station-area development. The Future Land Use Map expresses the desired intensity and mix of uses around each station, and the Area Elements (and in some cases Small Area Plans) provide more detailed direction for each station area. 306.1

Policy LU-1.3.2: Development Around Metrorail Stations **Concentrate redevelopment efforts on those Metrorail station areas which offer the greatest opportunities for infill development and growth, particularly stations in areas with weak market demand, or with large amounts of vacant or poorly utilized land in the vicinity of the station entrance.** 306.11

Policy LU-1.3.5: Edge Conditions Around Transit Stations **Development Along Corridors** **Encourage growth and development along major corridors, particularly priority transit and multimodal corridors. Plan and design** **Ensure that** **development adjacent to Metrorail stations is planned and designed** **to respect the character, scale, and integrity of adjacent neighborhoods** **while balancing against the city's broader need for housing.** **For stations that are located within or close to low density areas, building heights should "step down" as needed to avoid dramatic contrasts in height and scale between the station area and nearby residential streets and yards.** 306.14

Policy LU-1.3.7: TOD Boundaries **Tailor the reach of transit-oriented development (TOD) policies and associated development regulations to reflect the specific conditions at each Metrorail station and along each transit corridor. The presence of historic districts, landmark status, and conservation areas should be a significant consideration** **as these policies are applied.** 306.16

NEW Action LU-1.3.C: Metro Station and Inclusionary Zoning **Consider requiring the maximum percent of affordable units required by the Inclusionary Zoning Program in and around station areas, with the appropriate bonus density and height allowances.**

Infill development on vacant lots is strongly supported in the District of Columbia, provided that such development is compatible in scale with its surroundings and consistent with environmental protection and public safety objectives. **Opportunities for change from vacant to vibrant are in residential and commercial areas.** **In residential areas, infill sites present some of the best opportunities in the city for "family" housing and low-to-moderate-density development, as well as community gardens and pocket parks.** 307.2

In both residential and commercial settings, infill development must be sensitive to neighborhood context. High quality design standards should be required and the infill development should reflect the neighborhood., the privacy of neighboring structures should be respected, and density and scale should reflect the desired character of the surrounding area. 307.3

Policy LU-1.4.3: Zoning of Infill Sites Ensure that the zoning of vacant infill sites is compatible with the prevailing development pattern in surrounding neighborhoods. This is particularly important in single family and row house neighborhoods that are currently zoned for multi-family development. 307.7

LU-2 CREATING AND MAINTAINING **SUCCESSFUL INCLUSIVE NEIGHBORHOODS** This section of the Land Use Element focuses on land use issues within the District’s neighborhoods. It begins with a set of broad policies which state the city’s commitment to sustaining neighborhood diversity and **protecting** enhancing the defining characteristics of each community. 308.1

LU-2.1 A CITY OF NEIGHBORHOODS ... Land use policies must ensure that all neighborhoods have adequate access to commercial services, parks, educational and cultural facilities, share in economic mobility, and sufficient and accessible housing opportunities while **protecting** respecting their rich historic and cultural legacies. 309.1

Policy LU-2.1.3: Conserving, Enhancing, and Revitalizing Neighborhoods Recognize the importance of balancing goals to increase the housing supply including affordable units and expand neighborhood commerce with parallel goals to **protect** respect neighborhood character, preserve historic resources, and restore the environment. The overarching goal to “create successful neighborhoods” in all parts of the city requires an emphasis on **conservation** conserving units and character in some neighborhoods and revitalization in others although all neighborhoods have a role in helping to meet broader District-wide needs such as affordable housing, public facilities, etc.. 309.8

Policy LU-2.1.4: Rehabilitation Before Demolition In redeveloping areas characterized by vacant, abandoned, and underutilized older buildings, generally encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of architecturally or historically significant existing buildings, rather than demolition. 309.9

Policy LU-2.1.1: Variety of Neighborhood Types Maintain a variety of residential neighborhood types in the District, ranging from low-density, **single family** neighborhoods to high-density, **multi-family** mixed use neighborhoods.

309.5

Policy LU-2.1.5: Conservation of Single Family Neighborhoods **Support** **Protect and conserve** **Support** the District's **established** **stable, low density** neighborhoods **and ensure that their zoning reflects their established low density character**. Carefully manage the development of vacant land **and the alteration of existing structures** in and **adjacent to single family** around neighborhoods in order to **protect low density** respect character, housing, affordable housing, civic space, preserve open space, and maintain neighborhood scale. 309.10

Policy LU-2.1.8: Zoning of Low and Moderate Density Neighborhoods Unless a small area plan, District agency directive or study indicates otherwise, **D**discourage the rezoning of areas currently developed with single family homes, duplexes, and rowhouses (e.g., R-1 through **R-4RF**) for multi-family apartments (e.g., R-5) where such action would likely result in the demolition of housing in good condition and its replacement with structures that are potentially out of character with the existing neighborhood. 309.13

Policy LU-2.1.14: Planned Unit Developments in Neighborhood Commercial Corridors Consider modifying minimum lot size and other filing and procedural (but not height and density) requirements for Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) for neighborhood commercial areas for the purpose of allowing small property owners to participate in projects that encourage high quality developments and provide public benefits. Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) in neighborhood commercial areas should provide high quality developments with active ground floor designs that provide for neighborhood commercial uses, vibrant pedestrian spaces and public benefits including housing, affordable housing, and affordable commercial space. 309.18a

Policy LU-2.3.3: Buffering Requirements Buffer Ensure that new commercial development adjacent to lower density residential areas provides effective physical buffers to avoid adverse effects. Buffers may include larger setbacks, landscaping, fencing, screening, height step downs, and other architectural and site planning measures that avoid potential conflicts. 311

Policy LU-2.3.5: Institutional Uses Recognize the importance of institutional uses, such as private schools, child care facilities, and similar uses, to the economy, character, history, livability, and future of Washington, DC and its residents. **the District of Columbia. Ensure that** When such uses are permitted in residential neighborhoods, their y are designed and operationed in a manner that is should be sensitive to neighborhood issues and neighbors' that maintains quality of life. 311.7

The Rock Creek West area has **strong significant economic momentum potential**, leading to past and present concerns about the **effects community impacts of unrestrained development on traffic, public services, and quality of life. This creates a different dynamic than is present in many District neighborhoods, and reduces the need for government programs to stimulate private investment.** The combination of a relatively affluent population, **excellent transportation options (including five Metro stations with some of the system's highest non-CBD ridership levels)**, stable and attractive neighborhoods, high-quality retail, and a limited supply of vacant land, has led to very strong market demand. **This in turn has led to an emphasis on growth control rather than growth incentives.** The **need desire to thoughtfully appropriately control and** guide growth, and to **protect preserve** neighborhoods, remains a top priority throughout the community and is a major theme of this Element. 2300.

The 2016 median sale price for homes in ZIP codes west of Rock Creek Park exceeded \$975,000. In 2005, the median purchase price of a home exceeded \$800,000 in every zip code west of the Park. Tax assessments have escalated as home prices have increased, placing a burden on many residents-especially seniors and those with low and moderate incomes. Rents have also escalated, and the overall supply of rental units has decreased as apartments have converted to condominiums. Although there are limited opportunities for new housing development in the area, there continues to be a substantial unmet need for new affordable units and a need to preserve existing protect the remaining affordable and moderate income units in an environment where affordable units are being eliminated. Increasing the production of affordable and moderate income units in Rock Creek West is a priority.2300.8

Compared to other areas of the District, Rock Creek West is less racially diverse and has an older population. 2303.2

The percent of single family detached housing is more than twice the citywide percentage but the percent of 1-unit attached housing is less than half of that citywide (which is 25.1percent). At the same time, the Planning Area also contains **almost twice the percentage** a significantly higher percentage of units in large multi-family buildings compared to the city as a whole. 2304.1

About 7,000 additional households are forecast for the 201705-20425 period, increasing from 41,061 to approximately 48,100 in 2045. 2306.1

-in the draft Framework Element OP projected more than 4,700 new households in RCW between 2015 and 2045.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES Three large Comprehensive Plan workshops took place in Rock Creek West during 2005 and 2006. These meetings provided a chance for residents and local businesses to discuss both citywide and neighborhood planning issues. Many smaller meetings on the Comprehensive Plan also took place in the community, including briefings and workshops with Advisory Neighborhood Commissions and neighborhood organizations. 2307.1

The community delivered several key messages during these meetings, summarized below

-following 4 pages to be deleted

Policy RCW-1.1.1: Neighborhood Conservation **Protect Preserve the low density, stable residential neighborhoods west of Rock Creek Park **and recognize the contribution they make to the character, economy, and fiscal stability of the District of Columbia.** Future development in both residential and commercial areas must be carefully managed to address **infrastructure constraints and protect and enhance** the existing scale, function, and character of these neighborhoods. 2308.2**

Policy RCW-1.1.3: Conserving Neighborhood Commercial Centers Support and sustain local retail uses and small businesses in the area's neighborhood commercial centers as outlined in the Generalized Policy Map. **These centers should be protected from encroachment by large office buildings and other non-neighborhood serving uses.** Compatible new uses such as multi-family housing or **limited low-cost** neighborhood-serving office space (above local-serving ground-floor retail uses) should be considered within the area's commercial centers to meet affordable and moderate income housing needs, provide transit-oriented development, and sustain existing and new neighborhood-serving retail and small businesses, and bring families back to the District. 2308.

Policy RCW-1.1.4: Infill Development Recognize the opportunity for infill development within the areas designated for commercial land use on the Future Land Use Map. When such development is proposed, work with ANCs, residents, and community organizations to encourage mixed-use projects that combine housing, including affordable housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and commercial uses rather than projects that contain single uses. **Heights and densities for such development should be appropriate to the scale and character of Neighborhood retail along Connecticut Avenue adjoining communities. Buffers should be adequate to protect existing residential areas from noise, odors, shadows, and other impacts** Design transitions between large-scale and small-scale development to ameliorate the appearance of overwhelming scale and to relate to context of lower scale surrounding neighborhoods. 2308.5

Policy RCW-1.1.6: Metro Station Areas Recognize the importance of the area's five Metrorail stations to the land use pattern and transportation network of Northwest Washington and Washington, DC as a whole **the entire District of Columbia.** Each station should be treated as a unique place and an integral part of the neighborhood around it. **The Mixed-use redevelopment of large office buildings at the area's Mmetro stations should be discouraged. The preference is to use available and underutilized sites for** prioritize the production of affordable and moderate income housing and retail uses in a manner consistent with the Future Land Use Map, the Generalized Policies Policy Map, and the policies of the Comprehensive Plan. **Careful transitions** Design context-specific transitions to be more aesthetically pleasing from development along the avenues to nearby low-scale neighborhoods must be provided. 2308.7

Policy RCW-1.2.5: Historic Resources Conserve the important historic resources of the neighborhoods west of Rock Creek that are identified in the DC Inventory of Historic Sites...Where more intense development is proposed in the vicinity of historic properties, adverse effects should be mitigated through careful siting, massing and design to respect the character of the historic property and to provide appropriate transitions between the historic property and surrounding areas. 2309.6

Cleveland Park's historically healthy cluster of neighborhood serving retail and services has experienced challenges in recent years from limited nearby population growth and competition from other growing and revitalized commercial destinations. 2311.2

NEW Policy RCW: Cleveland Park Retail Enhancement Support retail enhancement strategies for Cleveland Park to grow and strengthen the local business association, continue to attract and serve local residents, capture a larger share of the Connecticut Avenue commuters as business patrons, and attract more visitors from outside neighborhoods.

Policy RCW-2.2.3: National Cathedral **Protect the Washington National Cathedral from development that would despoil its setting or further exacerbate traffic on its perimeter.** Any development adjacent to the National Cathedral should complement its setting and mitigate direct traffic impacts on the Cathedral's operations. At the same time, the Cathedral's **Ensure that** traffic, parking, and activity impacts should not generated by the Cathedral do not diminish the quality of life in the surrounding neighborhoods. 2312.10

Policy RCW-2.2.1: Housing Opportunities **Recognize Pursue** the opportunity for additional housing, including affordable and moderate income housing, with some retail and limited office space on **the east side of Wisconsin Avenue between Albemarle and Brandywine Streets, on the Lord and Taylor parking lot, on the Metro (WMATA) bus garage and underdeveloped sites** west of the Friendship Heights metro station, **and on underutilized commercially zoned sites on Wisconsin Avenue. Any development in these areas should be compatible with the existing residential neighborhoods.** 2312.

NEW Action RCW: Wisconsin Avenue Planning **Craft a coordinated vision with the District and community to better understand the realities of change along northern Wisconsin Avenue to inform future development and manage growth on Wisconsin Avenue corridor at the Tenleytown and Friendship Heights Metro station areas. A plan will identify opportunities for urban design, commerce, housing, mobility, culture, public space, and community facilities to preserve a high-standard urban quality of life and advance District policies promoting inclusive prosperity.**

-the amended Generalized Policy Map proposed by OP describes the Future Planning Analysis Area as anticipated for change in density and intensity of use, or for the introduction of a major use group not previously permitted

-the boundary of the planning area extends far south of the Tenleytown Metro station to include parts of Cleveland Park, Cathedral Heights, and McLean Gardens