GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

Application No. 15382 of the Catholic University of America, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3108.1, for a special exception under Section 211 for review and approval of a new campus plan in an R-4 and R-5-A District at premises 620 Michigan Avenue, N.E. (Square 3671, Lots 2, 3 and 802; Square 3821, Lot 816; Parcels 122/26, 122/72, 122/70, 122/71, 122/5, and 122/6; Square 3654, Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 809, 810 and 811; Square 3655, Lot 1; Square 3656, Lot 800; Square 3657, Lot 805, 821 and 826).

Application No. 15389 of the Catholic University of America, pursuant to 11 DCMR 3108.1, for a special exception under Section 211 for the further processing under a new campus plan (BZA Application No. 15382) to construct a law school and accessory parking garage in an R-5-A District at premises 620 Michigan Avenue, N.E. (Square 3821, Lot 816).

HEARING DATE: **October 24, 1990**
DECISION DATE: **November 7, 1990**

ORDER

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF RECORD:

1. The campus of the Catholic University of America (hereafter "Catholic University" or "University") is located in R-5-A, R-4 and C-M-1, zone districts and is known as premises 620 Michigan Avenue, N.E. The University campus contains 144.5 acres of land.

2. The Catholic University is located in the northeast quadrant of Washington D.C., in a primarily residential area of low to medium density. Immediately surrounding the campus are many large institutional facilities, particularly houses of religious study, colleges and hospitals as well as some light industrial and commercial properties. The campus is divided into three segments. The Main Campus contains 95.3 acres and is bounded by Michigan Avenue, N.E. to the south, Harewood Road, N.E. to the west, Taylor Street, N.E. to the north, and John McCormack Road, N.E. to the east. This central part of campus contains the administrative, academic and student life facilities. The South Campus, which consists of 8.7 acres, is located south of Michigan Avenue, and contains student housing and some support facilities. The North Campus contains 40.5 acres and is located north of Taylor Street, bordered by John McCormack Road and Hawaii Avenue. This area is used for recreation programs and includes an athletic center, stadium and sports fields. The Varnum Campus, situated east of the

B & O Railroad tracks, has been sold and is no longer part of the campus facilities. The campus is located on the metrorail line at the Brookland/C.U.A. Metro Station.

3. The applicant, Catholic University of America, has filed for a special exception under 11 DCMR 211 for review and approval of a revised campus plan. The applicant is also requesting a special exception to construct a new law school and accessory parking garage.

211 **COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (R-1)**

211.1 Use as a college or university that is an academic institution of higher learning, including college or university hospital, dormitory, fraternity, or sorority house proposed to be located on the campus of a college or university, shall be permitted in an R-1 district if approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in accordance with the conditions specified in Section 3108 of Chapter 31 of this title, subject to the provisions of this section.

211.2 Use as a college or university shall be located so that it is not likely to become objectionable to neighboring property because of noise, traffic, number of students, or other objectionable conditions.

211.3 In R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, and R-5-A, and R-5-B districts, the maximum bulk requirements normally applicable in the district may be increased for specific buildings or structures; Provided, that the total bulk of all buildings and structures on the campus shall not exceed the gross floor area prescribed for the R-5-B district. In all other residential districts, similar bulk increases may also be permitted; Provided, that the total bulk of all buildings and structures on the campus shall not exceed the gross floor area prescribed for the R-5-C district. Because of permissive increases as applicable to normal bulk requirements in the low-density districts regulated by this title, it is the intent of this subsection to prevent unreasonable campus expansion into improved low-density districts.

211.4 The applicant shall submit to the Board a plan for developing the campus as a whole, showing the location, height, and bulk, where appropriate, of all present and proposed improvements, including but not limited to the following:

(a) Buildings and parking and loading facilities;

(b) Screening, signs, streets, and public utility facilities;

(c) Athletic and other recreational facilities; and

(d) A description of all activities conducted or to be conducted on the campus, and of the capacity of all present and proposed campus development.

211.5 Within a reasonable distrance of the college or university campus, and subject to compliance with the provisions of Section of 211.2, the Board may also permit the interim use of land or improved property with any use that the Board may determine is a proper college or university function.

211.6 Before taking action on an application for use as a college or university, the Board shall submit the application to the D.C. Office of Planning and the D.C. Department of Public Works for review and written reports.

4. The Catholic University of America Master Plan 1975-2000 was approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment on October 6, 1975 in Order No. 12002. In Order No. 12308, dated April 13, 1977, the Board amended the plan to exclude the Varnum Campus and to approve certain interim uses for that campus. In Order No. 13639, dated April 14, 1982, the Board approved an amendment to the plan that allowed for the use of three floors of an existing building as administrative offices for the president of the University. In Order No. 14082, dated April 19, 1984, the plan was amended to change certain existing uses. Further, in that order, the Board approved construction of the athletic facility and a laboratory and classroom building for science and research activities. In Order No. 14170, dated October 25, 1984, the Board approved a plan for a small addition to the Salve Regina Building. Most recently, the Board approved the construction of eight low-rise dormitory buildings in Order No. 14582, dated April 22, 1987. The current proposal (the "1990 Master Plan") fully incorporates the previous plan approvals and updates the University's future plans.

5. Catholic University was first proposed as a national institute of learning in 1866. The University was formally established as a center for graduate studies in theology in 1884. On April 21, 1887, the University was formally incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. In 1928, a special act of the Congress expanded the University's authority, extended its

services and increased the membership of its governing body, the Board of Trustees.

The University's first classes were held on November 13, 1889. Initially, the University offered only graduate programs in religious studies. Beginning in 1895, the University expanded into the arts and sciences, and in 1898, the School of Law was formally established. Undergraduate classes were first offered in 1904. The University is fully accredited and is committed to undergraduate, graduate and professional education and to the cultivation of the arts. At present, the University is comprised of nine schools offering a variety of undergraduate and graduate programs, including the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Engineering and Architecture, The Benjamin T. Rome School of Music, the School of Nursing, the School of Philosophy, the School of Religious Studies, the National Catholic School of Social Service, the School of Library and Information Science, The Columbus School of Law, and University College.

6. University officials testified that for close to two years, the University has been engaged in a comprehensive campus planning process to update the master plan for the physical environment. A campus advisory group, with broad representation including faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, was established in 1989. Most of that year was devoted to data collection, concept development and preliminary meetings with the campus advisory group. The University met with the D.C. Office of Planning in January 1990. In February 1990, community liaisons were identified to work with the University to develop a final campus plan for submission to the Board. Exhibit No. 27F of the record sets forth a chronology of the meetings and discussions with the community. The desired results of the campus planning effort are:

a. A comprehensive but flexible physical plant plan to support the current and projected educational needs of the university;

b. A program to guide future development;

c. A framework for capital improvement decisions; and

d. A layout that enhances the neighborhood character and opportunities.

The University wishes to develop a system for on-going campus planning.

7. The proposed 1990 Master Plan is marked as Exhibit No. 33 of the record. The Master Plan document, a campus-wide study of

existing facilities, recommended improvements and proposed plant changes, has been prepared for the thirty year period from 1990 to 2020. In developing the program for a comprehensive national institution of higher education, serious focus has been given to the projected academic, housing, dining, recreational, cultural, spiritual and support service needs of the campus. Together with local community concerns, the campus needs have been translated into a planning document that is necessary for the orderly functioning of the institution, yet respectful of the local neighborhood and responsive to district area planning aims. The proposed Master Plan fully incorporates the previous plan approvals and updates the University's future potential plans.

8. In studying the existing campus, the following general concerns were raised:

a. lack of readily identifiable primary and secondary entrances;

b. access from public streets;

c. vehicle and pedestrian circulation conflicts;

d. undefined site development;

e. absence of an attractive and effective exterior signage system;

f. large separation of upper and lower campus areas;

g. random pockets of parking scattered throughout campus;

h. unfinished facility organization - (the need for greater unification of building structures, systems and access);

i. organization of campus and student services;

j. system of control for campus/building access;

k. space allocation for enhanced academic programs, libraries and computer center; and

l. limited development of open green space areas.

9. Priority was given to the following: the improvement of campus access and circulation; parking conditions; the evaluation of potential building sites and land use; and the preservation of open space. The construction of a new law school and accessory parking was designated by the University as a high priority.

10. The Catholic University is divided into three campus clusters: Main Campus, North Campus and South Campus. **The Main Campus** will be the center for all major activities of administration, academics, housing support, parking and informal outdoor recreation. **The North Campus** will continue to be developed as the athletic center and support services, with stronger links to Main Campus along McCormack Road and directly from campus across Taylor Street. **The South Campus**, because of its separation from the Main Campus by Michigan Avenue, will be slowly phased out as a student housing area and reserved for cooperative ventures between the University and other educational, government and cultural institutions. Communication and circulation across Michigan Avenue will be maintained; however, the future use of the South Campus will be more independent from the everyday activities of the rest of the University. The South Campus was not included in the Master Plan study, as it requires a more intense, longer term analysis and significant student housing relocation before any alternate use can occur. A specific independent study will be conducted to address the future of areas south of Michigan Avenue.

11. The architect for the Master Plan testified that currently, the buildings are disbursed somewhat haphazardly around the campus. There are a number of buildings oriented toward Michigan Avenue, another group toward McCormack Road, and a third group of buildings is oriented toward Harewood Road. He testified that wherever these three grid systems come together, there are conflicts. One of the goals of the Master Plan is to resolve these conflicts.

12. The architect testified that other goals of the Master Plan are: to more clearly define the open space on campus; create a defined main entrance; and to address traffic and parking problems.

LAND USE

13. Main Campus. In the proposed plan, the entire potential land area between the four bordering city streets is designed as a well-balanced development of buildings, circulation systems, parking, and landscaped green space. The proposed plan respects and builds upon the historic roots of the southern portions of campus and expands with a shift in development north toward Taylor Street. However, green transition space between campus and community is maintained. Within the campus, existing quadrangles are preserved and new quadrangles formed with proposed building projects.

Major use areas will respond more closely to function and are identified by the following campus sectors:

a. Administrative Sector

- Use McMahon Hall and Library Center.
- Convert Gibbons Hall and University Center to administrative use.
- Create a new main entrance for the campus from Michigan Avenue.

b. Southeast Sector

- Use existing science and technology academic area.
- Realize the development potential of the property surrounding the old stadium with new academic buildings, central services, underground parking, and major green space.
- Reinforce the pedestrian entrance from metrorail by creating a pedestrian street leading to the Perini Plaza in front of the Crough Center.

c. Central Sector

- Realize building potential for visual and performing arts and communications or other academic programs.
- Allow for an integration of new facilities with premier facilities including Caldwell, McMahon and Curley Halls.
- Formulate a new green quad to replace the McMahon parking lot.
- Create a new underground garage at the north end of McMahon parking lot.

d. Housing Sector

- Continue the cluster housing concept, similar to Centennial Village, for undergraduate and graduate student residences.
- Expand this concept along McCormack Road and north into the park area along Taylor Street.
- Maintain and expand Curley Hall as specialty housing and faculty support services.

- Maintain the natural wooded area along Taylor Street.

e. Northeast Sector

- Preserve and utilize O'Boyle and Marist Halls as general academic centers.

- Define existing green areas with new landscaping and circulation.

- Create interim surface parking behind O'Boyle and Marist Halls.

The general land use policy will continue to follow the historical development of the campus. New projects will be sited as individual buildings surrounded by green space. These buildings will be within the height and density of their immediate context. Building scale, massing, proportions and fenestration will respect the neighboring facilities, and the system of walks and landscaping will conform to campus standards discussed in other sections of this order. The campus will continue to provide a park-like setting of buildings and green space.

A specific change in current land use will involve existing patterns for vehicular access and parking. Most inner-campus roads and surface lots will be replaced by parking facilities located at the campus edge. This change will replace much of the impervious surfaces with natural surfaces above the new garages.

PROPOSED BUILDING USE

14. The Master Plan through the year 2020 will address the use of the physical plant in the following ways:

a. Identify new construction necessary to supplement the current programs or address the need of new programs;

b. Preserve and maintain the existing buildings that are functional and possess architectural character important to the University's past and future. Upgrade these buildings with state-of-the-art facilities;

c. Propose demolition of buildings that are obsolete, phased over a period of time; and

d. Group new and existing buildings in clusters according to function.

15. The University faculty, staff and students particpated in a programming effort in which they identified existing space conditions and the need for future growth. The factors identified as requiring growth in the building programs are:

a. Population increases - student enrollment is projected to increase to 8,000 by the year 2020. Faculty and staff increases are projected to coincide with this growth;

b. The need to upgrade existing buildings to supply more needed space or state-of-the-art facilities; and

c. The need for space required for programs currently nonexistent at the University, but identified as desirable and viable.

16. The University's Proposed Facilities Program is marked as Exhibit No. 33 of the record, pp. 41-43. In summary, there will be 810,000 square feet of new construction in the area of Academic, Administration and Support, and 400,000 square feet of new construction for housing and new construction of parking structures.

17. The Proposed Facilities Elimination for the period 1990-2020 is set forth on page 44 of Exhibit No. 33 of the record. Over this 30 year period, the University proposes to demolish a total of 166,814 square feet of building space identified as obsolete or problematic and beyond repair. The University also proposes to phase out the buildings on the South Campus totalling 387,870 square feet. The Proposed Facilities Elimination totals 554,684 square feet.

18. <u>The Law School</u> A representative of the University testified that the law school, which was founded in 1898, has been a member of the Association of American Law Schools since 1921, and is accredited by the American Bar Association. As a condition for continued affiliation, accrediting agencies and professional organizations set high acceptability standards for law school facilities. Leahy Hall, the central building for the school, was constructed in 1966. The building suffers from inadequate design and deterioration. A comphrehensive review of the existing law school accommodations and an examination of alternatives culminated in the recommendation for the construction of new facilities. Advances in technology, new educational requirements and new environmental regulations have all contributed significantly to the decision to pursue the construction of a new facility. Temporary measures have included supplementing space deficiencies with trailers and appropriating facilities from other departments.

Leahy Hall has reached the limits of improvability for legal education. Fundraising efforts to support the construction and operations of a new facility have already begun.

19. A member of the architectural firm that was selected to construct the new law school also testified about the law school application. He testified that the law school currently exists mainly in three buildings - Leahy Hall, built for the law school; Keane Hall, built in 1958 and occupied in 1987 for the law school's overflow, and McMahon Hall, built in 1895, the primary original building on the campus. The architect testified that currently, the law school occupies approximately 93,000 gross square feet of space. That amounts to about 56,000 square feet of useable floor area. The existing buildings are too small to meet current accreditation standards. They are also very outdated technologically in terms of data collection.

The architect testified that in selecting a site for the new law school, a number of factors were considered. The University wanted a site of visual prominence, a site with high visibility from the campus edge, ease of service access, and proximity to the Brookland Metrorail Station. The site chosen is located on the northeastern portion of campus, a sector of the campus that is currently undeveloped.

The architect testified that the proposed law school is designed to contain approximately 170,000 gross square feet and 100,000 net square feet. The structure will contain four stories and will be approximately 85 feet in height.

The school is oriented with the major faculty and administration spaces surrounding a skylit atrium. The Community Legal Services Center and student activities are located at the center of the building on the ground floor at the entry level from McCormack Road. There is a major three-floor library facility and a two-story classroom facility which flank and define an exterior court yard. This court yard becomes an adjunct space, adjacent to the main quadrangle.

There will also be a below-grade parking lot. The entrance to the parking lot will be from the south end of the building where the lower floor level extends toward the entrance at McCormack Road. The lot will accommodate 309 cars and will serve the law school and the campus population in general.

The architect testified that while the new facility constitutes a significant enlargement over the current facilities, the new one is intended to house about the same number of staff persons and students currently at the law school. Presently, there are 640 day students and 265 evening students for a total law student

population of 905. There are 40 faculty members and 50 administrative staff persons. The increase in space will allow for the reintegration of the Community Legal Services Center with the law school. The Center is currently located off campus. The increase in size also allows for the accommodation of state-of-the-art computer, audio-visual teleconferencing systems and facilities; the upgrading of inadequate facilities for teaching and student life; and a significantly larger library. Most importantly, it allows the University to meet the American Bar Association accreditation standards.

20. In the application, the University pointed out that certain buildings on campus have been identified as possessing architectural character. The buildings may qualify because their location gives then a special presence on campus, they possess a special quality in design, or they may be associated with a special historical event of the school. These buildings must be treated with respect, and acknowledged during new construction projects. Siting, landscaping, scale, materials, massing, and proportion of new construction must recognize the character of these major buildings. The University will develop design guidelines as a supplement to this Master Plan.

21. Student Enrollment. The University's current fulltime equivalent enrollment (FTE) is 6,816. In the fall of 1989 there were 3,607 graduate and 3,209 undergraduate students. It is anticipated that the undergraduate enrollment will stabilize or decline somewhat until the mid-nineties when it will return to its present level of approximately 3,000 students. The maximum fulltime equivalent enrollment is not expected to exceed 8,000 students by the year 2020.

22. Faculty and Staff. The current full-time equivalent faculty consists of 411 members. There are approximately 750 full-time persons employed in administrative, managerial, secretarial, technical and service positions. The University anticipates that the faculty and staff population will be maintained at the current level through the mid-1990's. Further, since part of the student enrollment strategy for the future is to maximize available resources, including the faculty and staff resources, it is anticipated that certain increases in the overall student population will not require increases in personnel. Based on historical data and current general practice, a combined student population that reaches 8,000 students by the year 2020 is projected to result in a total personnel range of 1,500 to 1,560 employees. In summary, the University does not project a substantial growth in population in the next thirty (30) years.

VEHICULAR CURCULATION

23. Existing Circulation. Vehicular access to the Catholic University occurs along the four major streets bordering the campus, with primary entry onto campus from Michigan Avenue and secondary arrival on Harewood Road and McCormack Road. There is no significant congestion from traffic entering and exiting campus. However, with so many points of access there is no priority system for entry, and people who are not familiar with the campus become confused.

Once on campus, there is free access to facilities by a system of winding roadways but no recognizable order to circulation exists. A dispersion of traffic causes the entire campus to be blemished by circulating and parked automobiles. Many of the roadways double as major pedestrian routes, thereby, creating many vehicular-pedestrian conflicts.

After analyzing the current vehicular circulation system, the University concluded the following:

a. The campus lacks a main vehicular entrance which would establish the image and identity of the University and direct visitors to information and administrative areas.

b. Haphazard entry and circulation should be eliminated. A hierarchy of entrance gates should identify access to areas for visitors, students and staff, and limited access to the interior campus should be reserved for service, emergency and special permit vehicles.

c. Vehicular circulation should not dominate the campus at the expense of pedestrian movement and safety.

24. Proposed Vehicular Circulation. The primary goals for the vehicular circulation system are to identify proper entry to campus, and quickly guide people to their destination by restricting vehicules to the perimeter of campus. This system should control vehicular movement, enhance security and maximize use of University property.

25. The Main Entrance. Michigan Avenue has been identified as the main source of vehicular traffic to campus. Presently, the Shrine draws people along Michigan Avenue to campus into the entrance at Fourth Street. The Master Plan proposes a new main entry on Michigan Avenue between Gibbons and University Center. This entrance must incorporate gate structure, signage, paving patterns and traffic signals in a design which will clearly identify the University entrance as distinct from the Shrine entrance. This will establish an identity and presence on the

street and draw first time visitors and special guests into and around the new administrative quad bordered by some of the University's most impressive architecture: McMahon, Mullen, Gibbons and the Shrine. A visitor may stop for information, directions to a campus building or parking structure, or may be directed to short term parking for administrative business or a visit to the Library Visitor's Center.

Presently, vehicular circulation occurs in all areas of campus resulting in conflicts with pedestrians and/or the negative visual presence of automobiles. The proposed everyday commute of students, faculty and staff will be limited to the public streets leading directly to parking structures or surface parking at the campus edge. This will allow the interior campus to become an environment for the pedestrian. Walking from the parking lots to their destinations will occur without the conflict of vehicular traffic. However, the interior campus will be designed with a "wide path" system of walks large enough to accommodate vehicles for service, emergency, and special permit.

A unified system of entry gates will be designed. The size and design of the gates and signage will be appropriate for the significance of the particular entrance. This system will not only define entry and give direction, but it will also give the campus an identifiable image to the public along all of the streets contiguous to campus. This proposal for vehicular circulation would require a traffic signal adjustment at the new main entry.

PARKING AND TRAFFIC

26. **Existing Parking.** Vehicular circulation and parking have a significant impact on the environment and lifestyle of Catholic University students, staff and visitors. The present parking spaces are scattered through the campus grounds, along curbs and in surface lots. When examined in conjunction with the present vehicular circulation, the parking situation raises concerns about visual dominance, safety and utilization of land needed for development of buildings, pedestrian walkways and open green space.

27. A parking study was conducted concentrating on main campus. North Campus has a parking supply of 164 spaces, used primarily for athletic functions. South Campus has 158 spaces, used primarily for residents and support services. The analysis below summarizes the current parking supply and demand.

ANALYSIS

Current Supply

o	North Campus	164 spaces
o	South Campus	158 spaces
o	Main Campus Lots	1,440 spaces
o	Net Current Supply	1,762 spaces

Current Demand

o	Peak Accumulation	1,780 spaces
o	Metro Riders Using Spaces	-150 spaces
o	Total Current Demand	1,630 spaces

The current estimated demand does not exceed the supply of existing parking.

The location of the nearby Brookland/CUA Metrorail Station has significantly reduced the parking requirements projected in the previous Master Plan. The University has a current parking supply of close to 2,000 spaces, 400 of which are located on McCormack and Harewood Roads and 135 of which are located on the South Campus. This total does not include the 164 spaces located on the North Campus, and used for general athletic purposes.

28. Proposed Parking. The University stated that planned centralized parking at key areas on the perimeter of the Main Campus is desirable. Therefore, the 1990 Master Plan proposes to eliminate a large number of existing surface spaces that are scattered throughout campus to provide for circulation improvements and to create and preserve open space. The 1990 Master Plan also proposes to phase in new parking facilities on the perimeter of the main campus to address the projected parking demand of 2,100 spaces by the year 2020.

In this regard, the University proposes to construct new parking facilities as needed. Included in the law school plan is the underground facility for 300 spaces, with access from McCormack Road. In addition, the 1990 Master Plan includes a second underground parking facility for 560 cars, with access from Harewood Road, and another 520-car facility with access from Harewood Road via the existing service drive. The potential for an additional above-grade parking structure of 300 spaces on the North Campus exists if the demand increases from the current projection of 2,100 spaces to 2,400 spaces. Certain surface lots at the perimeter of campus with a total of 250 spaces will be retained and improved. McCormack Road and Harewood Road provide accessible parking space. The University will encourage the use of metrorail and car pooling arrangements.

29. The University's traffic engineer submitted a statement and testified at the hearing about current and future parking conditions. He noted that the current ratio of students to peak parked vehicles is approximately 4:1. With a maximum student body of 8,000, the peak parking demand would be for 2,000 spaces. The Master Plan provides for 2,130 spaces on the main campus, with an optional 300 additional spaces on the North Campus, for a potential total parking supply of 2,430 spaces. The traffic engineer concluded that the parking supply for the year 2020 is adquate to meet peak demands. The future location of parking facilities will be much more orderly. Even with more vehicles on campus, the orderliness should improve internal circulation.

30. Traffic. The traffic engineer also presented information on traffic conditions in the area. He stated that measurements were made of existing conditions on the site, on the adjacent street and at abutting intersections. Projections of conditions were made in ten-year increments to the year 2020. The engineer's analysis was based on the following:

a) traffic growth trends on the street system;

b) student enrollment; and

c) on campus residents.

During the week beginning April 10, 1989, traffic counts were made, during morning and evening peak hours, at the principal intersections that abut the University campus. These intersections are:

Michigan Avenue and 7th Street, N.E.

Michigan Avenue and 4th Street, N.E.

Michigan Avenue and McCormack Road, N.E.

Harewood Road and Taylor Street, N.E.

The traffic engineer testified that he made measurements of the peak-hour movements through these intersections and evaluated those movements to determine the capacity levels. Measurements were also made of vehicles entering and leaving the campus at each of 12 access points during peak hours.

The traffic engineer set forth during peak hours, average daily traffic volumes on Michigan Avenue, Harewood Road and Taylor Street. On Michigan Avenue, the ten-year trend, indicates an annual growth rate of 1.9 percent. On Taylor Street, the growth was negative from 1978 to 1982; then there was a sudden increase between 1982 and 1983. Since 1983, the annual rate of growth has

been three percent. On Harewood Road, there was no growth over the ten-year period, 1978 to 1988.

For future conditions, the growth rates of 1.9 percent per year on Michigan Avenue and 3.0 percent per year on Taylor Street have been used.

With regard to the analysis and the proposal, the traffic engineer stated that the Master Plan would provide improved conditions on Michigan Avenue, with the elimination of the entrance to the University at 7th Street. The Michigan Avenue/McCormack Road intersection will be of much greater importance than it is today. It is likely that a traffic signal will be warranted at this location by about the year 2000.

The traffic engineer stated that all four intersections will have capacity problems in one or both peak hours by the year 2020, if the growth in traffic that was assumed in this analysis actually occurs. The University's contribution to these capacity problems will be minimal. The problem stems from an estimated 68 percent growth of traffic on Michigan Avenue and an estimated 10 percent growth on Taylor Street. These growths are based on historic data, but it is unlikely that the trends will continue for the next 30 years.

31. Proposed Building Services. Service to the buildings includes deliveries, trash removal, maintenance, campus security and the emergency vehicles of D.C. police, fire and rescue services. Service to all buildings will be from open vehicular streets onto the pedestrian circulation system. With proper construction, dimensions and turning radii, all "wide paths" leading to buildings will accommodate vehicles.

Some buildings have limited service needs and can operate with a designated service doorway accessed from small trucks parked on the path. However, all buildings with dock areas should be isolated from pedestrian traffic and screened with landscaping. All new buildings with heavy service needs will be planned with a loading dock in an unobtrusive location.

The University is proposing a new Central Service Building to be located adjacent to the underground garage structure off of McCormack Road. This location is screened from view. It is adjacent to the Power Plant service area and central to most of the campus. This facility will provide central storage and housing for all maintenance. It will eliminate the need for large deliveries to individual buildings on campus.

32. Proposed Pedestrian Circulation. The Master Plan proposes a pedestrian circulation system of which the primary goal

is to circulate through campus, without vehicular conflict, by an orderly network of walks, plazas, and green space. This system shall incorporate street furniture, information devices, lighting and landscaping. This is accomplished with minimal changes to the existing infrastructure.

Most of the proposed paths are a continuation of existing vehicular roadways. All public traffic will be prohibited from the interior of campus. Certain wide paths will be designed to handle limited vehicles for service, emergency and special access. Paving widths will vary to accommodate different traffic loads. The paths will be constructed with some type of unit paver to be consistently applied throughout campus. Often existing roads can be used as substrates and this system can be implemented, in stages, over a long period of time. Details of this system will be highlighted in the Design Guidelines as a supplement to the Master Plan.

The plan will also encourage the continuing and expanded use of bicycles on campus. All paths will be wide enough for riders and walkers to co-exist. Bicycle racks will be located on the outside of buildings in strategic areas.

Further details of the proposed pedestrian circulation system are set forth in the Master Plan. Several of the features in the proposed circulation system also address the concerns for pedestrian safety.

PROPOSED OPEN SPACE SYSTEM

33. The Master Plan describes Catholic University as a campus of buildings around open green space. For the University to realize the full potential of the campus plan, the open space system must be integrated with pedestrian circulation. The open space system is dependent upon the creation of new vehicular patterns and the elimination of parking from the center of campus. The pedestrian path system links the open spaces in an orderly fashion and provides for a variety of experiences with major quads and smaller yards for large gatherings or recreation, and courts, plazas, and gardens for gatherings of a more intimate scale.

34. Landscape Element. Presently, the campus is mainly composed of a natural less ordered combination of paths, ground cover, shrubbery, and trees. Outdoor furniture is limited to select areas. To achieve the goals of continuity and order, a cohesive landscape plan must be an integral part of all building projects, circulation and open space systems. The landscape elements will be incorporated in all areas of campus with a consistent blend of materials, design and construction. Landscape elements should include paving patterns, exterior graphics, seating

systems, trash receptacles, sheltered waiting areas, outdoor lighting, and a planting scheme.

PROPOSED SIGNAGE

35. The Master Plan states that the Catholic University of America's position as the national university of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States must be effected by a strong consistent visual identity program. All graphics, including signage, are to convey an image of the University to the public. Recognizing this, the University is committed to developing a graphics program that is clear, consistent and dignified.

The University will develop a uniform system of signage, and all exterior graphics will be made compatible with the visual identity program. The system will begin with the main gate and continue with information for both occupants of vehicles and pedestrians to identify all campus entrances and buildings. The signage system will also direct vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

PROPOSED UTILITIES

36. The current 30-year Master Plan envisions only modest incremental growth of enrollment and facilities. It is generally expected that existing systems will be extended, upgraded, and modified to handle the addition and elimination of buildings and facilities, rather than creating new systems or system components. In general, new buildings will be served by the central steam plant, and provide their own chiller plants, as in the past. In certain unique cases, individual buildings may be designed as "stand-alone", self-sufficient entities. A Central Energy Management System is anticipated to control energy use in all facilities. The North Campus utilities will continue to function independently of the Main Campus system.

37. The University maintains that the application meets all of the special exception requirements of 11 DCMR 3108.1 and 211.

38. **Sub-section 211.1. Noise.** The University maintains that the updated Master Plan is designed so as not to create objectionable conditions because of noise. In an effort to reduce ambient noise, the University has built into this plan the need to preserve large, open green space and natural wooded areas. The University blends into the neighborhood with minimum impact on the community in terms of noise and visibility.

All proposed construction under the 1990 Master Plan is located well within the campus boundaries or near natural buffers such as John McCormack Road. Within these boundaries, activities

are designed to be located in such a manner so as to satisfy the University's need for a quiet and secure place to study, work and live.

The Catholic University of America is located in a primarily residential area of low to medium density. However, many large institutional facilities, particularly colleges and hospitals, are within the immediate surroundings of the University in every direction. Large institutions with many acres of open green space provide a buffer between University and residential activity.

Traffic. The University stated that it is committed to handling University-related traffic and parking in a manner that will minimize any adverse impacts on the community. In accordance with its transportation management effort, the University intends to create a more pedestrian-oriented campus.

Number of students. Since 1975, the University has had a very stable student population as shown on page 35, Section V.B.1. of the 1990 Master Plan. Approximately 3,200 undergraduate and 3,600 graduate students were enrolled as of Fall, 1989. Over the term of the plan, the University anticipates only a modest increase in its full-time student population. In fact, total student enrollment including all full-time and part-time graduate and undergraduate students is projected at 8,000 by the year 2020. The proposed building development will meet the limited growth that is anticipated.

The Columbus School of Law. The University stated that because of the inherently quiet nature of the uses proposed in the law school facility, and the natural buffer created by John McCormack Road and the metrorail system, the law school's location will have no adverse effects on neighboring properties.

39. Sub-section 211.3. For colleges and universities located in residential districts, the maximum bulk normally applicable in zoning districts may be increased, provided the total bulk shall not exceed that prescribed for the R-5-B District (1.8 FAR).

The University stated that the subject property is located within the R-4, R-5-A and C-M-1 districts and all development under the proposed campus plan, when added to all existing buildings and structures on the campus, does not exceed the gross floor area prescribed for the R-5-B District. In the 1975 Plan, the Board approved a total density of 0.38. Under the current Master Plan the total land area proposed is 5,754,597 square feet. Construction of a new facility for the Columbus School of Law will add approximately 170,000 square feet of gross floor area to the existing campus. The FAR for the campus will be 0.38 after the

construction of the new law school, well below the maximum permitted FAR. If all buildings under the proposed Master Plan are built, the total gross floor area would be 2,884,922 square feet and the projected FAR would increase 32 percent to 0.49 FAR over the life of the plan. This is well below the density permitted under the Zoning Regulations. This low density is consistent with the University's interest in maintaining significant open space on the campus.

40. Sub-section 211.4. The University has filed with the Board, the long range plans for developing the campus as a whole. The updated Master Plan, Exhibit No. 33 of the record contains a thorough description of the plan for developing the campus as a whole, showing the location, height and bulk of all present and proposed improvements, including, but not limited to the following:

a. Building, parking and loading facilities (see Master Plan, Exhibit 33, Section VI. A.2. - Proposed Building Use);

b. Screening, signs, streets and public utility facilities (see Master Plan Section VI. A.8. and 9.);

c. Athletic and other recreational facilities (see Master Plan);

d. A description of all activities conducted or to be conducted on the campus, and of the capacity of all present and proposed campus development (see Master Plan).

41. Sub-section 211.5. The Board may permit the interim use of land or improved property with any use that the Board determines is a proper college or university function. The University stated that specific locations and uses change frequently as the University's needs change. The University may seek Board approval for interim use of land in future applications.

42. Sub-section 211.6. Both of the applications have been submitted to the D.C. Office of Planning and the Department of Public Works for review and written reports.

43. The Office of Planning (OP), by report dated October 17, 1990 and through testimony at the hearing, recommended conditional approval of the proposed Campus Plan. OP stated that the proposed plan was essentially a reiteration of the approved 1975 campus plan in that it does not anticipate an increase in student enrollment or programs. In formulating its specific recommendations, OP focused on the main goal of the proposed plan which is to upgrade and reorganize the existing facilities to accommodate state-of-the-art

requirements. With this focus, OP reported on the following issues and offered the following recommendations:

a. The proposed Master Plan fully incorporated the previous five plan approvals and updates the University's future potential plans.

b. The projected space increase under the proposed plan is similar to space projected for the 1975 Plan. In addition, the figures indicate that many of the proposed new projects would result in the demolition of existing buildings. OP pointed out that under the 1975 Plan, the Board approved 2.8 million square feet of space and under the proposed plan the projection is 2,884,922 square feet of development. OP had no objection to the proposed building area with an FAR of approximately 0.50 that is well within the maximum specified FAR of 1.8 for campus development. OP noted that the general land use policy would continue to follow the historical development of the campus building scale, massing proportions and fenestration would respect the neighboring facilities. OP further noted that the proposed plan would guide development north toward Taylor Street and would respect and build upon the historic roots of the southern portion of the campus. i.e. single buildings surrounded by open space. New projects would be within the height and density of their immediate context. OP indicated that the system of walks and landscaping would conform to campus standards.

OP stated that through the year 2020, the Master Plan would address the use of the physical plant in the following ways:

a. Identify new construction necessary to supplement the current programs or answer the needs of new programs;

b. Preserve and maintain the existing buildings that are functional and possess architectural character which is important to the University's past and future. Upgrade these buildings with state-of-the-art facilities;

c. Propose demolition of obsolete buildings that would be phased-out over a period of time; and

d. Group new and existing buildings in clusters according to function.

OP supported the proposed development under the proposed Master Plan for the construction of 810,000 square feet of new academic, administrative and support buildings. In addition,

400,000 square feet of new housing would be provided. New parking structures would provide another 672,000 square feet of new construction.

OP stated that the University's future development is influenced by the projected numbers of students, faculty, staff and visitors as follows:

	1975 Plan	1990 Existing	2020 Proposed
Faculty and Staff	1,550	1,530	1,560
Students	8,357	6,816	8,000
Visitors	170	312	392
TOTAL	10,077	8,658	9,952

44. OP supports the proposed vehicular circulation system. OP stated that the primary goals are to identify the proper entrances to the campus and to quickly guide the people to their destinations by restricting vehicular movement to the perimeter of the campus. This system would control automobile movement, enhance security, and maximize use of University property.

45. OP expressed no objection either to the location of parking lots or the increase in the number of spaces to be provided. OP pointed out that the plan proposes to increase the existing numbers of parking spaces by 432. This represents an increase of 240 spaces above the number of proposed parking spaces for the approved 1975 Campus Plan. OP noted that most inner-campus roads and surface lots would be replaced by parking structures located at the outer edges of campus.

46. OP expressed no objection to the proposed pedestrian system. OP described the proposed pedestrian circulation system, as being designed to circulate pedestrian traffic through the campus without vehicular conflict by providing an orderly network of walks, plazas, and green space.

47. OP had no objection to the building services proposal. OP stated that building services would include deliveries, trash removal, maintanance and emergency services.

48. OP did not oppose the proposal for the creation and use of open space. OP stated that the proposed campus would consist of four major quad areas which are the Mall, Caldwell/Hannan Quad, Stadium Quad and St. Thomas Hill. The major quads would be reinforced with a series of smaller open spaces which, in turn, would be reinforced with existing and proposed green spaces.

This hierarchy of outdoor spaces would extend through the proposed campus providing unity and visual vitality to the University.

49. With regard to the Master Plan as a whole, OP stated that the impact of the proposed campus plan would be mostly internal, not external. Therefore, OP recommended approval of Application No. 15382 subject to a finding by the Department of Public Works that the proposed traffic circulation would not impact the area adversely, and subject to the following conditions:

a. Approval of the campus plan shall be for a period of ten years from the date of the final BZA Order.

b. The University shall submit to the Board, as a special exception, each individual request to construct a building. Along with each request, the University shall submit information as to how the particular request complies with the plan. Such information shall also include a detailed statement as to the effect of the proposed building on the proposed building program, the traffic and parking impacts on the proposed main entrances and parking areas, as well as the impact of the proposal on the adjacent neighborhood.

50. OP stated that the proposed location and size of the new Columbus School of Law and accessory parking is in accordance with the proposed new campus plan. Therefore, OP recommends approval of Application No. 15389, conditioned upon approval of the new campus plan as represented by Application No. 15382.

51. The Department of Public Works (DPW), by report dated October 18, 1990, reported on the following issues and offered the following recommendations:

a. Currently there exists 2.2. million square feet of building space and the 1990 Master Plan proposes 2.9 million square feet of building space. The proposed 1990 Master Plan identifies phasing out the South Campus, eliminating pedestrian-vehicular conflict in the interior of the campus and limiting vehicular access to the perimeter of the campus.

b. <u>The Street System</u>. The main campus of Catholic University is bounded on the north by Taylor Street, on the south by Michigan Avenue, on the east by John McCormack Road, and on the west by Harewood Road. Other streets which feed traffic into the main campus are Seventh, Fourth, and Monroe Streets, N.E. DPW described each of these streets, the daily volume of traffic that each handles and the parking conditions.

- Michigan Avenue is a six-lane principal arterial with a 60-foot-wide pavement. The average daily traffic volume is 35,000 vehicles. Parking is prohibited along Michigan Avenue in the vicinity of the University.

- Taylor Street is a four-lane minor arterial with a 44-foot-wide pavement. The average daily traffic volume is 13,000 vehicles. Parking is prohibited on the north side from 7:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.; and unlimited parking is available on the south side.

- Harewood Road is a four-lane minor arterial with a 40-foot-wide pavement. The average daily traffic volume is 9,000 vehicles. Three hour parking is available on both sides of the street between 7:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

- John McCormack Road is a two-lane collector road with a 30-foot-wide pavement. Parking is prohibited on the west side of the road and unlimited parking is permitted on the east side of the road, south of Michigan Avenue. South of Taylor Street, unrestricted parking is available.

- Hawaii Avenue is a two-lane collector street with a 40-foot-wide pavement. The average daily traffic is 5,900 vehicles near the site. Unlimited parking is permitted on both sides of the street.

- Seventh Street is a two-lane collector street with a 34-foot-wide pavement. Between Michigan Avenue and Monroe Street, unrestricted parking is available along the east side of the street and parking is prohibited along the west side of the street.

- Fourth Street is a four-lane minor arterial with a 50-foot-wide pavement. The average daily traffic volume is 15,000. Parking is prohibited on the east side of the street between 4:00 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. Parking is prohibited on the west side of the street between 7:00 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. and from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

c. The Transit System. DPW concluded that the University is ideally located with respect to the public transportation system. Catholic University is served directly by the Red Line Metrorail service to the Brookland/Catholic

University Metrorail Station. In addition, the site is accessed by Metrobus routes, H1, H2, 80, and 81 along Michigan Avenue; and route H8 along Taylor Street.

d. In conducting its transportation impact analysis, DPW considered the following factors (among others):

i. the effort to reduce vehicle miles of travel to and from the central campus and to minimize the impact of University generated traffic on surrounding residential streets; and

ii. the proposed improvement in traffic operations.

DPW stated that the updated Campus Plan will provide 400,000 square feet of new construction for housing. Providing on-campus housing for students who are living off-campus will reduce vehicle trips to and from the campus.

The updated Master Plan will consolidate the presently scattered parking lots into a few locations at the perimeter of the campus. This is especially the case on Harewood Road where two major parking structures will be constructed to hold 1,080 cars. This, in turn, will add more vehicles at the intersection of Harewood Road and Michigan Avenue. Because the Campus Plan traffic study fails to address the increase in traffic at this key intersection, DPW recommended that the university perform a capacity analysis to determine whether the intersection can handle the projected traffic growth. The Campus Plan also alludes to some operational changes to improve vehicular circulation on and around the campus. The changes include a traffic signal adjustment at the new main entrance and the addition of a traffic signal at the intersection of Michigan Avenue and John McCormack Road. DPW agrees in concept with this proposal and will coordinate the feasibility and implementation of these changes. However, DPW believes that if new signals are required to be installed, the University should be required to bear the cost of these improvements.

52. With respect to parking, DPW stated that the updated Master Plan will locate new parking facilities on the perimeter of the main campus to consolidate parking and to limit vehicular-pedestrian conflict in the campus core. Currently, the University provides approximately 1,840 parking spaces to accommodate faculty, students and staff. In the future, there will be 2,140 parking spaces in the main campus. However, DPW noted that the University is including 400 to 500 on-street parking spaces along McCormack and Harewood Roads as part of the University parking supply. These spaces are available to the public at-large, including Catholic University's population and, therefore, cannot be counted on to

meet the University parking demand. The adjusted parking supply on the main campus will be 1,630 spaces. DPW believes these spaces will be adequate to accommodate the proposal because the campus is readily and conveniently accessible to the metrorail and metrobus system. DPW also noted that by phasing out the South Campus, the University will eliminate potential parking impact on the surrounding residential neighborhood streets.

To reduce the number of cars going to and from the campus, DPW recommended that the University implement an active ridesharing program to attain higher vehicle occupancy. DPW offered suggestions to facilitate implementation of the program.

With respect to the new law school, the Department of Public Works, by report dated August 17, 1990, stated that the proposed law school building will house activities already occurring on campus and that this proposal is not designed in response to an increase in student enrollment, but only to improve existing services. The DPW report concluded that the only traffic impact associated with the law school will be the elimination of 269 service parking spaces in the stadium lot. Since the law school will include underground parking facilities for 309 spaces with a net gain of 40 spaces, from the transportation standpoint, the proposed law school will have a positive impact on the parking and pedestrian circulation system on campus. Therefore, DPW stated that it has no objection to the law school application.

DPW concluded that the updated Master Plan can work from a transportation standpoint. DPW recommended that the University work with the Department to coordinate all design and construction elements in the public space, with costs to be born by the University.

53. By letters dated August 8, 1990 and August 20, 1990, the Metropolitan Police Department commented on the proposed Master Plan and the law school applications respectively. In each letter, the Police Department stated that it does not appear that the changes proposed by the applications will affect the public safety in the immediate area or generate an increase in the level of police services now being provided. Accordingly, the Department does not oppose this application.

54. By memorandum dated September 6, 1990, the Fire Department commented on the proposed Master Plan application. The Fire Department stated that it has evaluated the request as set forth in the application to determine its impact on emergency operations. Fire Department emergency access must meet the minimum fire lane dimension of 18 feet in width. Each access point must

have a sufficient turning radius to maneuver. Based on review of the application, the Fire Department stated that it had no objection to the proposed changes.

By memorandum dated August 29, 1990, the Fire Department commented on the law school application. The Fire Department stated that fire and life safety code requirements shall be determined during the permit review process. Having reviewed the application, the Department stated that it has no objection to the request for a new law school.

55. By letter dated September 25, 1990, the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools stated that nothing in the application would lead the school officials to anticipate any adverse effect upon the operations of facilities of the public schools. Therefore, no opposition was expressed to the application.

56. By memorandum dated October 18, 1990, the Department of Housing and Community Development stated that it has to objection to the applications.

57. The site of the subject applications falls within the boundaries of Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 5A. The property is in close proximity to ANCs 4D and 5C. Each of the ANCs was notified of the hearing on the subject applications. However, the ANCs did not submit written statements of issues and concerns nor appear at the hearing to testify as parties in the applications.

The records in the applications were closed at the end of the hearing on October 24, 1990. By letter dated October 30, 1990, ANC 5A requested that the Board reopen the records to receive the written testimony of that ANC regarding the applications. At its public meeting of November 7, 1990, the Board denied the request to reopen the records by a vote of 4-0 (Maybelle Taylor Bennett, Paula L. Jewell, Sheri M. Pruitt and Charles R. Norris to deny; Carrie L. Thornhill not voting, not having heard the case).

58. No one appeared at the hearing to testify as a party in support of the applications.

59. A neighbor residing at 3303 7th Street, N.E. testified at the hearing and expressed a concern about the parking conditions. He indicated that he is most concerned with the Monroe block portion of campus which contains three dormitories and one building used for maintenance. This section of campus is located across the street from his residence.

This neighbor testified that there is residential permit parking on his side of the street. But on the other side, parking is unrestricted. He testified that by 9:00 a.m. all spaces on his side of the street are taken. The other side is full by 8:00 a.m. He testified that he believes the University charges $135.00 for a parking space. Many people cannot afford this fee. Therefore, some purchase Zone 5 parking stickers so they can park on the street. Others park on the street without a sticker.

The neighbor testified that the parking conditions make it difficult for the elderly residents because often they must park two blocks away from their homes.

This neighbor was also concerned that the South Campus would be used for commercial purposes once it is phased out. He opposes commercial use of that property.

The neighbor also expressed a concern that housing for graduate students was unaffordable. He testified that the students are always searching for affordable housing off-campus.

Finally, the neighbor pointed out that while the relations with the University are generally good, there has been a lack of communication with his immediate neighbors about this project.

60. A neighbor residing at 3201 7th Street, N.E. testified at the hearing. He expressed a concern with the vehicular circulation on 7th Street. He stated that there are four bus stops from Monroe to Thornton. When children get off of the bus, they cross the street in front of the bus. Cars go around the bus from behind, creating a very dangerous situation.

This neighbor was also concerned that whatever is built on the South Campus will create the need to use the 7th Street or 8th Street artery for traffic. In his view this will be a tremendous problem.

61. Another neighbor, residing at 3219 7th Street, N.E., testified at the hearing. She testified that while it was not her intent to promote animosity, the communication is poor between the residents in her area and the University. She lives near the South Campus and requested information on what the University plans to do with the property located there. Finally, she expressed some concern for the amount of traffic on the street.

62. At the end of the hearing the Board raised questions about the proposed development. The Board requested more information about the proposed parking lots. Specifically, the Board asked what the hours of operation will be and how the lots will be secured. The Board asked the University for conceptual

plans of the footbridge across Taylor Street and inquired as to whether the University considered alternatives to this footbridge. Finally, the Board inquired about the University's efforts to clean up the land between McCormack Road and the railroad tracks, and the efforts to correct the problem creating the erosion of mud from the University onto the street where residents live.

63. Responding to some of the matters raised in the testimony of the residents, the applicant testified that efforts were made to contact the members of the community through the ANCs and the North Michigan Park Association. However, the breakdown in communications may have arisen because these neighbors are not members of an organized group.

With regard to the South Campus, the University does not currently have plans for development. The University is looking for a venture between another institutional user and a government user. Before any concrete plans are made, the University will contact interested neighbors for input.

University officials testified that they have considered alternatives for the footbridge; however, because the area is mostly undeveloped, any project would need to be coordinated through the Department of Public Works. A study will be conducted by undergraduate, graduate and professional students of architecture and engineering to determine how that area should be handled.

The University is coordinating with District government agencies to clean the area between McCormack Road and the railroad tracks. Also, the University is making an effort to correct the erosion problem.

64. At its public meeting of December 5, 1990, the Board reopened the record in Application No. 15382, to receive from the applicant certain information about the Master Plan proposal to the year 2000. By letter dated January 16, 1990 [sic], the Board requested the following:

a. Total number of students enrolled;

   i. Number of undergraduate students;
   ii. Number of graduate students;
   iii. Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students; and
   iv. Definition of FTE.

b. Number of off-street parking spaces within the campus boundary;

c. Total floor area ratio and gross floor area for the campus; and

d. Number of faculty and staff.

By letter dated January 26, 1991, the University responded to the Board's request and submitted the following information.

a. Enrollment

i. Method of Determining Enrollment:

As a comprehensive institution of higher education, the University enrolls graduate and undergraduate students who attend on a full-time and part-time basis. There are fluctuations in enrollment over the course of a given academic year. For purposes of the Master Plan, the fall semester period is used in calculating enrollment. The student enrollment is represented by a full-time equivalency (FTE) count calculated as follows:

(1) Undergraduate Student FTE: the total number of semester credit hours awarded to undergraduate students divided by 15 semester hours.

(2) Graduate Student FTE: the total number of semester credit hours awarded to graduate students divided by 9 semester hours.

(3) Total FTE: the sum of the undergraduate FTE and graduate FTE.

ii. Full-time Equivalency (FTE) Enrollment for the Year 2000.

Special efforts are underway to maintain the enrollment of full-time undergraduate and graduate students. The undergraduate student body is projected to increase after the mid-nineties. The part-time graduate and undergraduate population is estimated to be maintained at current levels. Studies regarding the desired balance of graduate and undergraduate enrollment, including the proportion of full-time and part-time students, will continue. Subject to admission criteria and policy, the University plans to target annual enrollment in order to maximize the use of facilities and resources. Recruitment efforts

are projected to result in a student population in the year 2000 of:

(1)	Undergraduate FTE	3,770
(2)	Graduate FTE	3,730
(3)	Total FTE	7,500

b. Personnel

Catholic University of America (CUA) anticipated that the faculty and staff population will be maintained at the current level through the mid-nineties. This is consistent with enrollment projections. Further, since part of the student enrollment strategy for the future is to maximize available resources, including the faculty and staff resources, it is anticipated that certain increases in the overall student population will not require increases in personnel. Based on historical data and current general practice, a combined student population that reaches 7,500 FTE students by 2000 is projected to result in a total personnel range of 1,650 to 1,710 employees. Note that this range represents a "headcount" of the potential number of full-time faculty members, special part-time faculty appointees, research associates, regular full-time and part-time staff.

The total number of faculty and staff is dependent upon the actual student enrollment realized and the number, type, status and breakdown of the academic disciplines offered.

c. Total Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and Gross Floor Area.

If the campus population (full-time equivalent students and personnel headcount) reaches the high end of the projections by the year 2000 and the potential academic, housing, dining, recreational, cultural, spitiual and support service projects are all completed, the total floor area calculations are as follows:

Proposed Gross Floor Area (buildings)	2,884,922 sq. ft.
Proposed Campus Area:	5,917,021 sq. ft.
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	.49
Allowable FAR	1.8

These calculations are consistent with the information provided in the Master Plan submission, October 1990, page 39.

IV. Parking Spaces Within The Campus Boundary.

If the campus population and building program reach the maximum potential identified for this Master Plan period, the parking situation is projected to be as follows:

Projected demand:	1,880
Projected supply of parking spaces within campus boundary:	1,939

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The Board finds that the applicant will provide adequate parking to meet the needs of the University.

2. The Board finds that the applicant worked diligently to communicate with the community about the new campus plan.

3. The Board finds that the applicant will work with the community to develop plans for use of the South Campus.

4. The Board finds that the applicant has been coordinating with District of Columbia government agencies to clean the area between McCormack Road and the railroad tracks.

5. The Board finds that, by implementing the changes proposed by the Department of Public Works, the traffic conditions will improve on and near the University's campus.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND OPINION:

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and evidence of record, the Board concludes that the applicant is seeking special exception approval for a proposed campus plan. Granting such a special exception requires compliance with the provisions of 11 DCMR 211 governing colleges and universities. The applicant must also demonstrate that the proposal is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map and will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property. The Board concludes that the University has met this burden of proof. The Board concludes that the applications addressed each of the provisions of Section 211. The Board concludes that granting the applications will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map. The Board further concludes that the campus plan and new law school, as proposed, will not tend to adversely affect the use of neighboring property.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the applications are **GRANTED**, **SUBJECT** to the following **CONDITIONS:**

Application No. 15382

1. Approval shall be for a period of **TEN YEARS.**

2. The campus plan shall be as shown in the revised Master Plan marked as Exhibit No. 33 of the record.

3. The boundaries of the campus shall be as shown on Map No. 3 "Existing Property and Zoning" of the revised Master Plan marked as Exhibit No. 33 of the record.

4. The University shall submit a special exception application to the Board for each structure or addition to an existing structure which the University proposes to construct over the life of the plan.

5. The maximum enrollment shall be 7,500 full-time equivalent (FTE) students to be comprised of 3,770 undergraduate FTE and 3,730 graduate FTE students. The full-time equivalent student enrollment shall be calulated as follows:

   a. Undergraduate Student FTE: the total number of semester credit hours awarded to undergraduate students divided by 15 semester hours.

   b. Graduate Student FTE: the total number of semester credit hours awarded to graduate students divided by 9 semester hours.

6. The number of faculty and staff shall be between 1,650 and 1,710 during the ten-year period of the plan.

7. A maximum of 1,939 parking spaces shall be provided on campus over the ten-year period of the plan.

8. A maximum FAR of 0.49 or gross floor area of 2,884,922 square feet shall be permitted by the year 2000.

9. All traffic circulation patterns shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to implementation by the University.

Application No. 15389

1. Construction shall be in accordance with the plans marked as Exhibit No. 15 of the record.

2. The applicant shall provide 309 parking spaces in an underground parking facility for use by students, staff and visitors to the law school.

VOTE: 4-0 (Sheri M. Pruitt, Maybelle Taylor Bennett, Paula L. Jewell and Charles R. Norris to grant; Carrie L. Thornhill not voting, not having heard the case).

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

ATTESTED BY: Madeliene H. Robinson
MADELIENE H. ROBINSON
Acting Director

FINAL DATE OF ORDER: MAY 22 1992

PURSUANT TO D.C. CODE SEC. 1-2531 (1987), SECTION 267 OF D.C. LAW 2-38, THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, THE APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO COMPLY FULLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF D.C. LAW 2-38, AS AMENDED, CODIFIED AS D.C. CODE, TITLE 1, CHAPTER 25 (1987), AND THIS ORDER IS CONDITIONED UPON FULL COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE PROVISIONS. THE FAILURE OR REFUSAL OF APPLICANT TO COMPLY WITH ANY PROVISIONS OF D.C. LAW 2-38, AS AMENDED, SHALL BE A PROPER BASIS FOR THE REVOCATION OF THIS ORDER.

UNDER 11 DCMR 3103.1, "NO DECISION OR ODER OF THE BOARD SHALL TAKE EFFECT UNTIL TEN DAYS AFTER HAVING BECOME FINAL PURSUANT TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE BEFORE THE BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT."

THIS ORDER OF THE BOARD IS VALID FOR A PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDER, UNLESS WITHIN SUCH PERIOD AN APPLICATION FOR A BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY IS FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.

15382Ord/bhs

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

BZA APPLICATION NO. 15382 & 15389

As Acting Director of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, I hereby certify and attest to the fact that on MAY 22 1992 a copy of the order entered on that date in this matter was mailed postage prepaid to each party who appeared and participated in the public hearing concerning this matter, and who is listed below:

Susan Pervi
1045 Rustling Oaks Drive
Millersville, MD 21108

Allison C. Prince, Esquire
Wilkes, Artis, Hedrick & Lane
1666 K Street, N.W., Ste. 1100
Wash., D.C. 20006

Russell Perry
4917 41st Street, N.W.
Wash., D.C. 20016

Reginald Cude
1600 20th Street, N.W.
Wash., D.C. 20009

Alyson M. Muff
3219 7th Street, N.E.
Wash., D.C. 20017

Christopher Byrd, Chairperson
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 4-D
715 Kennedy Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20011

Brian K. Flowers, Chairperson
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 5-A
Slowe School Demountable
14th & Irving Streets, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20017

W.H. Fixsen
3303 7th Street, N.E.
Wash., D.C. 20017

James Benton
3217 7th Street, N.E.
Wash., D.C. 20017

Mara Newsome
1600 20th Street, N.W.
Wash., D.C. 20009

Robert Wilson
3201 7th Street, N.E.
Wash., D.C. 20017

James D. Berry, Jr., Chairperson
ANC 5C
1723 3rd Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Madeliene H. Robinson

MADELIENE H. ROBINSON
Acting Director

DATE: MAY 22 1992
15382Att/LP