



District of Columbia Government
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A
PO Box 15020
Washington, DC 20003



July 26, 2026

H Street Land Use and Market Study
Office of Planning
hstreetstudy@dc.gov
<https://publicinput.com/hstreetstudyfeedback>

Re: ANC 6A Comments regarding H Street Land Use and Market Study

Dear Office of Planning:

At a regularly scheduled and properly noticed¹ meeting on July 9, 2026, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A voted 6-0-0 (with four Commissioners (4) required for a quorum) to authorize Chair Gove and Commissioners Burger, Butler, Hammer and Shapiro to finalize and submit the below comments, based on feedback from Commissioners, Committee Members and Residents. These comments were further reviewed and augmented at the Commission's Transportation and Public Space Committee meeting on July 20, 2026.

We have deliberately kept three things distinct in this letter: what ANC 6A is asking the Office of Planning to do today, material cited only as background, and the positions of the Greater H Street BID that converge with our own. Please see the footnote below further describing the relationship between the comments in letter, the ANC's historical reference and the Position of the H Street BID.²

¹ ANC 6A meetings are advertised electronically on anc-6a@googlegroups.com, and in newhilleast@groups.io, at www.anc6a.org, and through print advertisements in the *Hill Rag*.

² This letter also cites material from the ANC 6A website archive going back roughly two decades. Where used, it is clearly marked below in shaded "Historical context" call-outs and is included only as institutional memory — evidence that an issue has a long track record, or a citation OP/DDOT/DMPED that can be pointed back to. Note: These historical positions are not offered as, and should not be read as, the Commission's current position. This matters here in particular because the Commission's own outlook has changed substantially since much of that archive was written. Today's ANC 6A is markedly more supportive of housing growth and density, more skeptical of parking minimums and use restrictions that result in empty storefronts, and more focused on reinvigorating the H Street corridor — and a city — that works for residents of all ages and backgrounds. Where an older position (for example, our 2010–11 opposition to up-zoning on H Street) runs counter to that current outlook, this letter says so explicitly, **so OP does not mistake archival material for where the Commission stands today.**

A Note on the BID Association's Parallel Comments

The Greater H Street BID Association — a 501(c)(6) nonprofit incorporated to pursue business improvement district designation for the corridor, and not yet designated as a BID by the District — separately submitted its own letter of comments on this same interim report, also due July 26, 2026. Where a BID recommendation lines up with, or usefully extends a point already in this draft, we've flagged it in green below. These green flags show a shared business-and-resident view on these issues; they reflect the BID's position, and any Commission decision to adopt BID-sourced language as our own position.

1. Overarching Comment: Match the Ambition to the Moment

Our strongest and most consistent feedback is that OP's preliminary recommendations, while individually reasonable, do not yet rise to the scale of the opportunity — or the risk — facing H Street. The data in the OP report a 20% drop in H Street visitation since 2019, a 26% ground-floor vacancy, and an eastern segment down 36% in visitation. One of ANC6A's Commissioners concluded that the corridor is "like a trauma patient that can survive with appropriate care," but OP's recommendations "often constitute little more than plastic surgery."

We believe that the final plan should be bold and comprehensive and should explicitly integrate H Street with the Starburst Plaza/Hechinger Mall redevelopment and the DDOT/WMATA planning already underway for the new RFK Stadium campus (opening 2030). This is a narrow window: an integrated, fast-tracked, and creatively funded redevelopment strategy for H Street timed to RFK's opening could be transformative, while a piecemeal approach risks leaving the H Street corridor further behind as investment concentrates around Union Market, NoMa, and RFK itself.

Current position — specific gaps we'd like OP to address in the next phase:

- **A redefinition of how properties are classified and taxed as “vacant and blighted,”** including closing the exemption and appeal loopholes that allow owners of long-vacant buildings to avoid the higher Class 3 and Class 4 tax rates. We specifically oppose the policy to allow a building to be deemed occupied based on consolidation of multiple buildings into a single tax record, with minimal occupancy. With the closing of loopholes related to Class 3 and 4 taxes, the resulting incremental tax revenue should be earmarked for the corridor itself — funding redevelopment, re-occupancy incentives, and direct support for new business start-ups on H Street, including small-business lending at a meaningfully larger scale than existing programs provide rather than flowing into general revenue.
- **Identify a single all-of-government expeditor for the H Street corridor.** We ask OP to recommend one named, accountable point of contact empowered to move a development project or a new business through zoning review, the Department of Buildings permitting, DDOT public space permitting, business licensing, the Department of Health, ABCA, and DMPED grant and loan programs in parallel rather than in sequence. Today an operator opening on H Street navigates each of these agencies separately, and the resulting delay is itself a barrier to occupancy. We ask that this role be established and maintained at least until corridor vacancy and occupancy metrics reach agreed target levels. Only after these metrics are met could the position then be reassessed or sunset. This is the practical form of the all-of-government approach to the corridor needs: without a single office accountable for clearing the path, individual recommendations in this study will continue to stall in sequence.
- **A real gap analysis identifying and specifically recruiting missing anchor uses** — through zoning relief, expedited permitting, and/or tax incentives, efforts should be made to fill in missing services on H, for example, a relocated DC Children's Museum or similar tourist/community draws such as market-rate multi-level senior housing; a multi-specialty medical center; a hotel; or an independent movie house.
- **Serious evaluation of a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district** or a similar consolidated, corridor-focused redevelopment financing mechanism spanning H Street, Starburst Plaza, and

Hechinger Mall, with incremental tax flows dedicated to revitalization of this corridor rather than dispersed across unrelated citywide priorities. We understand a TIF was discussed for H Street as far back as 2007 but never implemented — this study should determine why, and whether the calculus has changed given RFK.

- **A properly funded Business Improvement District (BID)** — as more than a dozen other DC commercial corridors already have — to provide year-round, professional management focused on safety, cleanliness, vibrancy, and equitable commercial sustainability. The Commission enthusiastically supports creation of a BID for H Street. Its value is not limited to the trash and snow-clearance problems that recur along the corridor: a BID also provides additional eyes on the street, and the capacity to market the area and to plan events that draw visitors in from outside the neighborhood. Those last two functions are ones no District agency currently performs for H Street, and they bear directly on the visitation decline this study documents. A BID could also serve as a nonprofit “Project Advocate” for DDOT under the federal Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), giving the corridor a direct channel to federal funding rather than relying solely on DDOT’s own capital pipeline.
- We also recommend that OP’s implementation strategy support stronger public-private partnerships, and encourage community development corporations and other mission-driven organizations that can assemble land, coordinate redevelopment, and secure grants and financing. OP should likewise support commercial tenant ownership, cooperative ownership, and other equity-building models that let independent H Street businesses build long-term roots and wealth rather than face displacement.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): Vacant, blighted and nuisance properties are a long-standing, consistent concern for the Commission, not a new one — and unlike the zoning history discussed below, it lines up comfortably with where we stand today. ANC 6A previously pushed for a [redefinition of “blighted” properties](#) (2011), requested that DCRA [join a pilot program on vacant properties](#) and provide [greater transparency on vacant property procedures](#), and supported the [2007 Nuisance Property Abatement & Real Property Classification Amendment](#). We also wrote to then-Councilmembers on [vacant property legislation \(Bills 18-488 and 18-546\)](#). Our recent [2025 letter on the vacant property at 1000–1014 H St NE](#) shows this issue remains active and unresolved. Similarly, ANC 6A requested an [H Street NE Parking Increment Financing District](#) around 2007 — a financing tool related to the TIF idea above that appears to have gone nowhere and may be worth OP revisiting given RFK.

2. Transportation, Access & Parking

Feedback was clear that the plan fails to adequately address mobility and transportation issues, particularly on the eastern half of the corridor. This is an area of long-standing focus of the Commission, as evidenced by our historical advocacy for transit and density..

BID ALIGNMENT (Greater H Street BID Association letter, July 26, 2026): The BID’s parallel letter frames this same problem sharply: the DC Streetcar’s closure on March 31, 2026 removed the corridor’s dedicated transit spine at the very moment the Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit project and the RFK Campus Master Plan are being designed along the same corridor, and it asks that this study’s transportation recommendations be closely coordinated with both rather than stood up as a third,

independent planning framework. We agree, and would ask OP to state explicitly how this study's transit recommendations relate to Gold Line and RFK planning already underway.

- **Implementation of H Street Bus Priority Plan Pending Gold Line Implementation.** The plan notably lacks transit recommendations pending implementation of the Gold Line. This is particularly important for the eastern end of H Street, where visits have declined most steeply. The H Street Bus Priority Project already did substantial work studying, gathering feedback on, and designing pickup/drop-off zones along the corridor. That work should be salvaged and implemented now — even simple, low-cost interim measures like priority lane paint from 3rd to 15th Streets — rather than waiting on longer-term decisions about the Gold Line.
- **Frequent and Reliable Transportation.** The end of streetcar service (which ceased operating on March 31, 2026) will further erode H Street visitation. We need an interim transit solution connecting Union Station through the corridor now, and we need assurance that whatever serves RFK (Gold Line or otherwise) runs both on event and non-event days, with several stops along H Street — not merely terminal stops at either end — so that corridor businesses actually benefit from the service.
- **Establish an interim H Street shuttle now, on the Kennedy Center model.** We ask OP and DDOT to develop a shuttle connecting Union Station, the Hechinger Mall parking area, and stops along H Street NE, including a dedicated stop serving the Atlas Performing Arts Center — operating on the same principle as the Kennedy Center's shuttle from Foggy Bottom Metro. A shuttle can be stood up at a small fraction of the cost and lead time of new fixed-guideway service, puts underused Hechinger Mall parking to work for corridor visitors, and gives Atlas patrons and eastern-corridor businesses a reliable arrival option on performance nights. With the Gold Line not expected to be operational until RFK opens, the corridor should not go several more years with no transit link to Union Station.
- **Active Uses versus Parking.** The plan should prioritize people over parking. DC Government and H Street business owners continue to plan around assumptions about how visitors arrive that don't match the reality that most people walk, bike, or take transit to the corridor. Converting surface parking to housing — even a swap of roughly 40 parking spaces for 200 residential units — would do far more for corridor economics than preserving parking supply, and better serves a corridor meant to work for residents of all ages and backgrounds. However, we also recognize that some facilities such as Atlas Arts Center have critical parking needs and that that the corridor might benefit from remote offsite parking with shuttle service.
- **Explain how the Hopscotch Bridge replacement fits this plan.** The interim report does not address DDOT's [H Street NE Bridge replacement project](#), despite the bridge being the corridor's western gateway and the physical connection between H Street and Union Station. Its design, construction sequencing, and any extended closures bear directly on several recommendations in this study — the bus priority treatments beginning at 3rd Street, the interim shuttle proposed above, bicycle and scooter routing from Union Station, and pedestrian access to the western blocks. We ask that the final study state explicitly how its recommendations coordinate with the bridge project timeline, and that OP confirm whether corridor businesses can expect mitigation during construction. The same coordination question applies at the opposite end of the corridor. Fully connecting and opening up H Street depends on both of its gateways: the impending

reconstruction of the Hopscotch Bridge to the west and the eventual reimagining of the Starburst intersection to the east. Neither is a peripheral streetscape matter — they are the two points that determine whether the corridor reads as continuous and accessible or as a segment walled off at both ends. We ask that the final study treat both as integral to its recommendations, and recognize that delivering them may require a TIF or comparable dedicated funding mechanism rather than routine capital programming.

- **Evaluate H Street’s role as a regional traffic thoroughfare, including a decking study.** H Street suffers from carrying traffic that has no business on a neighborhood main street: not only commuters, but regional buses out of Union Station and trucks routed toward downtown. This volume is fundamentally at odds with the walkable, active corridor the study envisions, and no amount of streetscape treatment fully overcomes it. We ask OP to consider whether H Street is a candidate for burying the roadway and decking over it to create a continuous, walkable neighborhood plaza and active public space, taking the recent Connecticut Avenue and Dupont Circle decking work as a precedent. We recognize this is a long-horizon and capital-intensive proposition; we raise it because a study framed around the corridor’s next generation should at least test the idea rather than foreclose it by omission.
- **As center-running transit comes to H Street, DDOT should add wayfinding** — physical signage and, where feasible, routing partnerships with dockless scooter and bike-share providers — directing riders arriving from Union Station onto G Street NE and I Street NE for one block before continuing east, so inexperienced riders aren’t routed directly onto a corridor carrying both buses and future center-running transit. DDOT should also work with micromobility providers to use existing technology to reduce operating speeds and limit vehicle availability in high-conflict areas.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): The Commission has advocated for reliable H Street transit for nearly two decades: our 2007-era [request for an interim bus route on the H St/Benning Rd corridor](#) and [multi-ANC support for light rail on H Street](#), our [2015 request to complete and launch the streetcar](#), our [2016 request for seven-day streetcar service](#), our [2021 Resolution supporting extension of the streetcar to Benning Road](#), and our [subsequent letter supporting completion of the streetcar from Benning Road to Georgetown](#). Unlike the zoning history in Section 4, there’s no daylight here between past and present — citing twenty years of consistent advocacy strengthens rather than complicates our current ask.

3. Public Space & Streetscape

We support OP’s public realm recommendations (RECs 1–8), but see specific gaps and opportunities:

- **The report does not address the 8th and H Street NE intersection** — a busy bus transfer point with heavy foot traffic — despite the plan elsewhere noting the need for seating and shade at transit stops. This should be added explicitly as a priority location, however, concerns related to this location about safety and illegal activity will also need to be addressed
- **Significant public space could be gained by closing select intersections** to car traffic and paving them over, particularly at 9th and H St NE, where H Street does not run through the superblock south of H and where no parking would be lost. This would create shaded gathering space near restaurants, shops, and housing without displacing existing uses.

- **Cross streets could also receive continuous sidewalk treatment** (similar to 7th and C Streets SE near Eastern Market) to prioritize pedestrians without affecting vehicle access.
- **Address the corridor’s shortage of “third spaces.”** H Street lacks meaningful third spaces — places where adults, teens, and school-age children can simply be, without having to live there or buy something in order to stay. The corridor once had a temporary library that partly filled this role, and its absence is felt. This is a land use question as much as a programming one, and it fits naturally with the Atlas Arts District. Uses worth naming in the final study include a maker studio with 3-D printers, metalwork, ceramics, art, and sewing equipment available for public use with free classes for those under 18; community dance space; a bicycle workshop on the model of Gearin’ Up; a gaming mini-arena; and a climbing and bouldering gym. Two working precedents are Cincinnati’s [Play Library](#) and Rockville’s [VisArts Center](#). Third spaces are also the most direct answer to the corridor’s ground-floor vacancy: they activate space that retail demand no longer supports, and they generate the foot traffic on which surrounding businesses depend.
- **Clarify the accountability and reporting path for illegal street activity.** The Commission appreciates the recent crackdown on illegal marijuana sales, which has made a visible difference. Other visitor-unfriendly activity continues, however, including the open sale of throwing stars and other weapons. We would like to know what recourse residents, businesses, and this Commission actually have to report such activity and bring it to an end. A plan premised on drawing visitors back to H Street has to name which agency owns this problem and how a report gets acted on — otherwise the streetscape and programming investments this study recommends will be undercut by conditions no one is accountable for.
- **Widen the sidewalks on the eastern end of the corridor.** This is among the Commission’s highest public space priorities and the interim report does not treat it as one. Sidewalks on the eastern blocks are materially narrower than those on the western end, which have already been rebuilt — the same blocks that have absorbed the steepest visitation decline and that the report identifies as least able to support retail. Adequate sidewalk width is a precondition for the seating, shade, streeteries, and pedestrian activity the report recommends elsewhere; without it, those recommendations cannot physically be delivered east of 12th Street. We ask that sidewalk widening on the eastern corridor be named explicitly in the final study rather than left to a future DDOT project.
- **Resolve the status of the streetcar tracks.** With service ended, the rails remain embedded in the roadway while providing no transit benefit, and they are a recognized hazard to cyclists and scooter riders, whose narrow tires can catch in the flangeway. This question was raised at our July 20 Transportation and Public Space Committee meeting and went unanswered. We ask OP and DDOT to state plainly whether the tracks are being retained for possible future rail service. If they are, that commitment should be reflected in this study and paired with interim treatments to reduce the hazard. If they are not, the tracks should be removed or remediated as part of any repaving or streetscape work the study recommends — including the REC 4 cobblestone replacement — rather than left in place indefinitely. The Commission takes no position here against future rail; our concern is that the corridor not be left carrying the hazard without the service. There is a second consequence the study should weigh: so long as the tracks remain and no service runs on them, cyclists and scooter riders will increasingly judge the sidewalk to be the safer option for themselves, to the direct detriment of the walkability this study is trying to build.

Leaving the rails in place is therefore not a neutral choice — it quietly shifts risk from the roadway onto pedestrians.

- **The corridor needs more public restrooms**, and the Throne pilot should be expanded to serve it. The Commission is united on that underlying need and on Starburst Plaza as a location, but is split on precise siting elsewhere: there has been support for a facility at or near 8th and H NE given the foot traffic and bus transfer activity there, but equally strong concern that this particular corner has persistent nuisance and public-safety problems that would undermine a restroom sited there without accompanying management. We ask OP and DDOT to work through discussing potential locations for public restrooms with the Commission rather than treating the 8th and H question as settled in either direction — and, either way, not to let the debate on location stall expansion of the pilot on the corridor generally.
- **OP should expand street tree planting, add shade structures at transit waiting areas, and pursue additional streetscape greening along the corridor**, consistent with the District’s broader climate resilience and urban forestry goals. If structured parking is ultimately recommended anywhere on the corridor, OP should encourage solar canopies rather than exposed parking decks wherever feasible.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT: REC 4’s proposal to replace the cobblestone strips echoes a concern the Commission raised at the corridor’s last major streetscape rebuild, when we submitted [recommendations on H Street sidewalk materials](#) and broader [H Street streetscape construction recommendations](#) back in 2007. Purely a factual/procedural precedent — worth asking OP/DDOT why the 2007 material choice didn’t hold up, so the replacement doesn’t repeat the same mistake. No shift in Commission philosophy involved here.

4. Zoning & Land Use

On OP’s land use and zoning recommendations (RECs 17–20), comments from residents and Commissioners support greater flexibility across the board, and the Commission would go further still: our primary ask is the removal of the corridor’s use-restricted development subdistricts entirely. This section is where the gap between the Commission’s historical positions and its current outlook is widest, so we’ve been deliberate about separating the two below.

Current Commission Position (2026) — Supportive of Growth

- **Eliminate the corridor’s use-restricted development subdistricts.** This is our single most important zoning recommendation. Rather than maintaining separate housing, retail, and arts and culture subdistricts along H Street — each with its own use mandates and height limitations — residential, retail, and arts and cultural uses should all be permitted along the entire length of the corridor. The study’s own data supports this: the Arts sub-district’s restrictive use limitations correspond to a 31% vacancy rate, the highest on H Street, while mandatory ground-floor retail requirements force storefronts to sit empty on blocks where retail demand no longer exists. The corridor’s problem is not that the right uses are in the wrong segments — it is that too little is permitted anywhere. The recommendations that follow should be read as specific applications of this principle, or as the minimum acceptable changes if OP declines to remove the subdistrict framework altogether.

- **Broaden the ground-floor retail requirement to include space-activation uses.** Where a ground-floor use requirement is retained at all, the Commission supports widening the permitted categories well beyond conventional retail to include other uses that activate space — a gym or comparable amenity within a large apartment building, for example. Any of the third-space uses described in Section 3 should qualify. The objective of a ground-floor requirement should be an active, occupied, publicly engaged frontage, not a retail tenant specifically; enforcing the narrower definition is precisely what has left storefronts dark on blocks where retail demand no longer exists.
- **As a specific application of the above, support expanding permitted ground-floor uses** to include general retail in the Arts sub-district (REC 17), which the report links directly to that sub-district's elevated vacancy.
- **Support removing the special exception requirement for lots over 6,000 SF (REC 18),** which the report itself identifies as adding uncertainty, cost, and delay without a clear corresponding benefit.
- **OP should evaluate whether current zoning is compatible with single-stair apartment construction** on H Street's typical lot sizes — this could be a meaningful lever for unlocking small- and mid-scale residential infill that the corridor badly needs.
- **Support consideration of additional building height and FAR** to enable financially viable apartment construction on the eastern end of the corridor (REC 19), consistent with the report's own finding that current market conditions cannot support buildings over seven stories without additional density flexibility. The need is acute: the report documents just 183 new residential units built on the eastern corridor since 2015 against 1,353 on the rest of H Street — a gap the report itself links to the eastern segment's 36% visitation decline.

BID ALIGNMENT (Greater H Street BID Association letter, July 26, 2026): The BID's parallel letter reaches the same conclusion we do on the subdistricts, and goes further on height and design: rather than modifying RECs 17–20, it asks OP to eliminate mandatory ground-floor retail and use-based subdistricts entirely, allow arts and creative uses anywhere on the corridor, drop REC 21's design-conformity standard outright, and remove REC 19's height and FAR caps altogether rather than adding limited flexibility — leaving height and density to standard design review and market demand. Our position above aligns with the BID on eliminating the use-based subdistricts. The Commission may wish to discuss whether to go equally far on REC 19's height and FAR caps and REC 21's design standards, or to retain the narrower framing on those two points.

Taken together, this is a distinctly YIMBY, growth-oriented position: an end to use-based subdistricts, more housing, fewer procedural chokepoints, and flexible ground-floor uses so vacancy comes down and the corridor works for residents of all ages and incomes — not just today's mix of uses.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): This is the one place where our own archive cuts against today's committee position, and we think OP should hear us say so plainly rather than discover it independently. In 2010–11, ANC 6A [petitioned against up-zoning as part of PUDs](#) and sought a [five-year moratorium on up-zoning under the H Street Overlay](#). That reflected a different Commission, at a different moment for the corridor, with a different, more cautious view of density. It is not our position today. The current Commission is substantially more supportive of housing growth and additional density as tools for corridor recovery, and we'd rather flag that evolution ourselves —

clearly, and without apology — than have OP or a future commenter cite the 2010–11 letters as if they still represented ANC 6A's view. If anything, the fact that the Commission has moved this far should reassure OP that support for REC 19 today reflects genuine, considered consensus rather than a reflexive position.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): On REC 21's design standards: the Commission asked OP/DDOT to revisit H Street's design guidelines before — see our 2007 [request to revise the H St NE Design Guidelines](#). This one is procedural rather than philosophical — worth checking what became of that request before this round produces a new one — and doesn't carry the same historical baggage as the up-zoning question above.

5. Historic Preservation

- **We encourage OP to evaluate preservation and adaptive reuse options for Douglas Memorial United Methodist Church (800 11th St NE)** as part of the corridor's broader historic fabric strategy, particularly given the Arts sub-district's high concentration of pre-1958 buildings. Adaptive reuse — keeping a building's shell while enabling new, more intensive uses inside it — is very much in keeping with the Commission's current growth-oriented approach; it is not in tension with our support for added density elsewhere on the corridor.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT (archive, not current position): The Commission engaged with this building once before, supporting a [2013 BZA variance for the church \(BZA 18662\)](#); that record may be a useful factual starting point for OP's evaluation.

6. Relevant ANC 6A Correspondence

This is not the Commission's first engagement with H Street planning. Twenty years ago we supported the [H Street Small Area Plan designation \(PR 15-80\)](#) and the [H Street Transportation Study](#) that preceded the 2004 Strategic Development Plan, and even [testified to DC Council on the H Street development budget](#) that year. Worth keeping in mind that we've been here before, and pressing OP on what's genuinely different this time, given how much both the corridor and the Commission have changed since. Below, current/recent letters (2024–2025) are grouped separately from older archival material so it's clear at a glance which reflect where the Commission stands today.

Current & Recent (reflects today's Commission, 2024–2025)

- [ANC 6A Comments Regarding the H Street NE Land Use and Market Study](#) — our prior comments to OP on this same study process.
- [Comments on the Premature End to H Street/Benning Road NE Streetcar Service](#) (to Mayor Bowser, DDOT, WMATA, and Councilmember Allen) — directly supports our comment above on the need for an interim transit solution.
- [Reaffirmation of Support for the H St NE Bus Priority Project](#) — supports salvaging and implementing that project's work now.
- [Support for H Street NE Bus and Streetcar-Only Lanes \(NOI 24-07-TDD\)](#) and DDOT's response — additional, recent transit priority history.

- [Concerns about the Vacant Property at 1000–1014 H St NE and Related Dila Development Proposal](#) (to DC Council, DOB, and BZA) — relevant to our vacancy and “vacant and blighted” taxation comments.
- [Request Regarding Withheld Capital Improvement Grant Funds for Atlas Performing Arts Center, Theater Alliance, and Project Create](#) — supports the report's emphasis on the Arts sub-district's anchor institutions.
- [Conditional Support for H Street Main Street's DCAH Grant Application](#) and our [Letter of Support for H Street Main Street's Public Art Building Communities Grant](#) — relevant to REC 6 and REC 12 on public art and corridor identity.
- [Support for Special Exception, 1000–1016 H St NE \(BZA 20880\)](#) and [Support for Extension of BZA Order, 1207 H St NE \(BZA 20943A\)](#) — precedent showing the current Commission's approach to recent development review along the corridor (1207 H St is also the site of OP's June 24 Open House #2).

Archival / Historical (useful institutional memory — not necessarily current Commission position)

- [H Street Small Area Plan designation support \(PR 15-80\)](#) and the [H Street Transportation Study](#) (2005) — precursors to the 2004 Strategic Development Plan this study updates.
- [Vacant/blighted property classification and legislation letters](#) (2007–2011) and the [H Street NE Parking Increment Financing District request](#) (c. 2007) — background for Section 1; consistent with current thinking.
- [Streetcar and light rail advocacy](#) (2007–2021) — background for Section 2; consistent with current thinking.
- [H Street sidewalk material and streetscape construction recommendations](#) (2007) — background for Section 3; procedural, not philosophical.
- Petition against up-zoning under the H Street Overlay and request for a five-year up-zoning moratorium (2010–11, linked in Section 4) — **does not reflect the current Commission's substantially more pro-growth position and should not be cited by others as still representing ANC 6A's view.**
- [2013 BZA variance support, Douglas Memorial United Methodist Church \(BZA 18662\)](#) — background for Section 5.

H Street NE is one of the District's most significant corridors, and it deserves to be treated as one. It should be an extraordinary place to live, eat, walk, shop and be entertained. It should be active from end to end rather than in isolated pockets, drawing residents into daily use and visitors in from across the region. We close on the concern that troubles us most about this interim report. The H Street study and the RFK Campus Master Plan are largely advancing as though they were unrelated exercises, and they are not. The RFK campus will be the eastern gateway to this part of the District, and H Street is the corridor that connects that gateway to Union Station and downtown. Planned together, they are a once-in-a-generation opportunity — a continuous, walkable spine running from Union Station, across the Hopscotch Bridge, the full length of H Street, through the Starburst intersection, and out to the campus. Planned apart, as they are being planned now, H Street becomes the stretch that visitors pass through on

the way to somewhere else. We urge the Office of Planning to connect the H Street and RFK planning processes directly, so that the final recommendations of each are reflected in the other.

Thank you for giving great weight to the views of ANC 6A. Should you wish to discuss this letter with the Commission, please feel free to reach out to me at 6A04@anc.dc.gov.

On behalf of the Commission,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Amber K. Gove".

Amber Gove
Chair, Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6A

cc: Anita Cozart, Director, DC Office of Planning; Sharon Kershbaum, Director, District Department of Transportation; Councilmember Charles Allen, Ward 6; Councilmember Zachary Parker, Ward 5; Councilmember Wendell Felder, Ward 7; At-Large Councilmember Elissa Silverman; Advisory Neighborhood Commission 6C; Greater H Street BID Association (in formation)