

# Government of the District of Columbia

## ZONING COMMISSION



ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 450

Case No. 84-6

February 11, 1985

(Rezoning for Property in the Northeast I - Urban Renewal Area)

Pursuant to notice, a public hearing of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission was held on December 17, 1984. At that hearing session the Zoning Commission considered an application from the D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) to amend the Zoning Map of the District of Columbia, pursuant to Section 9101 of the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia. The hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 6 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure before the Zoning Commission.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The application, which was filed on March 23, 1984, requested a change of zoning from C-M-3 to C-3-C for Lot 839 in Square 675, Lots 112, 113, 115, 116, 118, and 831 in Square 676, and Lots 17, 18, 40, 45, 49, 51, 141, 814-820, 830-832, 834-342, 859, 869-871, 883, 884, 886, 888-893, 895, and 896 in Square 677 with public alleys proposed to be closed. The application requests the change of zoning in order to help facilitate commercial development under the Northeast I - Urban Renewal Plan.
2. The subject site is located in the unit blocks of G and H Streets, and G Place, N.E., is approximately 299,000 square feet in land area, is under the jurisdiction of the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA), and comprises a portion of the Northeast I - Urban Renewal Area.
3. The C-M-3 District permits high bulk commercial light manufacturing, to a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 6.0 and a maximum height of ninety feet with new residential uses prohibited.
4. The C-3-C District permits major business and employment centers of medium/high density development, including office, retail, housing, and mixed uses to a maximum height of ninety feet, a maximum FAR of 6.5 for

residential and other permitted uses, and a maximum lot occupancy of one hundred percent.

5. The subject site abuts the Union Station to the east and -the U.S. Post Office building to the south. The site is divided by H Street which runs through it and rises in grade to the overpass at the railroad tracks. The northern (4.6 acre) portion of the site is adjacent to the existing highrise Union Center Plaza office buildings facing North Capitol Street, and the low rise commercial/light industrial buildings facing K Street,. The southern portion of the site between H Street and G Place is being used for parking. Further south, property between G Place and G Street, which comprises a portion of Square 677, is occupied by the U.S. Government Printing Office warehouse and parking lots. Across North Capitol Street at this location is the U.S. Government Printing Office. Proceeding north, are located a. parking garage structure, a playfield, Gonzaga High School and St. Aloysius Church,
6. To the north of the site is C-M-3 and M zoning, To the immediate east is unzoned Federal property. Further to the east is C-M-1, C-2-A, C-1, and R-4 zoning. To the south is unzoned Federal property. To the immediate west is C-2-A, C-3-C and unzoned Federal property, and to the distant west is R-4, R-5-13, R-5--@, C-2-A, and HR/C-3-C zoning,
7. The site is subject to two development controls, those of the Urban Renewal Area Plan and the Zoning Regulations. The more restrictive of the two controls will be applicable to any specific proposed development.
8. Squares 675 and 676, the northern portion of the site, are designated "Industrial and Commercial" on the Land Use map of the Northeast I - Urban Renewal Plan, Square 677, the southern portion of the site is designated "Public and Semi-Public" and marked for the use of "Fast Office",
9. The existing Post Office Facilities are to be relocated to a new facility in the Brentwood area of the city in the near future, The property designated for Post Office use will need to be reassigned for some other compatible use.
10. The development patterns in the area indicate growth in the commercial office/hotel use, rather than the industrial uses originally anticipated in the Urban Renewal Plan. Consequently, the DHCD believe that the C-N-3 zoning on the property no longer is appropriate for industrial uses.

11. The Northeast I Urban Renewal Area Plan was amended in July, 1983, to allow hotel and inn use. Parking requirements were also amended from one parking space for each 900 square feet to one space for each 1,800 square feet to bring the Urban Renewal Plan standards in line with the emerging needs of the area. Some additional amendments to change Postal Services Use in the Urban Renewal Plan will be needed in the future to accommodate commercial office and hotel-type uses now being contemplated. The Plan permits a maximum FAR of 6.0, which is more restrictive than the 6.5 FAR permitted under C-3-C zoning.
12. The applicant does not propose any specific development plan but has determined that the area is now more suited for commercial/office/hotel use rather than industrial use. The change of zoning is requested to allow for the threshold action needed for eventual development to proceed on the site and appropriate zoning classification to be in place at this time. The applicant believes that in this way, the marketing of the site for development would be facilitated.
13. The District of Columbia Office of Planning (OP), by memorandum dated December 7, 1984, and by testimony presented at the public hearing, recommended that the application be approved. The OP reported that the request for a map change from C-M-3 to C-3-C was made by the DHCD to facilitate land development that would be in keeping with the needs of the area and in accordance with the goals and objectives of the city. The development trends in the area have change from commercial/light industrial to commercial/office/hotel in response to improve accessibility of the area. A Metrorail Station, the existing Trailways and proposed Greyhound bus terminals, and Union Station combine to provide transportation facilities at this location that are superior to any other Location in the District of Columbia. The area is thus more suitable for commercial/office/hotel rather than light industrial use. In the view of the OP, this request for a map change from C-M-3 to C-3-C represents a logical extension of the prevailing land use trends in the area, and a zoning which is in furtherance of the Urban Renewal Plan.
14. The OP noted that for the principal- uses encouraged by the Urban Renewal Plan, namely offices and hotels, the parking requirements of the C-M-3 and C-3-C Districts are significantly different. For both hotels and offices, the OP was of the opinion that the higher parking ratios required in C-M-3 are unnecessary for this location adjacent to Downtown and within walking distance of the Union Station Metrorail stop. According to the new parking requirements approved by

the Commission to become effective on March 1, 1985, the difference between the parking requirements are as follows:

	<u>C-M-3</u>	<u>C-3-C</u>
Hotel	1 space per room plus 1 space per 150 square feet in largest func- tion or exhibit space	1 space per 4 rooms plus 1 space per 300 square feet in largest function or exhibit space
Office	Exclude 2,000 square feet, then 1 space per 800 square feet of gross floor area and cellar floor area	Exclude 2,000 square feet then 1 space for 1,800 square feet of gross floor area

15. The District of Columbia Office of Business and Economic Development (OBED), by memorandum dated November 14, 1984, supported the objective of the DHCD to provide greater flexibility of uses for the subject site. The OBED believed that the C-2-C District might be more appropriate for the subject site based on existing FAR levels. However, the OBED noted that the subject site could accept additional density over the 6.0 FAR, if it could be shown that another public purpose, specifically historic preservation, could be achieved.
16. The District of Columbia Department of Public Works (DPW), by memorandum dated December 6, 1984, believed that the proposed change of zoning would not create any adverse traffic and/or parking conditions. The DPW stated that:

"The proposed zone change would provide for a sufficient quantity of underground parking to serve the permitted development. It is also anticipated that some additional commercial parking would be provided above the minimum requirement. The street system in the area is also quite capable of accommodating the additional traffic which would be generated under maximum development. It should be noted that the existing surface Lots generate a substantial amount of commuter peak-hour traffic and that future building development would replace a portion of this traffic and provide for a variety of trip-types spread out over a broader time period."
17. Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2C did not file a report in this case,

- 1.8. There were na parties or persons in support of nor opposition to the application.
19. The Commission concurs with the conclusions and recommendations of the OP. The Commission finds that the existing C-M-3 zoning has proven to be inappropriate in terms of the emerging development trends in the area for office and/or hotel use, The Commission further finds that the existing C-Pi-3 zoning is incompatible with the uses permitted on the subject site by the Urban Renewal Plan.
20. As to the concerns of the OBED, the Commission finds that the FAR development level for commercial uses under C-3-C zoning is more consistent with the existing development trends in the area than those levels permitted in the C-2-C District, The Commission. notes that the maximum FAR of 6.0, as permitted by the Urban Renewal Plan, will govern the development of the subject site.
21. The Commission concurs with the conclusions of the DPW and finds that the existing street system in the area and access to transportation facilities would have a positive and reciprocal affect on any C-3-C type development.
22. The proposed decision of the Zoning Commission in this application was referred to the National Capital Planning Commission under the terms of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, The NCPC reported that rezoning the subject site to C-3-G would not adversely affect the Federal. Establishment or other Federal interests in the National Capital nor be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Rezoning to C-3-C is in accordance with the Zoning Act (Act of June 20, 1938, 52 Stat. 797) by furthering the general public welfare and serving to stabilize and improve the area.
2. Rezoning to C-3-C will promote orderly development in conformity with the entirety of the District of Columbia zone plan as stated in the Zoning Regulations and Map of the District of Columbia,
3. Rezoning to C-3-C is not inconsistent with the Northeast I - Urban Renewal Plan.
4. Rezoning to C-3-C will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

DECISION

In consideration of the findings of fact and conclusions of law herein, the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia hereby orders APPROVAL of the following:

Change from C-N-3 to C-3-C Lot 839 in Square 675, Lots 112, 413, 115, 116, 118 and 831 in Square 676, and Lots 17, 18, 40, 45, 49, 51, 141, 814-820, 830-832, 834-842, 859, 869-871, 883, 884, 886, 888-893, 895 and 896 in Square 677, with public alleys proposed to be closed, as shown on Exhibits No. 5 and 6 of the case record.

Vote of the Zoning Commission at the public meeting held on January 14, 1985: 4-0 (John G. Parsons, Patricia N. Mathews, and Maybelle T. Bennett, to approve C-3-C and Lindsley Williams, to approve C-3-C by absentee vote - George M. White, not voting not having participated in the case) .

This order was adopted by the Zoning Commission at its public meeting held on February 11, 1985 by a vote of 4-0 (John G. Parsons, Patricia N. Mathews, and Lindsley Williams, to adopt and Maybelle T. Bennett, to adopt by absentee vote - George M. White, not present not voting-),

In accordance with Section 4.5 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure before the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia, this amendment to the Zoning Nap is effective upon publication in the D.C. Register, specifically on

8 MAR 1985

  
MAYBELLE T. BENNETT  
Chairperson  
Zoning Commission

  
STEVEN E. SHER  
Executive Director  
Zoning Secretariat