



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
1	<b>Janae Grant</b> Chair, ANC 5A <i>(full written testimony attached)</i>	“... the mentioning of a pet store didn’t <u>necessarily have to be housed in Subarea 4.</u> ”	The listing of a pet store has now been added to more generally apply to the entire corridor in the “Public Policy – Retail Driven Plan” section and removed from Subarea 4.	4
2		“One area that needs <u>further clarification</u> is that of Design and Development guideline – N: this avoids parking garage entrances from Rhode Island Avenue. While it is aesthetically appreciated to have a look similar to Chinatown’s 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, it is also noted that Chinatown’s garage entrance is also on a block that doesn’t house homes. Therefore we <u>need to ensure that vehicle traffic doesn’t emerge on a residential street</u> and that the alley network is not compromised. Furthermore, this lends itself to protecting 3000 block of Otis Street as it relates to preserving the BT&T Auto for parking.”	Item ‘N’ is now item ‘O’. The language in guideline ‘O’ has been changed as follows to allow more flexibility based on the specific project circumstances and location: “Discourage parking garage entrances from the Avenue to protect the pedestrian realm, but if needed, limit parking garage entrances to one for a development project at least one half block in size. Encourage entrances from side streets or alleys, where possible.”	32
3		“The <u>remaining concerns</u> deal with the TIF funding and the timing since next year C-1 in Subarea 1 is due to come online. Will the TIF designation be implemented in time or will C-1 be pushed back?”	The financing of the Rhode Island Station project closed in March 2010 and the project is slated to break ground in summer 2010. The project will take up to two years to construct. The delivery date for the project has been changed from ‘2011’ to ‘2012’ in the plan.	25



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
4		“Also, since Subarea 4 is the lowest cost \$57M with the least amount of time of 7 years per the corridor totals, is the TIF funding of projected future tax revenues aggregated or segregated by Subarea?”	The plan segregates by Subarea the estimated development value for key near term catalytic projects in each Subarea and then provides a total value for all Subareas of those projects. No change is made to the Plan.	28-29
5		” Likewise, do we have a say in whether the TIF revenues goes towards revitalization efforts or towards the TIF Notes?”	The District generally issues project-based TIF Notes to support development projects. Those TIF Notes are required to be approved by DC Council. TIF Notes are generally assigned to the Committee on Finance and Revenue for review and a public hearing so the community will have an opportunity to formally ‘have a say’ in the approval process.	N/A
6		“it is hoped that <b><u>a current transportation study will be enacted</u></b> for this plan to support the creation of 13,000 residential units this overall project anticipates to offset the current 31,200 vehicles per day that travel along the ‘Avenue’.”	The plan recommends the development of approximately 3,100 new units of for sale and rental housing units on the corridor—without displacement of existing residents. It is anticipated that DDOT will perform a transportation and streetscape study of the corridor as a part of its planned streetcar service on the Avenue by 2018.	5
7	<b>Janice Booker</b> President, Booker Waddelle Development Company, Inc.	“Time did not permit me to complete my testimony for the hearing tonight, and I am asking that the record remain open	The District expects to submit the Small Area Plan resolution to DC Council. The DC Council will,	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	<i>(no written testimony provided)</i>	for 30 days to allow for submission of that testimony. I am also making that request on behalf of Anthony Hood, President of the Woodridge Neighborhood Association. The Association also wishes to have the record open for 30 days to submit testimony.”	thereafter, convene its own hearing on “Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District.” That public hearing will be yet another opportunity for area stakeholders to submit testimony about the plan.	
8	<b>Mary Nesnek</b> Resident – Brookland (16 <sup>th</sup> and Brentwood) <i>(no written testimony provided)</i>	“I have deep concerns about monitoring the quality of life and enforcement issues, and I realize these are not small area plan details, but I think the devil is in the details. I am on the board of the Greater Brookland Garden Club, and I also am an educator. I teach at Catholic University. I’m a lowly instructor, and I also teach in the special ed wing of the autism program at John Burroughs school where I also vote. And my concerns have to do with some way of rezoning or unzoning or rezoning the ability to have the plethora, the mushrooming of liquor stores and take-out alcohol. The bag laws where people can purchase one beverage with a bag and take it out. And I am concerned about the hotels that are zoned for 15-minute increments of rental property.”	Correct. These specific concerns are not small area plan issues rather than enforcement and policing issues.	N/A
9		“And I think it’s incredibly positive to consider a public art and landscaping, but I think that we have to enforce and take back the quality of life that is not there on a very dangerous strip of the	Public art can help to transform the perception of a place and can improve the quality of life for residents who live nearby. The plan includes a public arts	34-35



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	city, Rhode Island Avenue, which is not a safe place at this juncture.”	section for this exact reason. Many of the proposed locations for public art are in landscaped settings which should be considered in the public art planning process. No change is made to the Plan.	
	“My vision is based on my involvement with both education and with the Greater Brookland Garden Club. And I would think it would be very important to get corporate partnerships going and to have a vision for a green corridor, of green businesses on Rhode Island Avenue to sorta broaden the concept so that there is green transportation. And the introduction of trolleys, perhaps a toll road even or an EZ Pass so that we can collect some money. That is tongue and cheek. I don’t think that can be done.”	The District is open to the participation of a wide range of stakeholders in the reshaping of the image of the Rhode Island Avenue corridor. It is going to take a lot of sustained interest from a lot of folk to bring the corridor to a high productivity level. The Plan is written to allow this wide spectrum of investment.  The “Public Policy: Retail-Driven Plan” section has been edited to expressive a preference for “green” businesses. This edit is in addition to item “M. Adhere to DC Green Building standards” under the “Design and Development Guidelines” section on page 32 which was in the original draft.	4, 32
10	“But I think it would be terribly important to have a coherent plan where there is a juried group of architects who have a sense of the historic beauty of Rhode	The Plan includes “Design and Development Guidelines” which allow flexibility in design while strongly encouraging “[a] great	32



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	<p>Island Avenue and to engage serious arborist who would give design concepts of plantings and burying the wires so the entrance to the city would also involve a canopy of, not junk trees, but substantial green canopy trees in partnership with perhaps Casey Trees which is now moving to the neighborhood and I think it would be very important to bring in progressive architecture and green job development leaders in addition to this plan—perhaps engaging the University of Maryland Department of Environmental Sciences and the architecture / city planning of the universities of the area.”</p>	<p>level of creativity.” Item “H” under “Design and Development Guidelines also specifically states: “Employ modern and innovative design interpretations of local and neighborhood architecture without being overly historicist.”</p> <p>In response to the request for a design jury, the Plan now includes the following recommendation: “In order to provide guidance and a public forum for discussion, an overlay district with a design review process should be established along the Avenue. The DC Zoning Commission should be given the authority to review and approve all proposed uses, buildings, structures or any proposed exterior renovations to any existing buildings or structures that would result in an alteration of the exterior design.”</p> <p>Comments about the streetscape and burying of wires have been forwarded to the District Department of Transportation for consideration.</p>	
11	“My vision would be that there would be	The “Public Policy: Jobs &	5, 30-31



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>health centers in walking distance, small green businesses that would employ disabled people and there are any number that live in this neighborhood and also places for employment training and retraining, and mixed use housing, locally owned restaurants, a theatre, organic food stores, not another Popeyes, but that there be incentives to create tea shops and bookstores and art galleries and that there be an area where there can be locally owned businesses that perhaps use the employment of people who are disabled and live in this neighborhood. Job training.”</p>	<p>Apprenticeships” section has been edited to now read: “Avenue stakeholders want to support new development projects which directly benefits residents who live in the neighborhoods--with special interest in the employment of area disabled.” The remainder of this section continues to address issues of apprenticeships and jobs for Rhode Island Avenue area and other District residents.</p> <p>The “Tools for Implementing the Plan” section on pages 30-31 continues to provide information on the incentives available to Rhode Island Avenue stakeholders, including the CDBG, Enterprise Zones, DC Main Streets, and Supermarket Exemption Act incentives which are applicable to small businesses.</p>	
12	<p><b>Norman Glasgow, Jr.</b>          On behalf of Charles C. (“Sandy”) Wilkes, Chairman of the Wilkes Company (properties on the 500 block of Rhode Island Avenue)  <i>(full written testimony attached)</i></p>	<p>“In recent days, there has been growing interest in developing a stand-alone community college in our city. In my view, the Rhode Island Avenue corridor, served by the Red Line, would be a perfect location for such an educational resource. The plan, then, might discuss</p>	<p>The colleges and universities included in the Plan are four year private institutions presumably with increasing tuition rates. Within the current economic climate, families (particularly lower income and</p>	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	this possibility.”	<p>minority families) are finding higher education to be unaffordable and out of reach.</p> <p>Yet community colleges fill an important educational and economic role. There is growing enrollment across the country of students in 2 year colleges.</p> <p>Within the District, the University of the District of Columbia’s (UDC) Community College now leases space at 801 North Capitol Street NE. The properties around the Rhode Island - Brentwood Metrostation might typically be considered as a potential location for UDC’s Community College. However, the Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Support Act of 2009, Subtitle J Section 4091 granted UDC “exclusive use” of the Bertie Backus Middle School building and site at 5171 South Dakota Avenue, N.E., in Ward 5.</p> <p>However, if another location for a community college is sought, that college might consider a lease in one of the office buildings proposed in subarea 1.</p>	



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
13		<p>“Our company’s largest holding in the plan area is in the 500 block of Rhode Island Avenue, NE (Site B on p. 17 of the plan). The plan recommends a rezoning of our property from the industrial category, C-M-2, to the mixed-use category, C-2-C, ‘through the PUD process’. While we strongly endorse the recommendation of C-2-C zoning, we urge that the designation be by map amendment with our development permitted as a matter of right and not through the PUD process. C-2-C will provide a sufficient zoning envelope to facilitate redevelopment of our property from its current single-story retail use (‘AutoZone’) to a transit-oriented, mixed-use development. It will place appropriate density (a) on a major arterial (b) within a short walk of the Rhode Island-Brentwood Metro Station. There is no compelling public policy that warrants burdening our redevelopment with the cost, time and expense of a planned unit development application to the Zoning Commission. The Plan’s recommendation of C-2-C, by right, for Site E on p. 17, which has identical proximity to Metro Station, should similarly apply to Site B as a matter of equity and good planning. Since our</p>	<p>No change is made to the Plan.</p> <p>First, the connectivity and walkability within the Rhode Island Avenue – Brentwood Metrostation area is a priority so the Plan seeks to ensure that the scale of blocks is suitable for both pedestrians and for investors. Although the plan drawings are “conceptual,” they do approximate the optimal length of blocks to make for a pleasant pedestrian environment and preferred retail footprint while not overly limiting an investors ability to capitalize on potential zoning changes—generally in favor of the value of the investor’s property.</p> <p>More specifically, the conceptual alignment of the “New Street ‘3’ NE” on the south side of Rhode Island Avenue impacts the District’s parking for its fire station at 5<sup>th</sup> Street NE and Rhode Island Avenue as well as a portion of the AutoZone parking lot which still remains significant in size. Hypothetically, the proposed significant increase in the property owners zoning</p>	17, 32





**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	<p>company has a deep commitment to design excellence, we would be receptive to some form of design review.”</p>	<p>warrants the potential of some private contribution to facilitating the connectivity and walkability of this subsection of this Subarea, particularly if the property owner seeks matter of right zoning similar to the property owners in Site E (and Site F). Inclusion of New Street “3” also enables the private owner to provide vehicle parking away from Rhode Island Avenue while allowing him to maximize commercial / retail revenues.</p> <p>The plan recommends a zoning change through map amendment with development permitted matter of right as long as the property owners complies with design review through the DC Zoning Commission and to fund improving conditions immediate to their sites. The same recommendation shall also apply to the property owners of Site E and F as it relates to improvements needed to make Reed Street NE more walkable and connected to the broader transit oriented development area.</p>	
14	“Consideration should be given to an	The plan now includes the	32



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on *“Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District”*

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>overlay district or simple text amendment to promote the practice of combined lot development in all or parts of the plan area. Combined lot development is a proven, effective tool for urban revitalization (see Mount Vernon Triangle) and has a role to play in the Rhode Island Avenue corridor.”</p>	<p>following language: “In order to provide guidance and a public forum for discussion, an overlay district with a design review process should be established along the Avenue. Explore the benefits and potential ramifications of combined lot development on the implementation of this plan when establishing the overlay district.”</p>	
15		<p>“It appears in ‘Sub-Area 1 Retail Diagram’ on p. 17 that a road or alley is proposed that bisects our property as a new automobile connection between Rhode Island Avenue and W Street. We would appreciate removal of this through connection since such a slicing through the heart of our property will all but eliminate the opportunity for its redevelopment.”</p>	<p>The drawing is “conceptual” and subject to further detailed plans and specifications through the District Department of Transportation. The intent, however, is to increase pedestrian accessibility and connectivity through and within this transit oriented development (TOD) location.</p>	16-17
16		<p>“On p. 32, item ‘N’ should be modified to limit the number of garage entrances to one (1) that serve new buildings on Rhode Island Avenue in lieu of an absolute prohibition, as drafted.”</p>	<p>Item “O” provides such a limit for projects which meet the requirement of being “at least one half block in size.” It is important to maintain sidewalk space for pedestrians and to minimize conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.</p>	32
17		<p>“On p. 33, item ‘S’ should be modified to provide a ceiling height of 14’ from slab to slab rather than ‘ground level floor to finished ceiling’. A height of 14’ from slab</p>	<p>As a policy decision across many different corridors in the District, the District has a standard requirement of 14’</p>	33



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
18		to slab will provide more than adequate height for any type of retail, restaurant or service use.”	clear between ground level floor to finished ceiling. No changes made.	
		“Some discussion of the value and benefit of the inclusion of small urban parks would be a positive addition to the plan.”	The plan documents over 80 acres of open spaces and recreation parks within walking distance of the corridor while also maintaining open spaces between 13 <sup>th</sup> and 14 <sup>th</sup> Streets NE, at 17 <sup>th</sup> Street, and at Eastern Avenue. The plan also creates a new urban plaza at 18 <sup>th</sup> and Hamlin Streets NE. No change is needed.	8-9
19		“The plan might include a recommendation that a business improvement district (BID) be formed soon after adoption of the plan. The NoMA Small Area Plan and the Mount Vernon Triangle Action Agenda both made such a recommendation which was acted on in both instances.”	Both the “Small Business Development” and “Public Realm and Crime & Safety” sections of the plan now recommend formation of a BID.	5
20	<b>Cheryl Dixon</b> Resident <i>(no written testimony provided)</i>	“I was particularly impressed at some of the meeting you held and you talked about your walk down Rhode Island Avenue in the summer which was blazing hot, but I feel that the study is greatly skewed toward the 4 <sup>th</sup> Avenue end of the corridor. If you had started from Eastern Avenue, it would have been a whole different story. We lack so many of the basics. People have spoken about the need for bookstores, small	The plan responded to each subarea’s unique assets, characteristics, and constraints. It is highly unlikely that a different plan would have emerged had the walk began in a different location. The plan encourages a wide variety of neighborhood retail businesses for the entire corridor. The “Public Policy” section of the	4-5



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		grocers. I feel there is a definite need for better transportation, including the streetcar. I spoke today to your Mass Transit Division of DDOT who, in fact, encouraged me to put that in the plan.”	plan also includes recommendations for “Expansion of Transit Options.”	
21		“Some other things that I would like to definitely see emphasized is the need for green space which has already been mentioned.”	The plan documents over 80 acres of open spaces and recreation parks within walking distance of the corridor while also maintaining open spaces between 13 <sup>th</sup> and 14 <sup>th</sup> Streets NE, at 17 <sup>th</sup> Street, and at Eastern Avenue. The plan also creates a new urban plaza at 18 <sup>th</sup> and Hamlin Streets NE. No change is needed.	8-9
22		“I have concerns about Rhode Island Avenue being an arts district. I would like to see that highly regulated. I feel that if we were going to get make this arts district, an arts district should be equal to a historic district. I would like to see in each subarea a arts commission appointed so that we can have the finest available.”	The District of Columbia currently has a Commission on the Arts and Humanities which collaborates citywide. No change is needed.  The proposed arts district is centered around historic structures in Subarea 3.	20-21
23		“I have concerns about the signs and billboards that exist along Rhode Island Avenue. Recently there was legislation regarding the disapproval ... ummm ... we still have that in subarea 2. What will be done to remove those sorts of signs?”	No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
24		“And so basically those are my major concerns. I am supportive of doing the	No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>best that we can for Rhode Island Avenue, but I felt that the survey and the study was skewed. As I mentioned, if you had started from Eastern Avenue going west it would have been a whole different story. Thank you.”</p>		
	<p><b>Dwight Ellard</b>            Greater Mount Calvary Holy Church  <i>(full written testimony attached)</i></p>	<p>“The Church’s properties are within the Rhode Island Avenue Metro Land Use Change Area designated on the Generalized Policy Map of the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The properties are shown in the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan in the mixed use medium density commercial/high density residential, mixed use moderate density commercial/moderate density residential and production, distribution and repair categories. The Church believes that the combined effect of these two Comprehensive Plan maps is to suggest that high density residential with commercial and institutional uses included would be the most appropriate development for this area.</p> <p>“The current zoning applicable to the Church’s properties is C-3-A and C-M-2. The C-M-2 District is an industrial zone which does not allow residential development and which permits a height of only 60 feet. The C-3-A District only permits a height of 65 feet. The Church believes that reducing the level of</p>	<p>The plan recommends a zoning change through map amendment with development permitted matter of right as long as the property owners complies with design review through the DC Zoning Commission and to fund improving conditions immediate to their sites.</p>	<p>17</p>



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		commercial development now permitted would be an appropriate trade-off to increase the overall height and the amount of residential development permitted. The Church therefore suggests and recommends that the Plan be clarified to provide that the properties be allowed to achieve a level of development equivalent to the C-2-C zone, which would allow a matter-of-right height of 90 feet and a matter-of-right FAR of 6.0”		
25	<b>Philip Blair</b> ANC 5A10 <i>(full written testimony is included here and is attached)</i>	“The Rhode Island Avenue Small Area Plan (SAP) has had an unusual genesis. The lead District of Columbia Agency was not the Office of Planning, but rather the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development. The initial community input process was for a Great Streets initiative, and only after much of that public process had been completed did the effort become one to create a Small Area Plan. The ‘small area’ involved is very large, a three-mile stretch of a major arterial avenue and the adjoining areas.”	The Executive Branch has prepared this Small Area Plan and the Mayor is submitted it to the Council for approval. No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
26		“Small Area Plans are more than suggestive guides for development; they actually can change the zoning status of tracts of land, drastically changing the kinds of development which are feasible for a tract. This proposed SAP is presented at a time when the nation is	No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on *“Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District”*

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		waiting for a commercial property value crash to echo the housing market value crash which is in process. In such difficult economic times, District resources are severely strained by new needs and declining revenues; commercial property owners and developers are especially eager to receive help from the District.”		
27		“The chief mechanism for providing such support envisioned by the draft SAP is Tax Increment Financing, TIFs. But in uncertain times, TIFs are inherently risky; essentially, the District counts its chickens (incremental revenues) as hatched when the egg-laying hen (the additional development) is not even born yet. It requires great discipline to manage TIFs responsibly; hopes and would-ovs and could-ovs and should-ovs can’t take the place of real money, and unwise TIFs can drive the District deeper into a financial hole.”	Tax Increment Financing is but one potential financing tool to which the plan document refers.	26-31
28		FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “So I have certain concerns about the TIF process here. Also TIFs tend to help big developers and not small businessmen.”	The plan document also references property tax abatements, community development block grants, enterprise zone incentives and other which can benefit small business persons. No change is needed to the plan document.	26-31
29		“The loss of businesses along Rhode Island Avenue is serious and getting	The plan aims to provide a framework for continued	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>more serious very fast. In my own SMD, Saints-Bourbon Street and Bubba’s Muskogee have closed recently; the Rhode Island Safeway at the east end of the SAP area may well be lost, which will endanger all business in that commercial strip; and even the Post Office on Rhode Island in Woodridge is threatened with closure. Development planned for the Rhode Island Avenue Metro site has stalled.”</p>	<p>reinvestment along the entire corridor over a 20 year period. No change is needed to the plan document.</p> <p>Construction of the Rhode Island Avenue Metro project is underway.</p>	
30		<p>“The factual portions of the draft SAP are useful to the community as we look to the future of Rhode Island Avenue and the surrounding areas.”</p>	<p>No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A
31		<p>“The parts of the draft that project future development show signs of hasty editing. For example, Subarea 3 is defined one way on one place and another way in another. The block between 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Streets is in Subarea 2 in the section captions pages 13 and 14, but in the prose on page 14 it is part of Subarea 3; on page 20 it is mapped as part of Subarea 3. These editing lapses make the document unnecessarily difficult to understand for the ordinary reader.”</p>	<p>The Subarea boundaries have been tightened to more specifically focus only on the commercially zoned sections of Rhode Island Avenue.</p>	All
32		<p>“In fact, the text on pages 13-14 largely duplicates without summarizing the text on pp. 16-25; pages 13-14 should be removed as redundant, after checking to see that no important information is lost.</p>	<p>Incorrect statement. Information on pages 13-14 is about existing conditions, what is currently allowed under existing zoning and is meant to provide (1)</p>	13-25





**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on *“Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District”*

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	The maps for the second section (pp. 16-25 have the advantage of being readable and usable; those of pp.13-14 are useless.”	information about how extremely underused the corridor is and (2) a framework or base for recommendations. Pages 16-25 in some cases recommend zoning changes and upgrades. No change is needed to the plan document.	
33	“Page 5 states: ‘As this plan specifically focuses on commercially-zoned properties which contain no housing, this plan does not encourage or support displacement of any existing residents.’ This is a promise to which the current residents of Rhode Island Avenue will hold you, and no zoning implication of the SAP should be allowed to vitiate this commitment, despite the obvious temptation to do so in a number of areas.”	No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
34	“In fact, the temptation to replace single-family homes has already led to breaking the promise: Site F in Subarea 1 (west of 12 <sup>th</sup> Street) is one of several possible examples.”	The reference is incorrect. Subarea 1 Site F is all industrial or commercial. No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
35	“What is the un-named ‘sub-area which is ideal for a future DC Main Streets [program]? (Page 5.) Is this Site C in Subarea 3? (See p. 14.)”	Recommendations for Subarea 3 clearly states: “Explore establishing a future DC Main Street within this zone ...” No change is needed to the plan document.	21
36	“In connection with Site C in Subarea 3, the area considered for a Great Streets	The “Realizing the Plan Through Public Policy: Retail-Driven Plan”	4



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>program, there is language that seems to apply to the entire corridor:            ‘Recommendation: ... Prohibit licenses issued to storefront churches, check cashing services, and other similarly redundant uses which tend not to enliven the streetscape <u>here especially and throughout the entire corridor.</u>’            [Emphasis added.]</p> <p>“Residents of that area would surely add addiction treatment facilities, half-way houses, and group residential facilities to the list of unlicensed uses. However, the justice and wisdom of such prohibitions should be carefully considered and much better explained, and this recommendation should be moved to a less hidden place and made application to the whole corridor, if it is to be doable. ‘Similarly redundant uses’ is a term without any discernable meaning. And of course this issue is not the existence of a reasonable number of such facilities, but their undue concentration in a few restricted areas.”</p>	<p>section of the plan applies to the entire corridor and includes the following language: “...new licenses for storefront churches, check cashing services, addiction treatment facilities, half-way houses, and group residential facilities are extremely limited or prohibited.”            The exact limits will be determined through a re-zoning of the corridor in accordance with this plan and possibly through an overlay zoning district.</p>	
37		<p>“For many reasons, the most important effect of SAPs is to amend the Comprehensive Plan by modifying current zoning. The document would be very much improved by a table showing exactly what zoning changes are merely recommended or actually implemented</p>	<p>The SAP only recommends land use and zoning changes to be approved by the DC Council. Actual zoning changes occur through a re-zoning effort and approved by the Zoning Commission. No change is</p>	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>by the SAP. There is remarkably vague language in many places where zoning changes (always up-zoning) are mentioned. Citizens deserve a clear statement of this critical information in order to be able to make decisions that take into account their own legitimate self-interests and the interests of the city are large.”</p>	<p>needed to the plan document.</p>	
38	<p><b>Leroy Hall</b>            Resident  <i>(Transcribed from the official videocopy of the public hearing referenced above)</i></p>	<p>“The vast majority of the community have not been given proper notice of the plans for Rhode Island Ave. We were not consulted about what we wanted to happen to R.I.Ave.”</p>	<p>Four very well attended public meetings were held on November 6, 2008; December 10, 2008; February 24, 2009; and March 10, 2009. At least two of those public meetings were recorded and broadcast on DC Cable. Over 200 area and Mount Rainier stakeholders participated in those workshops. The draft of the plan was released on June 17, 2009. A notices of SAP public hearing was published in the DC Register on January 29, 2010 (Vol. 57 No. 5 on Pages 1079-1080). The SAP public hearing was held on March 1, 2010.</p> <p>Throughout the public process, 2300 postcards were mailed to area stakeholders. Notices were posted on the DMPED website and on area listserves (i.e.,</p>	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
			<p>Brookland, Edgewood, etc.)            Direct notices were sent to impacted ANCs.</p> <p>Upon decision to move forward with a SAP, copies of the plan were made available in DMPED, impacted ANCs, Ward 5 Council office, Woodridge Library and online.</p> <p>No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	
39		<p>“Most of the few meetings you held were not in established ANC or Civic meetings. These plans cannot be legitimate unless they originated in the community rather than some outside interests who don’t live here.”</p>	<p>Not a correct statement. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A
40		<p>“Just because a small percentage of people invited to the City by former Mayor Anthony Williams come to a few special meetings, does not justify pushing this development. The Mayor, Council, O. P. DDOT, DPW and Zoning may want this development to raise tax revenue, but it has to go through the whole community.”</p>	<p>Over 200 area and Mount Rainier stakeholders participated in those workshops. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A
41		<p>“They have been catering too long giving special treatment to new arrivals while continuing to ignore the long standing concerns of long-established residents.”</p>	<p>A number of the 200 area stakeholders who participated in the workshops were long term residents of the surrounding neighborhoods. No change is</p>	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
42		“How much money and time was spent on this without full community examination? I repeat, if it did not originate in the community, it’s not legitimate.”	needed to the plan document. The total planning process cost approximately \$300,000 for professional consulting services. This was announced publicly in the earliest public workshops. No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
43		“Therefore, I want these proposals to be handed to our own local planners and architects for examination. We would get back to you later with our recommendations. We have at least two architects and planners in the community. I have handed out information put out by one of them tonight.”	Local planners and architects developed the plan in consultation with area stakeholders. No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
44		FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “Concerning the trees on Rhode Island. If Rhode Island is going to be development when did you start thinking about that? It was pushed into a very sad state when PEPCO was allowed to destroy over a hundred trees all the way to the District line and I have been fighting with DDOT for years.	The land use plan is not a streetscape plan. However, the does encourage a vibrant, inviting and pedestrian-friendly environment which would include maintenance of the tree canopy. No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
45		FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “Another thing is the development at the Metro station. My understanding is that the trees would be cut to add condos. ‘This is totally unacceptable,’ I said several years ago when they first talked about that project at Rhode Island Metro, ‘That	The plan links certain zoning changes and investments to a strategy to remove power lines and to bury them underground as a condition of re-zoning approval.	16-23



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>we didn't want another Georgetown. And no Starbucks.' The first thing we should think about is how can we reclaim the beauty of the trees—the tree canopy on Rhode Island and removing the power lines and putting them underground is a key to that. That includes not only beautification, but necessity to remove the power lines from being a danger to the community. We just had a snow storm and then we had a wind storm and power was going ... My power went out several times the other day. Fortunately it came back on quickly.”</p>		
46		<p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “I think the city should give some small businesses ... if you really want to help the small businesses that exist, give them some loans or grants so they can upgrade to improve the appearances and so that they better serve the community.”</p>	<p>The “Tools for Implementing the Plan” section of the plan includes a recommendation of tools (i.e., property tax abatements, community development block grants, and enterprise zone incentives) which are applicable to small businesses. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	26-31
47		<p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “I also would like some questions answered on why the city is ... pushing development but closing our inspection station and our Department of Motor Vehicle Branch. These are the things we need. These are things we have been talking about for years. And here comes someone with pretty pictures telling they</p>	<p>Separate and unrelated government actions which were vetted publicly. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
48		<p>gonna give us something for our tax money. I think we should have this.”</p> <p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “I repeat, I want the project to be handed for scrutiny to our local architects. If I can have that assurance ... I am a draftsman. And the two architects that I know we will get together and look over the plans and see if we can upgrade them.”</p>	<p>Local planners and architects developed the plan in consultation with area stakeholders. The proposed architects had the opportunity to participate in all of the public meetings and to provide comments into this planning process. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A
49		<p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “I object to ninety foot height for anything because that would just open the door for New York City. Thank you.”</p>	<p>Proposed density and zoning changes are consistent with the District’s transit oriented development policy. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A
50	<p><b>Hazel Thomas</b>          Chair, Premier Community Development Corporation  <i>(Transcribed from the official videocopy of the public hearing referenced above)</i></p>	<p>“Premier CDC was not invited to participate in this process. PCDC has undertaken and completed a detailed study of the RI Ave corridor and has worked with the number one land use organization in the world, The Urban Land Institute, and completed a detailed study of the commercial corridor here on Rhode Island Ave. However, we were only invited to send in our reports and our historic analysis. If this is indicative of how you treat the community you are proposing to develop, PCDC rejects your condescension and disrespect and hopes that you understand that as stakeholders this sets a bad tone.”</p>	<p>Premier CDC was invited to and attended a preliminary meeting with development stakeholders to understand why they had sought to invest on Rhode Island Avenue. Premier CDC then attended the public workshops. When asked if they might share their prior report, Premier CDC declined. The report was obtained from the Urban Land Institute. The scope of the report was significantly less than this planning document. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on *“Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District”*

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
51	<p>“PCDC has hosted several focus groups on the subject of how residents would like to see Rhode Island Ave developed. Therefore we have an intimate knowledge of what residents want and don’t want. Universally, most residents have said that they do not want big box development. Rather, residents prefer small ma and pa businesses.”</p>	<p>The plan strongly encourages the participation of a wide range of businesses sizes and ownership structures. The plan recognizes that most of Subarea 3 will likely be populated by local and potentially small business owners. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	4, 5, 16-23
52	<p>“PCDC recommends that with no budget, there will be no development. Therefore. PCDC recommends that the city put its money where its mouth is and allocate the proper resources to jumpstart development. Residents in this ignored corridor have patiently waited for development only to be told that development is over twenty years off. We reject this timetable and call on the City to put up adequate resources now.”</p>	<p>The “Tools for Implementing the Plan” includes a range of resources which the District can apply to realizing the recommendations of the plan. No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	30-31
53	<p>“PCDC and the residents in this neighborhood are against the proliferation of the following types of businesses: more storefront churches, liquour stores, car lots and social service businesses. This corridor is saturated with these “redundant businesses” and PCDC calls on the city to restrict further marginalization of this corridor. In fact, PCDC calls upon the city to declare a moratorium on these types of businesses.”</p>	<p>The plan allows room for this recommendation to be explored through a re-zoning process.</p>	4
54	<p>“PCDC also calls on the city to declare a</p>	<p>The plan allows room for this</p>	4, 32





**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on *“Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District”*

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		moratorium against anymore fast food business locating on this corridor.”	recommendation to be explored through a re-zoning and overlay district process.	
55		“PCDC wants this corridor to be developed by local businesses not outsiders. Thus, the DC Deputy Mayor’s Office approach of calling together developers beforehand and advising them to assemble parcels on RI Ave is counterproductive to PCDC’s notion of community development.”	The plan strongly encourages local participation in the redevelopment process.	4
56		“PCDC believes that RI Ave should get the same level of funding or more than was allocated fro the Brookland Community, upwards of ten million dollars for streetscaping and art and that all power lines should be undergrounded.”	The plan recommends a pool of resources which might be applied to finance public infrastructure improvements. No change is needed to the plan document.	31
57		“PCDC believes that RI Ave can support more affordable housing but believes that DC residents should have a preference for all housing building with government funds.”	The plan contains a section on “Housing & Affordability” under the “Realizing the Plan Through Public Policy” section. No change is needed to the plan document.	5
58		“PCDC advocates that local businesses should be mandatorily included in all development projects on this important corridor with a measurable percentage of business and jobs.”	The “Realizing the Plan Through Public Policy” section includes recommendations about business development, jobs and apprenticeships. No change is needed to the plan document.	5
59		FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “Ummm ... we, in particular, we have worked on a gateway project at Eastern Avenue	The District received and reviewed PCDC’s funding request and recommended an	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		and Rhode Island Avenue – Eastern and Rhode Island Avenues – and we would like to see local architects and engineers and other businesses involved in the development. We’d like to see the dollar turn over at least once in the District. At least once.”	approach which PCDC has not followed up on to the District’s knowledge. No change is needed to the plan document.	
60		“Local residents should have a continued say in the development of this important corridor and to that end, PCDC believes that this process should be further vetted within the Ward 5 community which is in no rush to rezone this area into a concrete jungle without the desired amenities and community concerns addressed in a comprehensive fashion.”	Local stakeholders and the ANCs play an integral role in the implementation of all SAPs citywide. No change is needed to the plan document.	N/A
61		FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “A final note ... Aesthetics matter. They matter a great deal. I would like to see our Rhode Island Avenue be as beautiful as other as other avenues that have been developed in the city. And that means adequate greenspace development. Certainly, we want to see appropriate streetscape, setback, and preferably where it is possible, we’d like to see more the attractive architecture that is in keeping with the landscape around it— not the landscape—but the streetscape around it.”	The “Tools for Implementing the Plan” section of the plan includes “Design and Development Guidelines.” No change is needed to the plan document.	32-33
62		FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “And final thing would be that ...we’d like to see	Addressed in multiple locations above. No change is needed to	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		small and we'll underscore it ... we'd like to see small and minority businesses in that development.”	the plan document.	
63	<b>Eugene Ford, Sr.</b> Owner, Brookland Manor Apartments <i>(no written testimony provided)</i>	FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “I would like to speak to the area designated as ... in Area 2 as A-1 and it surrounds ... I represent the ownership of Brookland Apartments which wrap around this area designated A-1 in this area study. We share the frontage along Rhode Island Avenue between Brentwood Road and Montana Avenue with that shopping center. We have apartment buildings in that area. Our property covers 16 ½ acres on ... on property on five squares. These apartments are seven years old ... and are nearing the end of its useful life and will undoubtedly have some sort of renewal plan in the next 10 to 20 years. The A-1 parcel ... consists on no less than two acres of ground. The various stores is part of the frontage in that square on Rhode Island Avenue and it backs up to 14 <sup>th</sup> Street. The recommendations proposed do not solve the issues if this property is to become a long range community asset. It really has little space for parking. It's limited in its depth by 14 <sup>th</sup> Street. It also ... it also accepts deliveries for the stores along 14 <sup>th</sup> Street in which there are seven apartment entrances on that street in that block. Liquor store with a rear	The existing shopping center at Montana Avenue may be eligible for historic designation, but is not currently landmarked. If Mr. Ford is proposing potential demolition of the shopping center, the plan does not prevent or prohibit that action, but that action would be subject to applicable demolition or landmarking processes. The plan states “Reposition existing shopping center with improved mix of new and enhanced retail uses and types (50,000 square feet.)”	19



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	entrance on 14 <sup>th</sup> Street is also a social problem in the area. By my speaking here with a ... I don't think it would be a good thing if the recommendations in this plan affected negatively the consideration in the future a possible mixed proposed use plan that reasonably satisfied the availability of commercial—which seems to be your goal in maintaining this property. Do I understand that the status of this plan if adopted is a what might be useful but would not be an impediment to a zoning action or a ... zoning action?		



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on *“Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District”*

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
64		<p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “If it were part of a plan, whether ... first I think you need to address some of the streets in that area in terms of long range use. I’m assuming that whatever the residential ... and the residents needs are would be accommodated and thought of in whatever was proposed. The ... I just would not like to see a proclivity set up to resist something that wasn’t in the plan and the only thing affected by that plan is the A-1 commercial parcel which I don’t think is a particularly big asset. It’s my opinion. The ... What I am saying ... what I am asking you I guess is whether the adoption of a plan with as you’ve proposed the maintenance of that A-1 parcel, is apt to prejudice some future action that takes care of considerations in some other way? I am saying that another use in the context of ... in my judgment it oughta be made somewhat larger or eliminated, that is what I think, but ... but it’s just too constrained a site to be economically sustainable as an asset to that community in my opinion over the long run. I ain’t not proposing to do anything really. What I don’t want to preclude is some ... fresh look at that ... It may well be that the rest of the frontage along Rhode Island Avenue for instance oughta be devoted to them ... to that</p>	<p>If Mr. Ford is proposing demolition of the shopping center, the plan does not prevent or prohibit that action, but that action would be subject to applicable demolition or landmarking processes.</p>	19



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>use. It would make for some parking inconvenience. I am just saying that what you are proposing isn't a particularly good thing to get into a box that you can't make into a different shape. That's all I am saying.”</p>		
65	<p><b>William Shelton</b>          Chair, ANC 5B  <i>(no written testimony provided)</i></p>	<p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “I am here to represent ANC 5B01 which covers Brentwood Road to Franklin Street in the plan. I am also here as the Chairperson of ANC 5B that has several parcels a part of Rhode Island Avenue. One of the things I just want to do is to pledge my support for the work that was done on this Great Streets. It is not ... There are some things that need tweaked, but I do want to commend Mr. Woody and his ... the team for really going out of their way to make sure that this process was very much vetted. I mean I think I attended pretty much all of those meetings that were held. I think that they were very much upfront about involving the affected ANCs from Rhode Island Station all the way to Mount Rainier which impact all three commissions. I think that our commission has ... I think we had the bulk of the Great Streets plan. And I think our commissioners really do support starting this process. I think many of us who have grown up in Washington really realize that</p>	<p>No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	<p>N/A</p>



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	<p>unfortunately Rhode Island Avenue – I guess we can ... might ... maybe say they saved the best for last. But I think it's an opportunity for us to really shape and make Rhode Island Avenue look like many of the other areas that have been designated Great Streets.</p>		
66	<p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “Two of the things that my community wanted to make sure were included in the plan and I think that they have begun to be ... is the Brentwood Shopping Center. We just want to make sure that everything around that shopping center is not brought up to speed, and the shopping center is left as this desolate, run-down kinda shopping center. It’s really much outdated. For those of us who shopped in that shopping center, those of us who live around that shopping center really realize that that shopping center really has potential, but it’s not reaching its potential as the way it is now.</p>	<p>The following language changes were made in the document:</p> <p>“3. Analyze making the intersection of Rhode Island Avenue NE, Montana Avenue NE, 14th Street NE and Evarts Street NE safer for pedestrians by eliminating Evarts Street NE between Rhode Island Avenue and Saratoga Avenue.</p> <p>“4. Explore potential to create better pad sites by reconfiguring roadways once Evarts Street NE is eliminated per item 3 above. Mitigate impact on existing Channing Street residents quality of life.”</p>	19
67	<p>FROM VERBAL TESTIMONY: “The other concern that my constituents had was the one way designation of Evarts Street. They were very concerned about what that could potentially do to the neighborhood itself, and what that would do specifically if you try to open it up on</p>	<p>See previous response above. This issue will be vetted through a transportation and streetscape planning process to be managed by the DDOT.</p>	19



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	<p>the side of the Rite-Aid, and they were very concerned with that.</p> <p>”I think that Mr. Woody attended a meeting that several of my constituents were there, and they voiced their opinion, and we just want to make sure that whatever is the decision is going to be finally made with this is that DDOT has definitely vetted this process through and the community has an opportunity once again, whatever decisions are made, to make sure that their input is heard.</p> <p>“But I do want to pledge our support for this. We really think that this the Great Streets plan is a good plan, and we really want to work together with the staff of Derrick Woody and the staff of the Deputy Mayor’s Office for Economic Development to make sure that this plan comes to fruition.”</p>		





**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
68	<p><b>Chester A. McPherson</b>            Resident  <i>(full written testimony is included here and is attached)</i></p>	<p>“My comments concerns the recommendations for <b>SITE C</b> of Subarea 4 as described on page 23 of Draft, ‘Rhode Island Avenue, Diamond of the District.’ I note the recommendation to ‘[p]reserve and rehabilitate [the] existing B&amp;T Garage Building’ with the recommendation to add an additional floor for parking off Otis Street N.E. I object to the recommendation for an additional floor to the B&amp; T Garage Building (“B&amp;T Garage”). Currently, the upper section of the B&amp;T Garage that is accessible via only an alleyway off Otis Street, N.E. is being used as an auto mechanic repair shop. The operators of the B&amp;T Garage currently use the residential 3000 Block of Otis Street, N.E. (the “Block”) for overflow parking in connection with their auto repair operations. This has resulted in massive and untold inconveniences for those of use who live on the Block. I note that the recommended additional floor is to provide off street parking. However, in my view, this recommendation is an invitation to intensify the severity and degree of the hardship currently experienced by the residents of the Block. At its current size, the B&amp;T Garage is not a responsible and respectful neighbor. The operators of the B&amp;T garage overrun the Block with broken down cars and trucks, which are often left parked for days on the Block in front of residences. Repeated requests to the operator to cease parking the cars on the Block have gone unanswered.”</p>	<p>The recommendation is to preserve the building and not the use. In addition to the statement which reads “Relocate or remove all existing uses away from the Avenue,” the following has been changed / added to address the confusion: “Adaptively re-use 3010 Rhode Island Avenue with retail.”</p>	23



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		<p>“I have no confidence that the situation will improve with an expansion of the B&amp;T Garage, even if it is designated for ‘off street parking.’ In my view, the additional space will simply result in compounding rather than resolving the existing parking situation on the Block. Therefore, I object to the recommendation and urge the elimination of that portion of the Draft.”</p>		
69	<p><b>Debbie Steiner</b>          (formerly Debbie Smith)          Former ANC 5C09 and Former 3 term president,          Edgewood Civic Association  <i>(Transcribed from the official videocopy of the public hearing referenced above)</i></p>	<p>“Ward 5 is home of several prominent individuals as well as, blue-collar workers and senior population as we are the largest Ward in the city. With that said, it is truly unfortunate that this Ward carries the most undesirable social services, retail, warehousing districts throughout. While we have had an influx of new neighbors, they have also grown tired of the continued blighted buildings, low lighting, unattractive facades, rusty industrial sites, with no amenities.”</p>	<p>No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
70		<p>“The Rhode Island Avenue plans represents comeuppances of desirable services and change that has not been on anyone radar until now. The current plan allows for mix uses on that corridor that has escaped this Ward repeatedly while other Wards have seen progress. This plan allows for a positive change while enticing new residents to the area that are sorely needed.”</p>	<p>No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
71		<p>“The Downtown area of the Rhode</p>	<p>No change is needed to the plan</p>	<p>17</p>



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	<p>Island Avenue Plan rids our community of the warehouse district that has been an eyesore for too long with no ending in site. This community deserves eateries, upscale shopping, and high end grocers to accommodate our expected residents with the new desired residents willing to unfold.”</p>	<p>document, but the plan does recommend a new grocery store, anchoring retail and local businesses in this subarea.</p>	
72	<p>“As a prior Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner of SMD 5C09 of 10 years, who chaired the Economic Development Committee, prior 3 term president of the Edgewood Civic Association, I know all too well, the importance of development with the right mix. The detractors might say that we are moving the low-income residents out; I will not elaborate on that even though change is needed for this Ward and quickly. WE have to find a way to assist those who have been here in this city through the rough times but it should not stop those of us who are begging for inner city services without having to travel to another state.”</p>	<p>No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A
73	<p>“Constantly you hear how residents in this Ward are going out of the city for services. With this plan, it will create a vibrant area that will spur continued growth that can exceed expectations once implemented. If we are to have a ‘World Class City’ it comes with a direct vision and the need to diversify and</p>	<p>No change is needed to the plan document.</p>	N/A



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
74	<p><b>William J. Barrow, III</b>            Executive Director, H Street CDC  <i>(written testimony submitted via mail and full written testimony attached)</i></p>	<p>deliver services to ‘All’.”</p> <p>“H Street Community Development Corporation is the owner of an approximately 40,000 square feet site at 2313-21 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W. (Square 3629, Lot 808) in the Edgewood community. Through an approved Planned Unit Development (PUD), HSCDC will be allowed to develop a 90 feet residential building with 170-units, with 3000 square feet of retail space on the first floor and 128 underground parking spaces. The project has been delayed because of the downturn in residential market. However, HSCDC is still excited by the future of this project.</p> <p>“2313-21 4<sup>th</sup> Street, NE is located in Subarea 1- Site D and we do have a concern which if incorporated in the draft small area plan would assist in the facilitation of the stated objectives.</p> <p>“HSCDC suggests that the zoning of Subarea 1-Site D be changed to allow a development density of high density mixed use (6.0 FAR) and a height of 90 feet as a matter-of-right. Our approved PUD permitted a 90 foot height and 4.5 FAR. We believe that the elements in the C-2-C zoning are most appropriate for our site in Subarea1-D. The Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive</p>	<p>The plan recommends a zoning change through map amendment with development permitted matter of right as long as the property owners complies with design review through the DC Zoning Commission and to fund improving conditions immediate to their sites.</p> <p>As of October 23, 2010, Zoning Commission Order No. 05-25 regarding the PUD for this project and 05-25A for the extension of this project to start construction may have expired as it does not appear that the HSCDC has pulled building permits to construct the proposed project.</p> <p>The drawings in the plan are conceptual and meant to convey a preferred scenario.</p>	16-17



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
 Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: [mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf](https://mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf)

Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
	<p>Plan provides for high density residential on the Edgewood Terrace property to the north and for moderate density mixed use on the shopping center property to the south and east. We think that allowing additional residential density on our site would be an appropriate trade-off for reducing the level of commercial development now permitted as a matter-of-right.</p> <p>“Zoning elements of C-2-C is more appropriate because of its close proximity to the Rhode Island Avenue Metrorail Development Opportunity Area and because it will allow more flexibility to property owners in redeveloping their sites with development parameters outlined the draft plan.</p> <p>“HSCDC seeks clarification of the massing drawing on page 16 of the ‘Transit Oriented Development’ section before commenting. HSCDC’s site is located in D-2 and shows our site being incorporated into a larger development structure. It suggests that the District through its power of eminent domain will be consolidating sites to arrive at the massing outlined in the drawing. We believe that the Plan must be clarified to state that this drawing is an illustrative massing only, that it does not reflect</p>		



**District of Columbia Government**  
**Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning & Economic Development**  
Comments and Responses on “*Rhode Island Avenue: Diamond of the District*”

March 1, 2010

Official videocopy of the public hearing is available at: <mms://primary.octtmedia.com/channel16/3163.asf>

	Stakeholder	Comments / Issues	Responses & Actions	Page (s)
		current property ownership and that it is not intended to suggest or require that properties be combined or divided in the way that the buildings are laid out on the drawing.”		