

## **MEMORANDU**M

**TO:** District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM: \(\sqrt{Jennifer Steingasser}\), Deputy Director for Development Review & Historic Preservation

**DATE**: March 8, 2011

**SUBJECT:** Zoning Commission Case Number 06-11A/06-12A, George Washington University

Campus Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Stage PUD and PUD Modification at Square 103 – Supplemental Report

## I. BACKGROUND

At their February 3, 2011 public hearing, the Zoning Commission requested additional information from the applicant, George Washington University (GW), and the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) regarding vehicular circulation and access for the proposed second stage PUD request at Square 103. Commissioners asked that the applicant study an alternative means for vehicular access, with an emphasis on improving pedestrian safety. The applicant submitted a post-hearing submission on February 22, 2011 that studied the use of G Street NW to access to the site as well as the conversion of the rear alley to one-way eastbound traffic. This submission also included a revised traffic analysis of the proposed alternative(s) as compared to the applicant's preferred solution, which would maintain the use of the adjacent public alley (with two-way traffic) for vehicular access to the site. On March 1, DDOT submitted an analysis of the applicant's post-hearing submission. Finally, the West End Citizens Association (WECA) submitted comments on the applicant's post-hearing filing to the Office of Zoning on March 2, 2011.

## II. ANALYSIS

The Office of Planning (OP) typically defers to DDOT for guidance on matters of traffic and circulation and this case is no exception. In their March 1, 2011 response, DDOT clearly articulated its policy and rationale for opposing both the creation of a driveway on G Street and the proposal to limit the alley to one-way traffic. As such, OP would also support the continued use of the existing public alley system to provide vehicular access to the site, albeit with enhanced measures to increase pedestrian safety. A G Street curb cut could also impact the design and function of the planned above grade improvements on site. The applicant has proposed to use of a variety of traffic calming techniques in the subject alley in order to signal drivers to slow down and alert them to the presence of pedestrians. These visual and tactile improvements would include, but not be limited to, textured concrete, signage, a stop bar, and colored pavement. OP would suggest that the applicant work with DDOT to select a suitable combination of techniques and features, as well as provide for future monitoring of the operation to assess if additional measures are needed.

## III. CONCLUSION

The Office of Planning **recommends that the Zoning Commission approve** the requested second stage PUD and utilization of the public alley for vehicular access, as mitigated by traffic calming techniques to enhance pedestrian safety .

JS/ayj Arlova Jackson, Case Manager

