GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----

IN THE MATTER OF:

UM 500 Penn Street NE, LLC : Case No.
and UDR, Inc. - Consolidated : 17-14

Planned Unit Development and : Related Zoning Map Amendment : at Square 3594, Lot 5 :

\_\_\_\_

Thursday, June 14th, 2018

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 17-14 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

## ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairperson ROBERT MILLER, Vice Chairperson MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, FAIA, Commissioner (AOC) PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation BRANDICE ELLIOTT

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF PRESENT:

JONATHAN ROGERS

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on June 14, 2018.

## CONTENTS

Preliminary Matters	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	5
Applicant's Presentation		•		•			•	6
Office of Planning Report		•	•	•	•			71
Department of Transportation Report		•	•	•	•			79
ANC 5D		•	•	•	•			91
Parties in Support, Opposition, Undecided		•	•	•	•			n/a
Applicant's Rebuttal		•	•	•	•			92
Adjourn								107

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	6:34 p.m.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good evening, everyone. We
4	ready to get started?
5	This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission
6	for the District of Columbia. Today's date is Thursday, June
7	the 14th. We're located in the Jerrily R. Kress Memorial
8	Hearing room.
9	My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Vice
10	Chair Miller, Commissioner May, and Commissioner Turnbull.
11	We're also joined by the Office of Zoning staff,
12	Ms. Sharon Schellin, as well as Office of Planning staff, Ms.
13	Steingasser, Ms. Elliott, and from the District Department
14	of Transportation, Mr. Rogers.
15	This proceeding is being reported by a court
16	reporter. It's also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask
17	you refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the
18	hearing room, including the display of any signs or objects.
19	Notice of today's hearing was published in the DC
20	Register, and copies of that announcement are available on
21	the wall, to my left on the wall near the door.
22	The hearing will be conducted in accordance with
23	provisions of 11z DCMR, Chapter 4 as follows: preliminary
24	matters of Applicant's case, report of the Office of
25	Planning, report of other government agencies, report of the

1	ANC, report, organizations and persons in support,
2	organizations and persons in opposition, rebuttal, and
3	closing by the Applicant.
4	The following time restraints will be made to
5	this, maintained in this meeting. The Applicant has up to
6	60 minutes, but we could probably hear this, do this in 20.
7	Organizations, five minutes; individuals, three minutes.
8	The staff will be available throughout the hearing
9	to discuss procedural questions. Please turn off all, all
LO	electronic devices at this time, so as not to disrupt these
11	proceedings.
L2	Would all individuals wishing to testify please
L3	rise and take the oath?
L4	Ms. Schellin, would you please administer the
15	oath?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Please raise your right hand. Do
L7	you solemnly swear, do you solemnly swear or affirm your
18	testimony in this proceeding will be the truth, the whole
L9	truth, and nothing but the truth?
20	Thank you.
21	(Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. At this time, the Commission
23	will consider any preliminary matters.
24	And Ms. Schellin, do we have any preliminary
25	matters?

1 MS. SCHELLIN: Just to accept two proffered expert 2 witnesses in this case. Both have previously been accepted by the Commission: Eric Colbert in architecture, and Jami 3 Milanovich in traffic engineering and design. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Certainly. We don't usually 5 6 undo what we've already done, we will so accept 7 Anything else? continue to accept. 8 MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I just want to mention to Ms. Elliott that I got her name correct. 10 11 All right. Okay, Mr. Kadlecek, you may begin. 12 MR. KADLECEK: Good evening, members of the Commission. Thank you for having us. 13 I'm Cary Kadlecek from the Law Firm of Goulston & Storrs on behalf of the Applicant. 15 Thank you for the opportunity to present this consolidated PUD and Zoning Map Amendment to the MU-9 zone 16 to allow an exciting addition to the Union Market District. 17 18 The proposed mixed-use project will include 11 stories of apartments above ground-floor retail in a new 19 building of high-quality design, and it will be the first 2.0 21 redevelopment on this particular block. 22 this project will include Importantly, exceptionally deep and broad package of proffered benefits 23 and amenities that range from significant affordable housing 24

to support for a job readiness programs for ANC residents.

As described in our pleadings, this project will not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan's future land use and generalized policy maps, and it will advance numerous policies of the comprehensive plan, the Ward 5 Works Industrial Land Transformation Study, and the Florida Avenue Market Small Area Plan.

Accordingly, the proposed PUD and rezoning satisfy the standards for approval under Subtitle X, Section 304.

In addition, we are pleased to have the support of the Office of Planning, DDOT, and ANC 5D, which reflects the hard work and extensive collaboration between the Applicant and those stakeholders.

With that, I will turn it to Chris Spendley to give you more information about the project.

MR. SPENDLEY: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for having us here tonight. My name is Chris Spendley. I'm a Director of Development for UDR, Inc.

We're an owner, operator, and developer of apartments across the country. And more specifically, we have ownership in and operate five buildings in DC that are of similar skill to the one being presented here tonight.

Of the five communities that we own in DC, we acquired the oldest of those communities in 2003, with our most recent development in the district, Capitol View on 14th, was completed in 2012.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

This illustrates how UDR is a longer-term of the communities that we acquire and develop, and with that, in an effort to provide a sense of place and stability for our residents within the community, we focus on a high-quality and durable design with architecture that promotes and aligns with the existing fabric of the neighborhood. And we're proud to present this project here to you today, as it meets that description.

We consider ourselves experts in the apartment business, and we're excited here to be joined by our coapplicant EDENS, an expert in the retail business who will own and program the ground-floor retail space of the building.

EDENS, as you know, has a significant presence in the Union Market district, and is responsible for many of the great projects that are taking shape in the area.

We initially met with the Office of Planning on this project two years ago to the day, and I bring this up only to illustrate the process that we've been going through in an effort to listen to and anticipate the needs of the various stakeholders to create the project that we believe responds to those needs, and captures the spirit of the Florida Avenue Small Area Plan.

The result of these meetings led us to a unique benefits and amenities package that garnered the enthusiastic

2.0

support of the ANC 5D, as referenced in their support letter that's in the record.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to our architect, Eric Colbert.

MR. COLBERT: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I'm Eric Colbert with Eric Colbert & Associates Architects, and I would like to just run you through quickly, through the drawings.

So this is just orientation. I figure you all know where it is. But you have New York Avenue coming down on the top of the page diagonally, and then parallel to the front of our site is Penn Street NE, and then 4th on the left side and 5th on the right side, coming up to our site.

I just included this shot because it's important to note that this PUD process could authorize as much as 9.36 FAR. However, we have, I'll explain to you why we have limited the development to 8.4 FAR.

And then next is the, we're not in a Historic District, but working with my client, UDR and EDENS, we've elected to, we're proposing to save the existing Rock Creek Ginger Ale Building that was in the market. We're taking down the lefthand side, which is not, doesn't have any kind of distinctive architectural characteristics, but using the piece that is the more well-known and dominant piece as, integrating it into our, our building facade.

2.0

This drawing I put up there to kind of help explain the FAR issue, because we could have gotten more density by having a footprint of the building that was C-shaped. However, instead we're, went with a T-shape, which allows more light and air on the, you know, you have the extension of the building going up to the north side, and this configuration enables kind of more openness around the building than another configuration, which might have actually netted in more square footage for the project.

So here we have canopy precedents. As you know, like in the market, on the lefthand side of this document you'll see pictures of the old market. And we want to not aesthetic, embrace that but also look other precedents that were very similar. So you have, a lot of these old industrial buildings have these continuous extended canopies, where trucks would come in and unload. trying to take advantage of some of that.

And also capturing some of the, the way these things were put together with, you're seeing kind of the framework of the structure underneath, and so we've used some of that aesthetic in our facade.

And so here we have storefront precedents. Again, with the old fabric, we want to celebrate that -- but then, you know, converting it to more commercial use, at the same time putting in some storefronts that are very transparent,

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

but also connote the industrial aesthetic.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

In terms of materiality of our building, we're again trying to, you know, take the theme of the old market, and put a building there that doesn't exactly duplicate it, but also is consistent with it in the sense that we have things like metal frameworks, concrete materials, and kind of large windows broken down in a way that connotes the old industrial precedent.

So here you see a document that we created showing buildings you know, some of these are under construction, like another PUD we did on the lower lefthand side. you know, Shapiro, which And then, is under There's one next to us that has the Trader construction. Joe's in it now, and then other PUDs that are kind of working their way through the system.

And then our, our project, on the north side of this. And then, as you can see, the old buildings in the center, so our design fits in very well with the concept that the Office of Planning has created to keep it density low where the old buildings are, and then build density around it to help support it from an urban design perspective.

One thing that we have done since the set-down hearing is a lot of refinements. One you see here, you know, here we have a couple, several renderings, actually, that show the roof -- and I know that you're very focused on that.

But also, you can see here the we've added solar panels as part of our green effort, and that was actually something that was recommended by the Commission, and also DDOE was supportive of that. So we, we've incorporated that to achieve a certain level of energy into the building.

And here's another rooftop exhibit that we created.

Again, so since the set-down hearing, we've continued to refine the design, and massage certain elements. For instance, in the center we're using this vertical piece to accentuate the residential entrance of the building. And if you compare this to what we had before, we've, it was, it was symmetrical before, and now we've, we have a little bit of an offset there -- and the idea being that it's kind of in keeping with the balance, but asymmetrical composition that we had previously created.

And then here's another view of it. So you can see, like, some of the details, you know, since the set-down we've really kind of massaged a lot of the details, and it has a, kind of a more rich appearance now, you know, having added some of those, you know, looking at how, you know, materials turn the corner, and the railings, things like that.

And here, this is, I think, a perspective that the Zoning Commission was asking for, as you see it from 4th

2.0

Street looking at the building as it kind of turns the corner, with New York Avenue on the lefthand side.

This rendering is informative in the sense that one of the things we've added to give the facade a little more richness is the fact that the balconies are strong horizontal elements in the facade, but if you look carefully you can actually see that they're broken up.

We have these openings that occur in the balconies that we've included, kind of structural beams in there to give it an added layer of texture in the facade.

And then, this is a very important drawing, because it shows that, you know, we have certain requirements based on the green area ratio of things that we have to do.

But in addition to that, all these plantings that we're using on the facades are not even, they're kind of in addition to all the, the plantings that we're putting in for the green area ratio.

For instance, the canopies are all going to have significant plantings, as well as on the sides of the retail entrances, we're going to have green walls there. And then also, around the opening that goes, you know, there's a, in terms of the elevators -- we have elevators, of course, for the residents, going down to the garage -- but we also have no, you know, with EDENS, their own commercial parkers that will have their own elevator lobby coming out to the street.

2.0

So we've surrounded that with a lot of greenery.

2.0

The other thing you'll see, on the top drawing here, you'll see this glass, and then there's kind of a wood-looking strip horizontally, and then a concrete underneath. And that's an aesthetic element that we added because it kind of suggests these old loading docks, where you had the concrete, and then a strip of wood, or some kind of material that the truck would actually drive in, at, you know, when they were unloading and loading, in the old, this, you know, the old market.

This is another drawing that I think the Commission asked for where, so what we've done here is, you know, at some point in time there will be another building called Maurice East to the east side of our site.

But knowing that that will take several years, we have done some embellishments to our east facade and, but also the main purpose of the three-dimensional drawing is to show the volume of what's going to eventually be there.

And then this is a more scaled version showing our east facade, and how we're planning to use different materials and windows to enliven that in the meantime, before that other building is constructed.

So again, as I was saying, you know, the Zoning Commission is really focused on roofs, so we've put some attention to make sure that we have adequate documentation

to achieve the one-on-one setbacks, the green roof. So you can see, again, the solar collectors that we're going to be adding up there, and the amenities for the residents.

And this document is showing where we're proposing to have signage in the facades of the buildings. And you have, in your documents we submitted, some precedents for what we're thinking in terms of the signage possibilities.

And I think that's about it.

MS. MILANOVICH: While JV's pulling up my slides, I think in the interest of time I'm going to focus on the proposed transportation improvements -- and in particular, the DDOT report -- and then, of course, be happy to answer any questions if I skipped over something that you were interested in.

The Applicant, along with DDOT's input, developed a series of improvements to mitigate the, the traffic impact of the project. This comprehensive list of improvements included demand management strategies aimed at reducing vehicular traffic, operational strategies to help facilitate loading activities, particularly with respect to the neighboring properties abutting the alley, as well as physical improvements.

This slide shows a summary of the elements of the transportation demand management plan. The items in red have been added at the request of DDOT.

2.0

This slide shows a summary of the elements of the loading management plan, and also a list of physical improvements that will be made by the Applicant. Again, the items in red were added at the request of DDOT.

The physical improvements include the design and installation of a new traffic signal at 4th and Penn, which is the intersection immediately adjacent to our site. They also include phasing improvements to an existing signal, significant pedestrian improvements, and conversion of a portion of 5th Street to two-way operation in the event that that's not completed prior to completion of our project.

As shown on the previous slides, the Applicant has incorporated many of DDOT's requests -- in fact, they have agreed to all but four of the requests outlined in DDOT's report.

We've had conversations with DDOT as late as this afternoon, and believe we have agreement on these four items, or at least very close to agreement with DDOT. And I'm sure Jonathan Rogers will weigh in on that.

The first of the items where we weren't in complete alignment is the missing sidewalk on the east side of the subject site, and the construction of curb ramps that do not meet current criteria.

The intersection, or the, the crosswalks in question are shown on this slide in the white circle. The

2.0

1	missing sidewalk in question is in this area, and then DDOT
2	has asked us to upgrade the curb ramps for this crosswalk,
3	and the curb ramps for this crosswalk.
4	What we have
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm sorry, which is the, I'm not
6	sure what the, what this you're referring to, because I'm not
7	seeing
8	MS. MILANOVICH: You can't see my arrow there?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't see it.
10	MS. MILANOVICH: It would be
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Can't use a pointer either.
12	MS. MILANOVICH: Yeah, let me try this. Are you
13	seeing the yellow dot?
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: I'm not seeing anything, do you
15	see anything?
16	MS. MILANOVICH: Are you seeing the red line I'm
17	drawing?
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, yes.
19	MS. MILANOVICH: Okay. Sorry about that. I don't
20	know why the pointer's not working.
21	So, we have agreed, or proposed to upgrade the
22	curb ramps for this crosswalk shown in red. That would,
23	obviously, facilitate pedestrian traffic coming to and from
24	our site, as well as other pedestrians in the Union Market
25	area.

On the east side of the intersection, the issue you can see we're faced with is there is a fire hydrant in the middle where the crosswalk, or the ADA ramp would be constructed. And then we also have an issue with a curb cut immediately to the east, so if we were to angle the crosswalk to the east, we couldn't do that either because of the curb cut.

And so our thought is that when that adjacent property redevelops, there may be a better opportunity to get a more optimal location for that crosswalk and curb ramp, as opposed to us sort of shoehorning something in, only to have to have it be replaced when that property redevelops.

So, you know, again, we've, we're hoping that we've reached a compromise with DDOT, and have agreed to upgrade on the west side of the intersection.

The second item is the construction of missing sidewalk on the west side of 4th Street along the PNC Bank property. We have agreed to, or we propose to complete the sidewalk connecting New York Avenue to this intersection of 4th and Penn, where we've proposed a traffic signal.

DDOT has then asked us to extend that sidewalk along the west side of 4th Street across this property, where the PNC Bank sits, where I've shown in, in the red there.

Our concern there is, again, we would be spending money for an interim condition that would be replaced when

2.0

that property redeveloped. And we also have a concern, because you can see in this picture there's a very narrow buffer there between the roadway and the parking lot, and there's some landscaping in there -- at least some of which, I believe, is on private property.

So as a private property owner, the Applicant would have to go in and remove landscaping on somebody else's property. So we have a bit of a concern with that.

The third item is to charge market rate parking for retail parking. Not necessarily saying we wouldn't do that, but not wanting to commit to it at this point, not knowing what the future holds.

We think it's important that we create an easy to circulate, affordable parking scenario -- especially in an evolving retail market such as Union Market, and, you know, particularly given the location at the intersection of a couple major arterials, being New York Avenue and Florida Avenue.

And then finally, DDOT requested that we provide vehicular access through our site for the future neighboring development immediately to the east. Logistically, that's a bit challenging. We've worked really hard to design an access scenario and a loading scenario where we can provide that access off of the public alley -- which is, as you know, what DDOT prefers.

2.0

And we've also worked really hard to create that loading area that allows for front-in, front-out loading maneuvers, so all of the backup is, is done on-site.

And again, without knowing what the future holds, and what the exact redevelopment of the neighboring property would be, we're concerned about committing to something at this point that might be challenging for the access for this particular project.

So again, not saying that we wouldn't necessarily do that in the future. We're just not willing to commit to that at this time with so many unknowns. We think there would be further study required as to what that development would be, and what that cross-access would look like.

And so, you know, we believe that we've developed a very comprehensive mitigation strategy that focuses on both vehicular improvements and significant pedestrian improvements, as well as demand management strategies and operational strategies to ensure that the impact of the project is mitigated.

We think with the implementation of those improvements, we would not anticipate any objectionable impacts to the surrounding roadway network.

MR. SPENDLEY: So just one last slide here to talk through. This slide summarizes the benefits and amenities package as it now stands, and its evolution since the initial

2.0

application.

2.0

So just a couple, in the interest of time, to get through. We're providing large floor plans, including three-bedroom homes.

It's a topic that's come up multiple times with the Office of Planning, the SMD and ANC. We know it's a, a home type that rarely makes it into the design of similar projects.

We'll be providing 15 three-bedroom homes in this project, and this will also be represented in our inclusionary housing mix.

We also are providing funding for employment training opportunities for ANC 5D residents. We came up with this program --

We came up with this program as a direct response to concerns about job readiness of residents raised during the conversations with the SMD and ANC.

We're working with and funding Jubilee Jobs, a nonprofit workforce development provider in the District. And our contribution to the program will enable Jubilee Jobs to provide training, coaching, transportation benefits, and scholarships for ANC 5D residents who are looking for work, and who are committed to continuing the program.

Just the last two here to note. Two, two items that have been added to the package since set-down. We've

1	added solar to the roof, as Eric mentioned earlier, and we've
2	also added a new contribution to the Department of Parks and
3	Recreation for \$10,000 for new playground equipment, or
4	upgrades to a nearby park within ANC 5D.
5	So I'd again like to thank the Commission for
6	hearing our project this evening, and would like to thank the
7	staff at Office of Planning and Department of Transportation
8	for their continuous availability as our project has evolved.
9	And with that, we'd like to open it up for
10	questions.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Want to thank you all for
12	your presentation. Let me go right into what you worked out
13	with Jubilee.
14	I, I've heard that before. Eventually, I'm going
15	to ask for a track record, and I think that's the new way
16	we're doing jobs now.
17	Did you have another case, Mr. Kadlecek, that you,
18	you talked about Jubilee Jobs?
19	MR. KADLECEK: That was my colleague, Jeff Utz, I
20	believe for another project in the
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so
22	MR. KADLECEK: Union Market area.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: so it'll be one of you all
24	that'll be able to give me the track record on how that's
25	working out.

1 MR. KADLECEK: We should, be yeah. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. MR. KADLECEK: And, and we did file the Memorandum 3 of Understanding into the recording today outlining the terms 5 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So --7 MR. KADLECEK: -- with Jubilee Jobs. 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we're talking about training, and giving job readiness. As a result of that, eventually 10 jobs will come to fruition, right? It'll come the reality 11 that jobs will come out of all this. MR. SPENDLEY: Correct. So Jubilee Jobs has two 12 13 in the District already, one in the northwest quadrant, one in the southeast quadrant. Nothing in northeast right now. So some of the residents are aware of 15 16 their services, they're just not actively participating. we're bringing some of the services of Jubilee Jobs to this 17 18 They're going to provide services at the new ANC 5D ANC. community space in the Edison Building. 19 2.0 And program, you'll have this initial the 21 orientation -- residents will come in, hear what, what Jubilee Jobs provides, and then from there they have three 22 Jubilee Jobs will have career coaching, they'll 23 workshops. have a conflict resolution in the workplace workshop, and 24

they'll also have a third for interviewing skills.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So and, and this is for 5D
2	residents only.
3	MR. SPENDLEY: Correct.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are we, can we do that? The reason
5	I'm asking, and I don't want to put 5D residents on promised
6	land. Some years ago, we, we were trying to designate some
7	job issues to a certain SMD or ANC, and we found we couldn't
8	do that. So I want to make sure that we're not putting this
9	community on promised land.
10	MR. SPENDLEY: Yeah, I mean obviously, we'll do
11	only what the law allows us to do. But certainly the intent
12	of the program is to target 5D residents.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
14	MR. SPENDLEY: I mean, I don't know that as a
15	matter of law, that they can exclude people. But certainly,
16	I think the intent
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So we can target. I, that
18	MR. SPENDLEY: Yeah.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: that word sounds better to me,
20	target.
21	MR. SPENDLEY: Yeah. Yeah.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to undo what, what's
23	been done with 5D. I think that's a great idea. But I don't
24	want you to run into any problems, and then when you see all
25	of Ward 5 coming, or the city coming, and that wasn't

1	expected so.
2	MR. SPENDLEY: Yeah.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
4	MR. SPENDLEY: Yeah, I think the intent is to,
5	largely through the SMD, get the word out to, to those
6	residents to then be able to take advantage of
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr
8	MR. SPENDLEY: the services.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr., Mr. Kadlecek. Let me make
10	sure that as, as we move forward, and if we move forward,
11	that we say targeted.
12	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, so we won't run into any
14	illegality. Okay. I'm going to, I just wanted to get on the
15	jobs piece. But let me, coming to my colleagues. Any
16	questions or comments, Vice Chair Miller?
17	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And
18	thank, thank you for your presentation, and thank you for all
19	the work you've done on the project for at least two years,
20	and the responsiveness and work with the community ANC 5D,
21	obviously, you wouldn't have that kind of letter of support
22	if you hadn't worked with them.
23	And your responses to both the requests for
24	information and refinements that Zoning Commission asked at
ا م	

25 set-down, and Office of Planning asked for, and all the work

1 with the other agencies, including DDOT and DOE, and so 2 appreciate. And on behalf of our missing Commissioner tonight, 3 Shapiro, we thank you for the solar panels. Not that we aren't thankful as well. 5 So I mean, I like the ANC. I think, I think it's 6 7 The massing, the design, the a very attractive project. Most of the program, especially the 299 housing materials. 9 units, 12 percent of which I believe are affordable. 10 And the size of the, and it's, that's a larger 11 set-aside than what would be, inclusionary zoning would, the 12 minimum requirement under inclusionary zoning, and, you're doing larger-sized units than normal, than we often 13 14 see. 15 You have the 31 percent, 94 units of it are two bedrooms, and 17 units, particularly commendable, six percent 16 of the units are at three bedroom. 17 18 And the Office of Planning, think Ι had recommended that there not be flexibility to reduce that 19 2.0 percentage on the three bedrooms. Do you have a comment on 21 that? 22 So right now, what's really MR. SPENDLEY: Sure. driving the, those last two or three units is the programming 23 on the penthouse level. We're working with, we're showing 24

three in our drawing, the penthouse level. And that's kind

1 of just going through initial demising plans. 2 We know that that's going to change based on some 3 of the roof uses, added in solar, and, and working through how the mechanical equipment will impact the ceiling height. And so some of those, the rooms that are currently 5 showing bedrooms, depending on where we end up, could end up 6 7 being bathrooms, or a dropdown for a kitchen or something like that. 8 So we think that we'll end up with 15 three-9 bedrooms in the project, and we can proffer to not go under 10 that number. 11 VICE CHAIR MILLER: And the penthouse residential 12 space is going to be used to three, three residential units 13 up there, or --? 15 I think the penthouse level MR. SPENDLEY: 16 seven? 17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Seven. 18 MR. SPENDLEY: Currently. VICE CHAIR MILLER: So that, and that triggers the 19 2.0 50 percent median family income requirement, which in your 21 latest submission, or an OP submission, it said that that translated, I think, to 644 square feet, but you wanted the 22 23 flexibility to do a contribution to the Housing Production Trust Fund of \$144,000. 24 Is that --25 MR. KADLECEK: That, that's an approximation based

|| --

2.0

VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- is that --

MR. KADLECEK: -- on current --

VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'll ask OP this, to confirm this, but is that alternative contribution --

I would personally rather see the square footage, even if it's only 644 square feet of the 50 percent MFI. But is that alternative contribution something that's explicitly provided for in the, wherever we set forth the 50 percent trigger for the penthouse residential space?

I didn't recall that for new construction.

MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, the way, my understanding of the regulation is, the way it says is if you don't have to provide other, if you, otherwise you're not required to provide 50 percent MFI units, which this building isn't required to -- it's 60 percent, because it's a residential building, a rental building, rather.

And the set-aside is smaller than the smallest unit, then you wouldn't have to do that. So that's why we're asking for the flexibility to do either, because the regulations would allow for that normally, but they just haven't come to a decision about whether they would want to provide to the Trust Fund, or the actual square footage.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I realize that it's maybe a greater cost to do the square footage, and certainly

will be a greater cost to the city to produce that unit, and 2 the \$144,000 won't cover it. So I would encourage you to 3 cover it in your building of 299 units. I think you can find a way to make that happen. It's not that much. It's 5 probably just a, I don't know, what is, what is 644 size, a Or a studio? I mean, or, or is that, yeah, 6 one bedroom? 7 it's not, it's not more than that. MR. SPENDLEY: Yeah, somewhere in between one of 8 9 those two --10 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yeah. 11 MR. SPENDLEY: -- unit types. 12 VICE CHAIR MILLER: But it's important symbolically that we, that these projects produce as much affordable and, 13 as, at deep levels as, actually produce the units, rather than make the city have to figure out how to do it, which 15 sometimes we do well, and sometimes we don't do too, do so 16 I think you all can do it well. 17 well. 18 So I trust that you can. But we can't require you to, I don't think --19 2.0 although, I still am unsure about whether you have that 21 flexibility, whether the provision requires that flexibility. So I need to go look at that provision that you made a 22 23 reference to, the --24 Well I'll look at that further. 25 So, and I appreciate I chart that you provided,

1	that I think it was your chart and not OP's. Or maybe it
2	was OP. It was all the responses to the agency comments.
3	That was a very helpful response, even though we weren't
4	agreeing, but it was really the, the OP report, response to
5	the OP report.
6	That was a very helpful chart, and I think that's
7	a template that we should encourage other applicants to bring
8	forward. It just put it all right there, and then we knew
9	where, where the differences remain, and Milanovich reduced
10	those differences this evening on the DDOT side I'll look
11	for.
12	And I think your explanation in general made sense
13	for the four. We'll hear from DDOT.
14	On the access to the adjacent property through the
15	alley, don't you, one of you own that adjacent property?
16	Aren't you going to need that access?
17	MR. KADLECEK: Well, it's, they're technically
18	under different ownership.
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: But it, I mean it's a, same
20	principal, or no?
21	MR. KADLECEK: Well, I mean the contract purchaser
22	for the site that we're talking about tonight is a, is a
23	different entity than the owner of
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.
25	MR. KADLECEK: the adjacent site. I mean, yeah,
ı	I and the second

	31
1	there's some affiliation at this point, but kind of to
2	Jamie's overall point, it's, we don't know what that is going
3	to be in the future, so to sort of dedicate that is, one, I
4	think, kind of unprecedented.
5	But secondarily, I mean, it does have the impacts
6	of really changing what the design of the loading area and
7	the parking access area was for this building in an effort
8	to make that the best possible condition for the alley.
9	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay, I think those were the
10	major things I wanted to touch on, Mr. Chairman. I may come
11	back as, as others talk, as I look through my notes. Thanks.
12	Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you.
14	Commissioner Turnbull.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
16	would echo the Vice Chair's comments. I want to thank you
17	for your presentation on the changes that have been made
18	since set-down. I think there's a big improvement.
19	I just want to go back to the IZ for a minute.
20	Maybe the, I guess the numbers have changed. I originally,
21	I had on my notes that there was 39 IZ units. But is that,
22	am I wrong on that final count?
23	MR. SPENDLEY: I think we're currently showing 36
24	based on the demising plan that's in place.

But, however, those, those units will end up

1	laying out, it'll be 12 percent of the residential floor
2	area.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I guess what was,
4	I mean my original count, based upon doing a count from the
5	original drawings we had here was 15 studios, 10 one-
6	bedrooms, six one-bedrooms with den, seven two-bedroom, and
7	one three-bedroom. Now maybe the numbers have changed, so.
8	But there was a predominance of studios.
9	MR. SPENDLEY: We'll look at that. I think the
10	predominancy of studios sounds like there might be some
11	interior bedrooms, which a lot of our units are.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You know, I was just
13	counting the drawings on A40 and 41, I mean, the units.
14	And I think I'm, and I was looking at Exhibit 27
15	B1, 27 1, 27 B5. I guess that was the latest drawings, I
16	think, that you had.
17	Anyways, that's where I just counted. I was just
18	counting from that drawing.
19	But I guess my question is, that mix of units
20	was that decided with the ANC's input, or how did you come
21	up with that mix?
22	MR. SPENDLEY: So this mix was just made kind of
23	proportionate to the overall unit mix.
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
25	MR. SPENDLEY: We wanted to make sure that all unit

1 types are represented. 2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. 3 MR. SPENDLEY: So you have some one-bedrooms plus dense, you have some two-bedrooms, you have a three-bedroom, 5 some studios, some units that have interior bedrooms. So of kind laid throughout building, 6 just out the 7 proportionate to how the units lay out. 8 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So the ANC had no input as 9 far as, like, saying well, we'd like to see more of these other kind of units in the community, or anything? 10 11 MR. SPENDLEY: They were, they were excited that we had included a three-bedroom, but the rest of the unit we 12 hadn't discussed with them. 13 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Now, nine of the units are 14 on the third floor, which is almost a quarter of the overall 15 I'm just wondering why the, the third floor is so 16 heavily staggered with IZ units, and then they sort 17 gravitate upward, get, get less. 18 I quess I'm just curious as to your rationale on 19 how you're laying out these IZ units. 2.0 21 I mean, usually we see them interspersed amongst the floors a little bit more --23 I think MR. SPENDLEY: Yeah, tried to we intersperse them throughout the remaining floors. I think. 24

you know, we tried to not stack as much as possible, and --

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, looking at your
2	floor, they're pretty much stacked in, in rows in the same
3	area on every floor. There's quite a bit that's sort of, I
4	mean, I guess the 22 of these, my count was that 22 of these
5	units are sort of on the alley side, angle of the building.
6	I got, I had 13 on the closed court, and only four
7	units are on Penn. I'm just trying to figure out the
8	rationale as to
9	MR. KADLECEK: Well, ultimately, you know, there's,
10	there's still, that, some demising that will happen in the
11	future development of the plans, and interior layouts.
12	And, and ultimately the goal is to intersperse
13	them, but I believe that it's been generally accepted
14	practice that IZ units don't have to be on the top two
15	floors.
16	And of course, there is still the requirement
17	going through the Zoning Administrator that they're, you
18	know, consistent with the zoning regulation that requires
19	that they're evenly dispersed.
20	And so this is really meant to be a sample plan.
21	It's not the final plan, because the exact demising and unit
22	types haven't been laid out yet. So it's
23	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right, I
24	MR. KADLECEK: not meant to be
25	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I understand that, and

1	I understand about the top floor also. But it just seems to
2	be, even at this early stage, there would have been a little
3	bit more integration of the units within the floorplans, try
4	to make it a little bit more mixed.
5	So I mean, when I see, like, nine, almost 25
6	percent of the units on the third floor, it, I think you
7	might even want to look at that, and just make it seem a
8	little bit more random than what it seems at first.
9	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, that's something we can look
10	at.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. The other, can you
12	talk a little bit about the maker units? I mean, in the
13	Office of Planning's report, like I think it's on page 21,
14	they list a lot of structural reasons, so what requirements
15	for what the PDR spaces, have you, going along with that,
16	what Office of Planning is requesting?
17	MR. SPENDLEY: In terms of
18	MR. KADLECEK: Oh
19	MR. SPENDLEY: page 21?
20	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, actually, no, that's, so those
21	are
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)
23	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Boilerplate?
24	MR. KADLECEK: conditions that we proffered.
25	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

1	MR. KADLECEK: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: They're boilerplate in the,
3	in the
4	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, so the, the idea is that the
5	retail space would be built to these specifications in order
6	to facilitate and accommodate PDR and maker uses.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Now, from what I was
8	reading, it sounded like you were a little bit hedging on
9	whether or not you could do this, or where it was going to
10	go, and I wonder if you could talk a little bit more about
11	that.
12	MR. KADLECEK: No, those specifications
13	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I mean the actual
14	implementation of the maker units at the time of opening.
15	MR. KADLECEK: Oh, you're asking about the, the
16	actual uses themselves.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah.
18	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, so as we've proffered in the
19	package, it's a commitment, there, there's sort of a
20	multifaceted aspect to the package, and we can run through
21	it more specifically. But it includes a commitment of, of
22	PDR maker uses for five years, as well as a commitment in the
23	adjacent site for, for some maker uses.
24	And then I think the really big piece of this is
25	the buildout specification of the space in order to

1 accommodate any PDR uses in the event that there 2 continued interest by tenants to occupy that space. 3 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. On the rooftop -and I appreciate the amount of the effort you've put on redefining that, and making it look as nice as it does -- I 5 just want to be sure that there's -- I'm assuming there's no 6 7 uplighting. It's all downlighting on the, up there, that the lighting is at a minimal level for the rooftop. 8 9 Is there any lighting on the penthouse? Is that lit up? Is that not lit up? 10 MR. COLBERT: We will assure that we will, you 11 know, have the absolute minimum light pollution by carefully 12 specifying fixtures to achieve that goal. 13 14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. And if you could follow up with something on that, that would be 15 iust appreciated. 16 17 The other, and I do appreciate your pages on the, responding to the signage issue. 18 I guess the, in looking, and if I looked at the 19 presentation tonight with the signage, very happy with what 2.0 21 I saw. think it looks very low-key, I think it's I think it goes with what you're trying to do 22 distinctive. with the building. 23 24 My only question is, when I look at the actual 25 pages that you have for the signage, S, I forgot, S-something

1 there, there's like six pages or whatever. 2 You do talk about designing to, that it was going to maintain the design integrity of the building, and I'm not 3 really sure what that means, per se. I sort of understand what you're getting at, but 5 when I look at some of the images, especially with signs that 6 7 are on, going vertical, it reads, some of those signs look like they could be 20 feet tall. You sort of indicated on the plan an area where 9 10 they're going to be, but I'm concerned that you could put up, 11 as long as the sign is attached within that area, it could 12 stick up 10 feet. 13 I mean, you, I don't think that's your intent. But I'm just concerned that there's, you might want, I would 15 like to see that tightened up a bit. I understand you wanted some kind of signs that you might need to do that, but I just 16 want to be sure that we're not going to be suddenly getting 17 a 10 foot blade sign sticking up beyond that area. 18 Yeah, I think somewhere you say it won't go beyond 19 the second floor. I don't know if that's the top of the 2.0 21 second floor, or --MR. KADLECEK: Well, the area that's indicated in 22 light blue on the drawing is limited to the ground floor. 23

So --

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.

24

1	MR. KADLECEK: in no event would the signage
2	extend beyond that.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: In height, too.
4	MR. KADLECEK: In, in anything.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: In blade. Okay.
6	MR. KADLECEK: Correct. Yeah.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: You do show an area on the
8	Maurice Electric Supply, you've sort of dashed over an area
9	in there, and it looks like you're trying to keep the
10	original Maurice Electric Supply Company sign? But it,
11	there's also a dashed area that sort of goes over that.
12	So I'm just curious as to what you really mean by
13	that.
14	There's a blue area, yeah. If, yeah, on that
15	drawing that you've got there, 20, you've got the Maurice
16	Supply, Electric Supply Company sign, which I'm assuming is
17	the existing signage, that you're either replacing to put it
18	there, that you're also covering up.
19	I'm just curious as to how you're integrating what
20	you're doing there.
21	MR. KAUFMAN: Hello, Commissioner. Excuse me. My
22	name's Jeff Kaufman. I'm with EDENS, and I just jump in on
23	the signage because we're very focused on that.
24	I think the intent is, is definitely to, to keep
25	the Maurice Electric sign. There is some retail to the

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
2	MR. KAUFMAN: left
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
4	MR. KAUFMAN: that will be new, and so we will
5	want some kind of signage for that retail. But again, it
6	would be within the, it wouldn't be instead of, it would be
7	in addition to, and it would obviously have to work with,
8	sort of the aesthetic of the building.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, okay.
10	MR. KAUFMAN: And the historic aesthetic of the
11	building.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right. I
13	MR. KAUFMAN: Does that answer your question?
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah, I was just curious.
15	When I saw the, the, I figured you were going to do
16	something, but it's just sort of like this blank blue swatch,
17	and I was wondering if you were, I didn't think you would
18	screw up the Maurice Electric sign. But, so you're going to
19	have some lower, some signage, probably, lower than that
20	around those, tops of those windows or something.
21	MR. KAUFMAN: Probably. And if you would like, I
22	mean, we can look at it in more detail, and figure out, show
23	you something so that you can understand that it doesn't
24	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
25	MR. KAUFMAN: detract from the Maurice Electric

1	sign
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right, that would
3	MR. KAUFMAN: because that's not the intention.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That would be fine. And
5	I think, Mr. Chair, those are my questions.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We'll go to Commissioner May, and
7	I think the Vice Chair and I have some follow, well I have
8	my original question. Okay. Commissioner May?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, thank you. So I
10	appreciate that you showed us the views of the eastern side
11	of the building, and what might happen eventually with that
12	site.
13	The rendering, though, is based on an assumption
14	that it's going to be zoned similar to what this property is?
15	Is that right?
16	MR. KADLECEK: That's the assumption, yes.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. What could happen there
18	right now? What's the height that would be allowed there
19	now?
20	MR. KADLECEK: IT's PDR 1, so I believe the maximum
21	height is 50 or 60 feet. That's off of memory, I don't
22	recall off the top of my head.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And is that the location
24	that you were talking about, where the promised PDR would be
25	off-site?

1	MR. KADLECEK: Yes, that's what is referred to as
2	Maurice Office. So that's where part of the proffer is.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: It would be in that, it would
4	be in the building next door.
5	MR. KADLECEK: Correct.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: So you have enough of connection
7	to the building next store to promise PDR use there, but you
8	don't have enough of a connection to the building next door
9	to figure out a way to share access from the alley?
10	MR. KADLECEK: They're I think they're slightly
11	different issues in that the, the, the commitment for the use
12	next door is for five years.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mm-hmm.
14	MR. KADLECEK: And the development can be well
15	beyond that. And of course, then the nature of that
16	(Simultaneous speaking.)
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean, how quickly are
18	you going to break ground on this?
19	MR. SPENDLEY: The plan will be as soon as we get
20	final order, and, and all approvals are in place, we would
21	just start finalizing design, and, and get under
22	construction.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. So it's, it, two or three
24	years, it'll be finished. Something like that. Three years?
25	MR. SPENDLEY: That would be the goal.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. And the other one could
2	be, then, would be eight years out, presumably, because the
3	PDR use wouldn't survive the redevelopment.
4	MR. KAUFMAN: Sorry, I don't want to jump in, but
5	yes. That's, the space that you're referring to is fully
6	leased right now. And so those leases are tied to all roll
7	at the end of 2022. And so the idea would be that in 2022,
8	we would start the development of that next piece.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: So is the PDR that you are
10	promising now the existing PDR?
11	MR. KAUFMAN: So the tenants that are in there
12	Not, I'm not sure I totally follow the question, but
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well you're, I mean, you're
14	promising, in order to meet the PDR requirement, you're
15	trying to do it off-site in the building that's adjacent.
16	And is that because there is existing adjacent PDR uses that
17	you are trying to take credit for?
18	MR. KAUFMAN: So we've been doing PDR uses in this
19	area for the last 10 years. Most of the uses in the space
20	right now are PDR, or would qualify for PDR which, retail
21	being one of them.
22	But the proffer is, is that as these tenants
23	leave, come and go, that we will maintain those PDR uses for
24	the next five years to 2022.
l	

COMMISSIONER MAY: What if they don't change at

	44
1	all?
2	MR. KAUFMAN: Then they would still, in theory,
3	qualify for
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
5	(Simultaneous speaking.)
6	So essentially, you're, I mean, for at least a
7	period, a partial, a part of the time that you are
8	proffering, you're just proffering to take credit for
9	existing PDR use in the adjacent building.
10	MR. KAUFMAN: Yes. Without, I mean, I think
11	there's nuance there, but I think
12	(Simultaneous speaking.)
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand there's nuance, and
14	there are complications, and all this. But I just, I'm
15	trying to understand what it is you're, what you're actually
16	offering in terms of PDR.
17	MR. KADLECEK: There, there's also a commitment in
18	this building itself, as well.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, for
20	MR. KADLECEK: So it's not sold
21	COMMISSIONER MAY:31 FAR, or whatever, some
22	very small amount
23	MR. KADLECEK: Right, but
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: that the Office of Planning
25	is unhappy about.

1	MR. KADLECEK: Right, but there, there's also the,
2	the specification piece of it, to build out to PDR
3	specifications. That was what we were talking about earlier.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: I
5	MR. KADLECEK: So it's a, you know, it's a
6	multifaceted aspect.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: I understand. But, I mean, the
8	Office of Planning still believes that it's inadequate to
9	meet what they expect out of a property that's been striped
10	like this.
11	To be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan,
12	there should be a meatier commitment to do PDR on-site.
13	Anyway. So let me ask about the retail that's
14	planned. You have a very large retail space on the western
15	side of the building. Is that anticipated that it might be
16	a single tenant in that space?
17	MR. KAUFMAN: So it could be a single tenant.
18	Probably not. It'll probably be a large tenant that sort of
19	takes, has a presence on the street, and then takes a deeper
20	
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mm-hmm.
22	MR. KAUFMAN: piece. And then there'll probably
23	be shop space sort of in between
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: In the front of it.
25	MR. KAUFMAN: the lot

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
2	MR. KAUFMAN: in front of that. And then on the
3	other side of the lobby, the residential lobby, there'll be
4	additional shop space. I think it's about 25 to 30,000
5	square feet of leasable space in
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
7	MR. KAUFMAN: between the two.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, it just seems
9	extraordinarily deep space, unless you were doing something,
10	you know, like a department store, or grocery store, or
11	something like that. I mean what's the total square footage
12	of that one large section of retail on the western side?
13	MR. KAUFMAN: I think it's about and correct me
14	if I'm wrong but I think it's about 20,000 square feet on
15	the left side, and then another five on the right.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Yeah, so it's too small
17	for most grocery stores. But it's, I mean, it's just got
18	that depth of space that you don't usually
19	MR. KAUFMAN: Yep.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: find unless there's a reason
21	to go sort of deeply into it.
22	All right. So one of the things I find very odd
23	about the design of the building has to do with just the
24	layout of the, of that ground floor, and the access to the

25 garage -- and the fact that people who are coming by car and

parking in the garage, so people, presumably people who live in the building are, you know, entering into that alley, and going up along that long facade.

They're going uphill just a bit. It's about four feet from the front of the building to the back of the building, and then you go through the loading area, and the trucks backing in and out, making multiple movements to do that -- and then down a very long ramp to get to the floor below.

And I'm wondering if you've looked at alternatives that would separate the parking access from the loading at the back of the building, because it seems to be there ought to be a way to figure that out so that you go, you know, halfway up, or three-quarters of the way up the alley, and turn right into the parking garage.

And then if you're a truck, you continue on, and you have a segregated loading area.

Because I mean, it's not a great thing to go past the loading area to get to the parking garage.

Going into the same portal, and going left to loading, right to parking is one thing. But you're making all of the people parking go past the loading docks. So.

MR. COLBERT: I -- Excuse me. I think the problem with that is that if you had the parking entrance, like, say halfway down the alley facade, and then you put the loading

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

further north, it would separate the loading docks from access getting back into the commercial spaces.

And I think part of the problem her is this is a, kind of a very awkward site, given the triangulation of it. And, you know, moving the parking and loading entrance further south toward the front of the building onto Penn Street, it, we've looked at a lot of different options. But that would kind of really create problems with the, you know, we spent a lot of energy trying to make as nice of retail space as possible. We worked hard with the column grids to make them open and still work the apartments.

So, you know, EDENS is like super-focused on, you know, significant requirements they have for what they needed in the commercial space to make it rentable. And the result of that was really pushing the parking and loading entrance to the back.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I can appreciate that. But I find it really problematic.

I also think that if you thought about this a little bit more -- I mean, I appreciate that there's, you know, the fact that there's, there are economic issues associated with what retail tenant goes into these spaces.

But one of the things that you are faced with is the fact that the building as designed, the project as designed, doesn't have adequate PDR spaces.

2.0

And you have a very deep building, and that depth could actually be used to your advantage. I mean, you have a deep building with an alley facade.

So, I mean, if you did wind up reconfiguring the building, and you wind up with some theoretically rentable space toward the back of that building, it seems like that would actually be pretty decent PDR space.

You know, it's not unheard of to go into an alley to get to the, you know, the shop where somebody's building something, making something.

I mean, I used to go up that alley all the time to go to the guy who stripped doors. It was on the other side of the alley, but you know, that was his business. You drove up the alley, and went to the loading dock, and he appeared from the depths and took your doors, and stripped them, and you came back a week later. Usually at like 10:00 at night. It was very strange.

But I don't know. I think you, you wind up with a very contorted plan as a result of this, and you're, and the grades are fighting against you. And it would seem to me that there might be a way to slip a ramp in, onto the left side, and push the retail around a little bit.

It's not like you're trying to maintain a retail footprint that's designed for a particular size tenant, right? It's not going to be, most likely not going to be a

2.0

1	single tenant that needs 20,000 square feet.
2	So if you wind up with 15 on the left, and a
3	little bit more on the right, and then some PDR space at the
4	back, it might work actually pretty nicely.
5	I'm not sure what you do with that as a comment,
6	but I think that you do have to address the PDR issue, and
7	maybe this is a way to, for you to think about it.
8	Why is it that, I think I asked, maybe I asked
9	this, sat down and raised the question, and maybe you've
10	answered it and I've missed it.
11	But it's very strange that the property line is
12	right down the entrance, right down the middle of the
13	entrance of the Maurice Electric entrance. Is that just
14	because it was originally, just, it was two lots from the
15	very beginning, and you bought one half, and somebody else
16	bought the other?
17	MR. KAUFMAN: No, it has to do with how the
18	building laid out, and to the right is where there's 35,000
19	square feet of existing tenants.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
21	MR. KAUFMAN: And to the left is the old Maurice
22	Electric showroom, which, when they left, was empty.
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: Mm-hmm.
24	MR. KAUFMAN: And so that was sort of a clear
25	division between people that were staying and space that was

51 1 empty. 2 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So I'm, and, I mean this is just a, this is another, sort of visible architectural 3 oddity about the building, because you have this portal into Maurice Electric, right? 5 There's a recessed opening there into the front door, as I recall? 6 7 And right in the middle of that, you've got a building growing out of the top of it. So, you know, opening, with a building, a line of the building coming out of it. And it's just very strange architecturally. 10 11 You, you want, when you have a wall of a building, you want it to come to the ground. And to have it not come 12 13 the ground like that just like said, Ι it's, architecturally bizarre. 15 16 17

And I'm not sure what you, you know, obviously the plans are quite advanced, and you've decided how to, how to split up the building. I'm not sure what the solution could potentially be. I don't know.

I don't know, Mr. Colbert, do you want, I mean, do you have, I mean, what's your response to that? I mean, how did you feel about, did you see the problem I'm talking about?

I mean, this is sort of like, you know --

MR. COLBERT: Yeah, I think --

COMMISSIONER MAY: -- Architecture 101 problem.

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1	MR. COLBERT: Right. So that's why we created the
2	balancing brick facade on the left side of the, you know,
3	Penn Street face, so that would create a kind of continuous
4	visual base
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
6	MR. COLBERT: and
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: And that's a good move. I like
9	that.
10	MR. COLBERT: So I think that part of the answer
11	to that is going to be when they develop the adjacent
12	building, to do it in a way that really captures the
13	continuation of the Maurice facade. So, you know, until
14	that, you know, is done, it'll be a little bit of a question
15	mark.
16	But I think that, you know, given, I, I think
17	there's a strong desire to make sure that there's a
18	continuity there when, you know, the next phase is developed.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, is it, is, I, is that
20	building actually historic, or it's just, it just has
21	MR. COLBERT: No ,it's not
22	(Simultaneous speaking.)
23	COMMISSIONER MAY: and you want to keep it.
24	MR. COLBERT: There was a historic area, but this
25	is not in it.

	53
1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
2	MR. COLBERT: That was newly created for the market
3	buildings.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean, I think it's worth
5	taking a look at, just to see if there's some treatment of
6	that entrance at Maurice, just to kind of bring the wall to
7	ground.
8	MR. COLBERT: Okay.
9	MR. KAUFMAN: Can I make one
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
11	MR. KAUFMAN: just, observation. I don't know
12	that this helps.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: Sure.
14	MR. KAUFMAN: I talk, I tend to talk a lot, and so
15	sometimes I talk myself into more problems than, than it's
16	worth. But
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: I know that feeling.
18	MR. KAUFMAN: One of the things that is sort of
19	hard to tell from the rendering is that the edge of the
20	building is actually not on center with 5th Street. So
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
22	MR. KAUFMAN: The edge of this building actually
23	lines up with the edge of the left side of the 5th Street
24	buildings.
25	And so when and if you do build the next tower,

1 that would actually, in theory, be lined up with the 2 termination of 5th Street. So I, so we thought a lot about that when we were 3 originally looking at how to phase that stretch from, of Penn from New York Avenue all the way to 6th Street. 5 I don't, and again, I don't know that that helps. 6 7 But that was part of the process. 8 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I mean, I can appreciate that. But I don't know that it necessarily does anything for 9 my particular issue. 10 11 I mean, I really just feel like there needs to be a, I mean I, what I really would like to see is the whole 12 edge of the building shift over so that it aligns, aligns 13 with the columns that are established on the facade of Maurice Electric. But I know that's impractical. 15 So if it's going to be over there, maybe there 16 just needs to be something done to the treatment of the 17 facade to insert some sort of form, the column form or 18 19 something that recognizes that. And of course, you'd have to do that on the second 2.0 21 floor too, or else it's, you've got that window being squished between. 22 23 I mean, maybe there's nothing to I don't know. be done with it, but I would appreciate it if you would just 24 25 take some kind of look at it to see if there's anything that

can be done.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And I, last thing is I appreciate what you've done with the western -- sorry, the eastern facade of the building where it will join up with whatever is developed next door, because I think that those look better than what you had before.

I assume that those are all just at-risk windows, but there are not very many of them. Right? Yeah.

I mean --

MR. COLBERT: They're at risk, so they're not required for the apartments.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Yeah. But I appreciate the treatment of it. It's, it works with the rhythm of what you have with the rest, the way you break up the facade the rest of the way, and you keep the frame going. So I think that works pretty well.

The one last thing is, on the access to the building next door, that DDOT would like you to promise. So the loading is all the way at the back of the building, presumably, are they just asking that you leave a knockout panel or something like that, and agree that in the future trucks or vehicles can access the property next door through a portal that would go through the knockout panel? Is that what the theory is?

MR. SPENDLEY: Presumably. If that would be

1 possible. We've initially studied it, and it just kind of 2 struggled with how all the uses would connect back there, where you have your head-in and head-out loading, which was 3 4 a request of, of --5 COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. SPENDLEY: -- of DDOT as well, to not have 6 7 those activities in the alley. 8 You have our residents and retail parking going initial thoughts, you have a down the ramp there. So blindside when you're actually trying to leave the building 10 11 with the loading on your left as well. So just logistically, something that we couldn't 12 13 come to grips with at this time. 14 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Right. Well, again, I think, I mean, I think that if you got rid of that car ramp, 15 the garage ramp from that location and put it somewhere else, 16 separated it, segregated it from loading, it would be easier 17 to accommodate. 18 I can totally see why you wouldn't want to promise 19 2.0 it, given that you have your garage access right there, 21 because I can see how that's a problem on the interior of the building, and it's just inviting issues. 22 23 And you can put all the curvy mirrors you want, and flashing lights, and stuff like that, and you're still 24

going to have problems.

1	But it's unfortunate.
2	I mean, I, it's also a little bit hard to predict,
3	because you don't know even how the grades might be different
4	next door, and you know, the efficiency of the layout there.
5	But I, you know, leaving open the possibility, I
6	mean, I guess you're saying that you're open to the
7	possibility in the future potentially, but you're not going
8	to promise it now. Right?
9	MR. SPENDLEY: Correct. Certainly we can look at,
10	but it's, at this point, I can't commit to that.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. I understand that. I
12	just think the whole loading and parking access needs to be
13	redesigned. Small thing.
14	All right. Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Vice Chair Miller?
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I forgot
17	to touch on a couple, a few points.
18	Quickly, a couple positive. Maybe one negative.
19	But on the positive, I always like balconies, and
20	I don't know if I mentioned that at set-down. I don't know
21	if you increased them since set-down, but I like all the
22	balconies. They, and I, I like the variation and, that you
23	talked about, and the - so that's great.
24	You know, it's a residential building even though
25	it's the industrial aesthetic.

1 And I like the wood underneath the canopy, the 2 wood, and I like all the brick, and I think it warms up the 3 glass, and the other materials. So that's good. 4 The, I just wanted to put that comment on the 5 record. 6 On the, but I wanted to chime in on the, on asking 7 you to take another look, as OP has requested, on increasing the time commitment and the square footage commitment on the PDR maker uses. And I read your response, and I understand that 10 11 the market will drive a lot of that, but, and I appreciate all the, all the PDR that you've done, that EDENS and, and 12 others have done at Union Market for the last 10 years. 13 That's really fantastic, all that activation, and providing all that creative economy space is just great. 15 Did I hear you say that the Maurice office site, 16 all those, the film production, the studio sculpture, the 17 18 digital stuff that's in there now - did, that comes up to 35,000 square feet? 19 2.0 MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah, there's, it's about 35,000, I 21 think it's actually 36,000 square feet, but --22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: So, so my, just the, 23 jumped out at me, because you're only making a commitment for 1100 square feet with this project and, for five years, and 24

that's --

59 1 MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah. VICE CHAIR MILLER: -- like, that just drives home 2 3 the point that OP, I think, was making. 4 MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah, and I, and again, at the risk of talking too much, I just, try it on for a little bit of 5 6 insight. 7 I think that our vision and OP's vision are very much in alignment. I think we totally agree with what they're trying to achieve there. I think where the, I don't even want to call it a disconnect. But I think where we're 10 11 struggling is in the best way to achieve it. We've been there for 10 years. We've been doing 12 a lot of stuff; we've done what I would, I would say is about 13 100,000 square feet, between the market and a number of other things, of PDR space. 15 I think there's, it's important to sort of parse 16 the PDR slightly, because retail - I mean, the Small Area 17 18 Plan, and the vision that I think OP and, and EDENS both very much agree on, and is the goal, is to activate the street. 19 And so the, where we start to get into trouble 2.0 21 with the, with OP, is I think the maker space definition which is what I would say is a sliver of, you know, is a, one 22 segment of the overall PDR concept. 23

retail, the retail world, you know, the state of the retail

where we're struggling is, you

And so

24

world today is not great. E-commerce is really affecting a lot of retailers - particularly local and small retailers.

And so the one area where I would say, that's bucking that trend, is the PDR maker - and not, not even PDR, but the maker space.

So fundamentally, we have no problem trying to commit, you know, doing as much maker space as we possibly can. And I think most of the stuff there would qualify with the maker space.

I think where we run into trouble is the commitment - things are changing so fast, how much, you know, what is a maker? You know, for example - and again, I'm talking too much - but you know, if you buy your material, if you make your dress at home, dresses at home, but you sell them in a boutique in a shop at Union Market, is that a maker? And you live in Ivy City.

So it's not that I, that we disagree. I think it's that we disagree on, or we, we're struggling with how to get there. And so in our, in our minds, the best ways to achieve what that goal is, I think we've worked with OP fairly well on a broad definition, and we're pretty happy - that we're pretty happy with, and I think that they're happy with as well.

The commitment to the specification of the delivery of the space is very important. And it's nuanced,

2.0

because in a building like this, the Maurice, which is a ground-up, new building, it will likely be 100 percent built to the spec that meets the PDR space.

The reason why we are saying we only want to build 50 percent of the, of the overall space - and I know it's, we're sort of combining this PD-- this PUD with other projects is, is that, you know, it makes all the sense in the world to build this space to that spec. It does not necessarily make all the sense in the world to build the next project, because of the heights, and the, and the whatever, the, so maybe it's got a piece of historic building in it, or whatever.

So the 50 percent is sort of our commitment to OP to deliver on the overall retail PRD ground floor that we intend to do at Union Market.

And so I, you know, I'm happy, we're happy to keep working with OP in trying to figure out how to make the maker space segment work. But we're just really, I mean, we're really hesitant to commit to specific sizes and time periods, because the retail market is just changing so fast.

And I would just end with, you know, unfortunately I think we're in a moment in time - and all these things are a moment in time - so we're in a moment in time where the more traditional retailers are the ones that I think maybe need some protection, or some things to help them, because

2.0

1	they're the ones that are getting sort of, you know, put out
2	of business by all the e-commerce.
3	So sorry again, that was a long answer. But I
4	hope that
5	(Simultaneous speaking.)
6	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I appreciate all that. So I
7	would encourage you to just, to continue to work with OP.
8	And, and if that Ivy City dressmaker is not included in their
9	definition, make sure it is included.
10	So, and other similar. Thanks.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: First, let me say, I, I thank you
12	for leaving the sign, Maurice Electric. That's all I
13	remember being there, so I appreciate that.
14	Let talk a little about the, I have some
15	clarification.
16	Did you all agree to the tin shopping carts that
17	DDOT is proposing?
18	MS. MILANOVICH: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And what, what kind of shopping,
20	not like the Home Depot one, I had to take those on my street
21	back to Home Depot one day. But what, what kind of shopping
22	carts are we talking about?
23	MS. MILANOVICH: No, I mean the intent is just to
24	have, you know, I have one in my condo building to help me
25	get my groceries upstairs. But I think the intent is that
	I .

1 if you live there and want to shop in the market, buy your 2 groceries, whatnot, you have a cart that can, you can, it can 3 be one that, you, you know, kind of pull behind you, it could be a pushcart. And you can take that with you, and you can, 5 so you can --CHAIRMAN HOOD: Bring it back. 6 7 MS. MILANOVICH: -- walk, as opposed to having to 8 take your car because you have too much to carry. 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And I saw somewhere, I can't think of where I saw what I was reading yesterday, the, was 10 11 it \$50, was that an, was that in the agreement for the jobs? \$50 SmarTrip card? 12 I can't, I had, I'm trying to figure out where I 13 saw it. 15 MR. SPENDLEY: So we have it in two places. as part of a TDM measure for our residents. But also, part 16 of our, our proffer with Jubilee Jobs is to provide transit 17 cars for ANC 5D residents who are placed through Jubilee 18 19 Jobs. CHAIRMAN HOOD: And, and let me ask you this first. 2.0 21 Let's talk about the ANC 5D residents. The \$50 card lasts, 22 is it one time, or when you get a job, or what is the timeframe? 23 MR. SPENDLEY: The theory is that the more you have 24

access to public transit, the more likely you are to have a

1	job, and the more likely to keep a job. So the \$10,000 that
2	we're providing to Jubilee Jobs for those, those transit
3	cards will be for ANC 5D, 5D residents who continue through
4	the program, and continue to maintain that job.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it's not a one-time thing, it
6	depends on continuation.
7	MR. SPENDLEY: Correct
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
9	MR. SPENDLEY: until the, the amount is
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And help me refresh my memory.
12	What did you say about the residents, as far as the SmarTrip
13	card. Five years like the bike share? Or is it two years
14	of - I can't remember.
15	MS. MILANOVICH: The, the SmarTrip cards for the
16	residents would be, I believe, for three years.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Three years, okay.
18	MS. MILANOVICH: Yeah, and it, that is a one-time
19	card.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's one-time for three years.
21	Okay. Let's put back up the, I think the west
22	side - the side, on the side of, is that Riggs Bank, P, I'm
23	dating myself. Is it PNC now? What, whatever the bank is.
24	MS. MILANOVICH: Down
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's put that street Is it

	65
1	Riggs?
2	PARTICIPANT: It used to be Riggs.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, I know it used to be, but I
4	don't
5	MS. MILANOVICH: Yeah
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: what it is
7	MS. MILANOVICH: it's PNC now.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, it was. It was a
9	good bank then. I used to go to that one.
10	Okay, as you turn the corner, you showed me where
11	you wanted a sidewalk, I think right on the side of the bank.
12	MS. MILANOVICH: Right.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can you show me with the red line
14	again where, I know you all are still talking and having
15	conversations.
16	My concern is, I know things have changed. When
17	I used to drive - well, not me, but others used to drive down
18	that street, they come kind of fast. And we want to make
19	sure that when you turn off New York Avenue, that's a concern
20	for me.
21	Maybe I can mention that to DDOT. And I'm not
22	going to say others - I used to do it as well, because I had
23	to keep up with what was going on there.
24	But I can tell you, my concern is - and I don't

25 want to create a problem. When you turn that, when you turn

off New York Avenue, and you're trying, and some people are 2 trying to get off New York Avenue - and when you turn there, 3 to me, for a sidewalk to be that close, and another part, and I'm sure they're not going, you know, another part to be 5 private property. So we need to really make sure if you, if that's 6 7 what, and I know you all may disagree on that, but we really, I'm really concerned about the safety of someone walking down 9 that area. So that's something, I guess in your continuation 10 11 conversations with DDOT, you really need to look at that. 12 And I'll, well, DDOT can hear me. I don't need to repeat 13 myself. 14 MS. MILANOVICH: Sure, and I quess I would also add, I mean, I understand your concern, because if you look 15 at the aerial, it is a very wide street. And that, what we 16 know is wider streets encourage speeding. 17 18 I think with the conversion to two-way, we'll have parallel parking on both sides - whoops - and the, that 19 travel way will actually be narrower, and that will, in and 2.0 of itself, reduce travel speeds. 21 22 There have been studies done that show, you know, when you have narrower travel lanes, speeds decrease. 23 24 think that will help with the speeding

problem.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And also, Penn Street. I
2	know - and again, I don't go over there as much as I used to.
3	But I know Penn Street, there was always something going on.
4	And I know with the district of this building, and others
5	that are soon to follow, some of the same things that
6	happened on Penn Street in the past cannot happen now,
7	because we're going to have more pedestrians.
8	Has that, was that part of the equation in your
9	analysis of what goes on?
10	Or did you, in your expert opinion, did you see
11	a whole lot of things that were going on on Penn Street as
12	you studied it?
13	MS. MILANOVICH: So I mean, we spent, obviously,
14	a fair amount of time out at the site. And, you know, one
15	of the concerns is, obviously, as you mentioned, the speeding
16	traffic.
17	I think the streetscape guidelines that have been
18	developed that call for the on-street parallel parking, that
19	in itself creates, it's essentially a traffic-calming
20	measure. It gives the feeling that it's a much more
21	constrained condition, and it also provides a buffer between
22	pedestrians and the travel way.
23	So I think as this area redevelops, as 4th and 5th
24	are converted to two-way, a lot of the issues that you have

mentioned that you know, we also could, could see when we

1	were out there observing traffic - I think those will go
2	away, and take care of itself.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. I will
4	definitely accept your professional opinion, I believe, on
5	that one.
6	But I, let me just say, as far as the design of
7	the building, I really like the way it looks. It's a lot
8	better than what we've seen for years.
9	And I like the way, when you turn in, I think it's
10	going to really help continue to jumpstart the market, as
11	it's already been jumpstarted.
12	Okay. That's all I have. Any other questions up
L3	here? Mr. Turnbull.
L4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah, I just had one on
15	phasing of construction. You have this really nice drawing
16	of the elevations perspectives showing the Maurice Electric,
L7	the full elevation of the facade of it.
18	But you're really only occupying half of it. So
L9	you're building the wall, the foundation wall on there.
20	You're going to be into that part of the building.
21	So how's that going to affect the existing people
22	that are there, then? How do you plan to maintain that
23	facade, and everything else?
24	MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah, so maybe we can both answer
25	this

1	From my perspective, we were very concerned about
2	our tenants who were in there. One of them is actually huge,
3	which is a international internet company that has 120
4	employees there - and their, our agreement with them has
5	protections of how close construction can be to their
6	building, and all kinds of stuff.
7	We've actually, over the last two years, been
8	working with all the different permitting departments. And
9	we actually have in-hand permits that allow us to separate
10	the building as the sort of first phase of the construction.
11	So essentially a buffer is built, sort of
12	separating the existing tenants that stay from the new
13	construction.
14	And, and as, I mean, it's got, it's been analyzed
15	with fire, and life safety, and all that kind of stuff.
16	So I don't want to make it sound like it's
17	insignificant, but, but that was one of the major issues we
18	had to figure out before we could get to the point where we
19	are today.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So you're able to maintain
21	the whole facade still, or?
22	MR. COLBERT: We've actually had a structural
23	engineer do drawings to show how that can work, because there
24	is an exit corridor that goes along the property line.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah.

1 MR. COLBERT: And also, it's important to point 2 out, too, that the new facade is actually set back several 3 feet, so that enables us to come in there structurally. 4 You know, the, the front, that goes in front of 5 our building, is going to have to be braced from the south 6 side during construction. 7 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Vice Chair Miller. 8 9 I promise this is the VICE CHAIR MILLER: Sorry. Maybe I asked it, I just can't remember. 10 11 Green, the green screen is really very, very attractive. But is it really going to be green more than six 12 13 Does anybody know? months a year? 14 think Ι just а green saw screen garage somewhere, I think in the city. 15 I think it was artificial 16 turf. MS. FELDMAN: Good evening. My name is Stacilyn 17 Feldman. I'm a landscape architect with Oehme, van Sweden 18 In answer to your question, our intent to have 19 & Associates. as much green coverage as possible throughout the year. 2.0 tend to work with a cocktail of vines, as we refer to it, so 21 that we have different interest coming throughout the year. 22 So the hope is to have a completely green effort. 23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: What with climate change, maybe 24 25 it'll help with that too. One advantage.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other, okay, any other
2	questions up here? Okay.
3	ANC 5D, is the representative of ANC 5D here?
4	Okay.
5	Okay, so let's go to the Office of Planning and
6	District Department of Transportation.
7	Ms. Elliott?
8	MS. ELLIOTT: You're two for two, Commissioner.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm on a roll.
10	MS. ELLIOTT: Chairman.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm, you know what I'm doing? I'm
12	doing it right tonight, so when I mess up, you'll forgive me.
13	Her name is Ms. Brandice Elliott. Yes.
14	MS. ELLIOTT: We've come a long way. So good
15	evening
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me ask you this. So how many
17	years has it been?
18	MS. ELLIOTT: Six.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know, that number keeps going
20	up every time. But anyway. Okay.
21	(Laughter.)
22	MS. ELLIOTT: Been here my whole life.
23	Good evening, Commissioners.
24	In general, OP is supportive of this project. You
25	know, we feel that several goals of the Comprehensive Plan

have been met with what's been proposed.

2.0

We do have some conditions that we think need to be further addressed, and among those is the PDR maker space. We've had a lot of discussions with the Applicant regarding how that could be achieved.

One thing that was discussed - and, and actually executed by the applicant - was sort of tinkering with the definition of what maker space is.

We empowered them to broaden it in scope so that it would be easier to actually find a PDR or maker space to occupy that space in the building.

They did. They've added food hubs. They, and food incubators to the definition. And of course, we're open to additional suggestions. That's just all that came up at the time, and, you know, we thought that that would help them fill their space easier.

We have also discussed providing PDR in other locations. Similar to what's been proffered under this application, you know, the 20,000 square feet next door - which is a great proffer. You know, it, those leases have already been signed. So actually, we wouldn't get, you know, that PDR space guaranteed for a full five years, because those leases have already been executed.

So we have discussed, actually, we are aware that EDENS owns other properties within Florida Avenue market, and

we're open to them making the commitment to provide PDR in some of those spaces, as well.

I know we've talked about PDR in the market in general, and we appreciate, you know, the work that EDENS has done to provide that space in the market area. But the issue that we have up to this point is there is no commitment. So that space could be converted to retail at any moment.

Now, the, it is true that retail use is permitted in PDR zones. But the, the property is striped on the future land use map with PDR. And I think that - OP thinks that - if the intent was to provide retail only, then that PDR stripe has no reason to exist on the map.

So we really think there needs to be a greater balance of PDR, you know, incorporated into this development, or just within Florida Avenue market, period.

And as part of that, we would like to see floorplans actually identifying where that PDR space is. That's part of the commitment of providing it, and you know, I think part of the, the presentation from the Applicant, you know, in discussing some of the, the market conditions, they're a little leery to make the commitment.

But I think that that's important to demonstrate that this is actually not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan - because we have no guarantee as to where that's going to be provided.

2.0

Another issue that has come up is in regards to DC Water, and is condition number three in our report, is up to this point, they have yet to receive a master utility They've had some issues executing some of the reviews, and trying to determine who's doing what, and when, and what improvements are going to be made with various projects. Applicant And so we would request that the continue to work with DC Water, provide that master utility plan prior to any action on this request. The Applicant has also proffered \$10,000 to DPR, which we think is fantastic. But we're not sure how that's being allocated, and so we would also ask that the Applicant continue working with DPR to identify specifically how that money is going to be spent, so that it can be, you know, properly identified as a benefit or amenity to this project. think that that's, that summarizes the outstanding items that we listed in our report. So I'm happy to answer any questions you have. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Let's see if we have any questions up here. Commissioner May? COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, so it's unusual for us to

have a DC Water issue under a PUD. Presumably, this is just because there's so much redevelopment happening in that area, and there are significant infrastructure upgrades that will

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Τ	be required.
2	But is it incumbent upon, I mean the, this is like
3	the sixth or seventh PUD that we've done in this space
4	between, just between Florida Ave and New York Ave.
5	And why is it coming up now, as opposed to, why
6	hasn't this been a recurring theme in past PUDs?
7	MS. ELLIOTT: It has come up before, and the
8	applicant has continued to work with DC Water, I think as
9	these projects have moved forward.
10	But the problem is up to this point, DC Water has
11	not received the information that they need.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's been, it's been
13	mentioned in the past ones, but it was never
14	MS. ELLIOTT: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: something where you put your
16	foot down, and said we have to have
17	MS. ELLIOTT: Right. We have not put the brakes
18	on, but DC Water is really starting to have some concerns
19	about how to move forward with some of these projects, and
20	so
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
22	MS. ELLIOTT: it has become more of an issue
23	with this project. But it certainly has been discussed with
24	this Applicant with previous projects.
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.

1		MS. STEINGASSER: I'd also add it's, it's an
2	evaluation	standard in the zoning
3		COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, I know it is
4		MS. STEINGASSER: regulations
5		(Simultaneous speaking.)
6		COMMISSIONER MAY: It just, and
7		MS. STEINGASSER: in the past
8		COMMISSIONER MAY: and it's, when it comes up,
9	it's usual	ly, you know, not an issue. And so it's just, I
10	mean, this	is
11		MS. STEINGASSER: Right.
12		COMMISSIONER MAY: what's striking to me, is
13		MS. STEINGASSER: Right.
14		COMMISSIONER MAY: just that it's, now it's an
15	issue when	we're saying yeah, it's got to happen.
16		And I agree. It, you know, it's got to happen.
17		MS. STEINGASSER: DC, this is the first time DC
18	Water has	elevated it
19		COMMISSIONER MAY: Ah.
20		MS. STEINGASSER: through
21		COMMISSIONER MAY: Through
22		MS. STEINGASSER: to this level
23		COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
24		MS. STEINGASSER: for us.
25		COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Yeah, I thought there was

1	something unusual about it. All right.
2	Yeah, I'm curious, your thinking on the
3	possibility that there could be a commitment to PDR uses off-
4	site, and that would somehow satisfy the complaint
5	requirement for the mapping requirement, because it was, you
6	know, striped with PDR uses.
7	And you feel comfortable saying that, well,
8	because this PDR use, it may not be happening exactly on this
9	site, where it's supposed to by the map, this project is
10	driving the creation of that PDR.
11	Does that, I mean, it feels like it's, we're sort
12	of stretching the, you know, how we interpret the map.
13	Turn your mic on.
14	MS. STEINGASSER: Oh. I'm sorry. Can you call up
15	the Future Land Use Map here? I think that's the zoning.
16	Well, yeah. The issue we have with the PDR - and
17	I agree with Mr. Kaufman that overall, we all have the same
18	vision. It's just, you know, one is prioritizing
19	flexibility, and we're prioritizing permanency.
20	The entire market has a stripe on it, and we've,
21	each PUD has come through without this commitment to it, and
22	now we're beginning to feel a little bit uneasy that they're,
23	the market itself, as a whole, the commitment needs to be a,
24	start to be nailed down

And in this project, they actually build the

78 1 space. They agreed to build the space for that PDR 2 availability, which we really appreciate, because it does 3 show, you know, a true importance of it. 4 But without that commitment it could just as easily become, you know, Williams Sonoma or, you know, that 5 it could become any kind of retail chain. 6 7 And so that's what we're looking for, is now that the market is beginning to be mature through PUDs, there is an opportunity to roll that, that commitment around as each project comes under construction, or, you know, their, the 10 11 historic spine - excuse me - are, of the original historic, the original marketplace has the opportunity, also, 12 13 through those smaller spaces, to absorb some for temporary 14 purposes. 15 So that's why we were encouraging an opportunity to look at more of a fluid standard. 16 17 And the other thing that's different now about PUDs is the level of modifications, and how quickly the 18

And the other thing that's different now about PUDs is the level of modifications, and how quickly the Commission can respond to a modification request, whether it's minor, consequential, or significant.

So that allows, that actually accommodates some flexibility, whereas previous PUDs didn't have that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Well, thanks. I appreciate that explanation. And I agree with you, you know, we will need to have specificity on the \$10,000 to DPR.

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 Thanks. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Any other questions of Office of Planning? 3 4 Let's go to DDOT. Mr. Rogers? MR. ROGERS: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of 5 6 the Commission. For the record, I'm Jonathan Rogers with the 7 District Department of Transportation. 8 It's good to be back; it's been a few months since 9 I've been here last. DDOT is largely supportive of the project. 10 11 are a few outstanding issues that I'll get into. We appreciate the close coordination with the 12 13 Applicant. That's always very helpful. And particularly, on a case like this, there was really a need for that level of coordination. 15 There were, from a vehicle standpoint, nine, 16 excuse me, nine impacted intersections. Part of that is from 17 18 the development program itself, about 300 square feet - or 300 units, 30,000 square feet of retail, and an extra level 19 sort of beyond, of parking beyond what we would normally 2.0 21 expect to see. A lot of that is generating a significant number of trips that is having an impact intersections in the 22 vicinity. 23 24 And the other piece is that, sort of the, just the

timing of this particular PUD in relation to other PUDs that

have come before it, and sort of claimed some of the excess capacity on the roadway.

And now we're at a point where we're, in a, in a very constrained environment from capacity standpoint.

There's also still significant substandard pedestrian facilities in the vicinity, although many of the other PUDs in the area have done a good job of starting to claim those improvements, and really to help build out the pedestrian network in the area.

I do want to focus on just the four areas where there is maybe a little bit more coordination that still needs to happen, as was highlighted in Ms. Milanovich's presentation.

So there were four mitigations that DDOT had requested that there's still some daylight on. The first is regarding the construction of the sidewalk on Penn Street east of the site, and then the pedestrian crossings at the 5th and Penn intersection.

DDOT understands the challenges, particularly, presented by the fire hydrant, and in putting an ideal pedestrian crossing at that location. For that reason, we are comfortable with just the pedestrian crossings, the two curb ramps, and the crosswalk along the west side of that intersection, which would provide a compliant connection to the 5th Street sidewalk along the west side of the street,

2.0

81 1 where there is actually a pretty generous sidewalk, and would provide a high quality pedestrian connection. 2 3 So I think we're in agreement on that particular 4 piece. Regarding the construction of the sidewalk on the 5 west side of 4<sup>Th</sup> Street between New York Avenue and what we 6 7 requested to be the edge of the PNC property, the Applicant, it is our understanding that they have proposed to install a sidewalk on the west side of the street from New York 9 Avenue just to Penn Street. 10 11 Our understanding, from discussions earlier, was that there would be a commitment also to provide the curb 12 ramps and crosswalks east-west to connect from the west side 13 of 4th Street at Penn to the east side. 15 I did not hear that particular component in the presentation tonight, so I would ask for clarification on 16 17 that. 18 I think in the absence of providing the crossing, the pedestrian crossings at that location, that we would 19 2.0

continue to ask that the 4th Street sidewalk be brought all the way down to the PNC property.

While there are landscaping features next to the PNC property, we believe that they are mostly, if not all, in public space, and could - with, of course, coordination with that property owner - be replaced with a sidewalk to

21

22

23

24

provide that vital pedestrian connection.

2.0

Regarding charging for the market rate retail, we understand this is a little bit more of a, it needs a little bit more discussion. It's not as simple as, as making a blanket statement about providing, or charging market rate for the retail parking, in part because the market, in many ways, is set by the co-applicant here, EDENS, because of their, their prominence in the market.

The other piece is not knowing exactly what, what is happening with other parking environments in the area, and winding up with a situation where there is some paid retail parking, and other retail parking that is not.

And so needing just to have a better understanding of the complete retail parking picture is important for us.

Just to back up a little bit, the reason why this is an important mitigation for DDOT is because there is so much parking that is provided, particularly for the retail component.

And we understand the justification that the Applicant has given. Our, based on our experience, and based on, on research in, in the field, pricing of parking is perhaps the best way to control, and to mitigate the, the effects of, of providing this, this high level of parking, which can lead to negative traffic impacts for the whole area.

So it is, that is a particular piece that we would like to see explored a little bit more, and just teased out a little bit.

And finally, regarding the provision of vehicular access through the site for the, the adjacent property. The adjacent property is sort of landlocked without alley access.

Therefore, in order to provide access to that parcel, we would be looking at a curb cut, either on Penn Street, which has, is going to have a lot of pedestrian activity, or Brentwood Parkway, which would be a relatively high-volume street, which would not be a street that we would typically want to see a curb cut from, and not meeting the DDOT standards.

The thinking with providing the access through this site would be to consolidate the number of curb cuts, so you minimize the number of conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians.

And that's really an opportunity that we want to see maintained. And I think there are other examples, even within the market, of where there's been this very thoughtful, forward-looking approach to, to site access.

I'm thinking of the square bounded by Morse, Neal, 5th, and 6th, where there's a private alley that is shared across multiple owners to provide loading access in one central point.

2.0

1 And so that's the type of thing that we think will really enhance the pedestrian environment over the long run, 2 by limiting these conflict points. 3 4 This may be something that's easier said than done, and I think we would like to understand a little bit 5 better some of the architectural challenges, the legal 6 7 challenges of proposing, of that option, and until such time think, that we've become comfortable Ι as, understanding some of those challenges, we still think that there's value in this ask, and would like to keep that as a 10 11 requested condition for DDOT approval. And so with that, I would like to pause, and be 12 happy to answer any questions you may have. 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Rogers. 14 Any Commissioner May? 15 questions of DDOT? COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, so just on this, the 16 loading connection issue. So is everything to the east of 17 18 this property, is that a consolidated single owner that, and will that whole site be redeveloped at once? 19 Is that what 2.0 your assumption is? 21 MR. ROGERS: I would defer to the Applicant on 22 that. 23 COMMISSIONER MAY: Is that, I mean, do you know --? 24 MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, we own, EDENS owns everything 25 from where this building ends, all the way to Brentwood.

COMMISSIONER MAY: All the way to Brentwood.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
And, and do you see it redeveloping as a single
property?
MR. KAUFMAN: One or two.
COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
MR. KAUFMAN: Meaning
COMMISSIONER MAY: So
MR. KAUFMAN: there might be a, two phases
COMMISSIONER MAY: Sure.
MR. KAUFMAN: more, you know
COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, right.
MR. KAUFMAN: two more additional phases
COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
MR. KAUFMAN: but
COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah. It's a lot.
MR. KAUFMAN: It's a lot, yeah.
COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, right, I understand.
MR. KAUFMAN: And the, the leases, as you get
further down - like, for example, Dolcezza's factory end is
in that sort of end piece where the flower market used to be.
COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. So I mean, how are you
imagining, I'm going to shift to you, and then I'll go back
to, to DDOT.
But how are you imagining that you might have

1 garage and loading access for those two properties, if not 2 through this one? MR. KAUFMAN: I think ideally some kind of shared 3 alley system, garage would be the, would be sort of the hope. I think the issue is sort of chicken and the egg. 5 I think it's easier to, once, you know, once this is in place, it's 6 7 easier for us to come back, and on the next piece, and make those connections. For example, the ramp for the parking garage is, 9 10 it's not coincidental that it's located on the edge of the 11 adjacent property because, for example, you could connect 12 garages, because that ramp is there. But I don't think that we can pre-commit to that. 13 I think that's our issue, not that the ultimate sort of solution lines of 15 isn't along the what Jonathan is 16 suggesting. 17 COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay, but I mean, you're saying, you're sort of arguing both sides of the question, right? 18 19 You know, it's --2.0 in more simple terms: Just, when the other 21 properties are redeveloped, and access does not work out through this property --22 23 MR. KAUFMAN: Right. 24 COMMISSIONER MAY: What do you imagine happening? 25 MR. KAUFMAN: Well, so I think there will be, or

1	there would need to be
2	Well, two things. I, and I understand your
3	question, and I'm not trying to be evasive.
4	The, if you were to join all these things
5	together, you would need more access points regardless. You
6	still couldn't, it all could not function off of just the
7	existing one that's from the property that there is today.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
9	MR. KAUFMAN: So that being said, I think that
10	there would be an expectation, or a I shouldn't say
11	expectation, but there would be a hope that we could get a
12	curb cut along Penn, and there would also be a hope that we
13	could get another curb cut on Brentwood.
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Do you actually have frontage
15	on Brentwood?
16	MR. KAUFMAN: I think it's a very
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's
18	(Simultaneous speaking.)
19	MR. KAUFMAN: triangular
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: so close to
21	MR. KAUFMAN: But yeah.
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: so close to Penn, I can't
23	imagine, you wouldn't allow it, because it's too close to
24	Penn.
25	MR. ROGERS: I don't have the measurements in front

1	of me. DDOT's standard is that curb cuts be at least 60 feet
2	from the adjacent intersection
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah.
4	MR. ROGERS: It looks like that space is not there.
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I mean, that's where our
6	driveway, Park Services' driveway is, like 60 feet away.
7	Something like that.
8	And you don't want to try to make a deal with us.
9	We're just
10	(Laughter.)
11	such a pain.
12	MR. KAUFMAN: Duly noted.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, all tongue in cheek.
14	No, the, I mean, there are already existing curb
15	cuts on Penn, right? So I mean it, I mean, I agree with the
16	point that it's, you end up with such a big property relying
17	on a single entry point, particularly one that has loading
18	in and out of the same portal, is problematic.
19	And is Penn such an important street that you
20	wouldn't want to have a curb cut on it, because it's, I mean,
21	it's really long. It, and it has two north-south streets
22	that essentially dead-end into it.
23	It seems to me it's almost calling out for a curb
24	cut, or an alley entrance, or something.
25	MR. ROGERS: Penn being a local street, there's

1 nothing particularly objectionable about having a curb cut 2 on that location, from that street. 3 It's not, say, a New York Avenue, or even a 4 Brentwood. I think the effort is to minimize just 5 the 6 potential conflict points. A potential sort of middle ground 7 situation might be to have loading be accessed perhaps through this building, and perhaps a separate access point 9 for the garage. 10 But it's too early to get into that level of 11 detail. 12 COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. But I would just say that if you did reconfigure the loading and garage ramp, as 13 I suggested earlier, it would lend itself to shared loading as opposed to the current configuration, which, I think it 15 would be impossible to do shared loading, because of the 16 17 presence of that garage ramp between the property to the east and this property. I'm just saying. 18 19 All right. Thanks. 2.0 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, any other questions of DDOT? 21 Okay. 22 Does the Applicant have any questions of Office of Planning or DDOT? 23 24 MR. KADLECEK: Just a question of clarification 25 from, from DDOT. For the, it sounds like there's just three

1	issues, really, that you're indicating there's still some
2	difference.
3	Are you suggesting that those are things that
4	could be worked out, sort of as the project proceeds? Or are
5	you suggesting that those are more immediate?
6	MR. ROGERS: Our preference would be that there be
7	further discussion in the context of the PUD. And I'll defer
8	to the Zoning Commission, in terms of how they want to pick
9	that up, and incorporate that.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Yeah, we will answer that
11	question as we conclude.
12	Any other questions down there?
13	MR. KADLECEK: Sorry, I think it's just two. I was
14	just, I was informed that it's really just the retail parking
15	question and the vehicular access to the adjacent site,
16	right? Just for our clarification.
17	MR. ROGERS: The 4th Street sidewalk, I think is
18	something that we needed additional clarification on, whether
19	the commitment included the east-west crossing or not.
20	MR. SPENDLEY: It does include that. We just
21	missed it on our slide.
22	MR. ROGERS: Okay, then. If that's the case, then
23	yeah, it's just those two.
24	MR. KADLECEK: Just the two.
25	MR. ROGERS: Yeah.
l	

	91
1	MR. KADLECEK: Okay. Great. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions before we move
3	on?
4	MR. KADLECEK: No more questions. Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Again, there was no one
6	representing 5D present.
7	All right. I'm going to read the Report of A,
8	Advisory of Commission 5D.
9	They enthusiastically, let me see if I can find
10	it. Well I just remember the word enthusiastically supported
11	
12	Well, let's see. It's not good to try to do it
13	off the top of my head. Okay. When you I got it.
14	All right, so it says, and I'll just read an
15	excerpt from it: ANC 5D voted 6-0-0 with one Commissioner
16	absent to enthusiastically support this application to submit
17	the letter of support to the Commission.
18	And this comes from Mr. Clarence Lee, ANC 5D
19	Chair.
20	And that is in the record, and that is our Exhibit
21	26.
22	(Whereupon, the above-referred to document was
23	marked as Exhibit 26 for identification, and received into
24	the record.)
25	Okay, do we have any organizations and persons who

1 are here who'd like to testify in support? 2 Any organizations and persons who are here who'd like to testify in opposition? 3 4 Any organizations or persons who are here who are undeclared? 5 6 Okay, do we have any rebuttal, Mr. Kadlecek? 7 And if not, we'll have closing. 8 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, we have just a couple little that we wanted to clarify that came up 10 discussion with OP, and DDOT. 11 MR. SPENDLEY: So Department of Parks and Recreation, we have met with them a couple times. We toured 12 the Trinidad Recreation Center with them as well. 13 14 Talking through their needs, and I think we concluded with them that the \$10,000 commitment should be 15 within 5D and, you know, to be determined that, should it be 16 equipment, should 17 replacement of it be upgraded or 18 maintenance of equipment? But until we get closer to C of O, maybe not 19 determine which equipment that should be at this time, as if 2.0 21 we're, you know, two years out from construction, they might have, you know, their opportunity fund work through some of 22 the existing maintenance issues that they have. 23 24 So we would continue to work with them, as Ms. 25 Elliott has suggested. But until we had closer to C of O

1 when we would finally decide what, where it should go. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would just suggest in this process that that be outlaid, how you're going to do to it. 3 You're not going to give them the money, naturally. going to do all the work in procuring and buying, and make 5 sure it's there at that time, correct? 6 7 MR. SPENDLEY: If it was equipment, then yes, we could make that procurement. But if it's something that they wanted, you know, additional maintenance on an area, or other construction that they wanted to control, we would allow 10 11 that. I think maintenance would fall 12 CHATRMAN HOOD: 13 under capital improvement. But anyway, I will, I, typically, well, we like to see it laid out exactly. 15 And I know you, some kind of way you have to work out some language, Mr. Kadlecek, that won't go against what 16 we normally do when you're trying to give something to a 17 community, or to a rec, especially a public rec center. 18 We don't want it to get lost in the general fund. 19 2.0 MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, our understanding is DPR 21 actually has a very specific fund for these types of things, which is an anomaly, as opposed to other agencies. 22 They allow these sorts of contributions. 23 That's our understanding - that other agencies don't. 24 They have a

fund to allow for a private entity to give --

	94
1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I don't even think we like
2	it going into the fund. I mean, I think we want to know
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.
4	COMMISSIONER MAY: that it's going to go for
5	something specific.
6	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: And I mean, it's not like they,
8	you know, you have to have the shopping list, and give us the
9	shopping list. It's like, you know, then it's going to go
10	for acquisition of, you know, sports equipment for a
11	particular rec center, or something like that.
12	Just as specific as it can be, and then, you know,
13	we'd want to have, I mean, obviously, you'd have to
14	demonstrate that it had been spent for that in order to get
15	the C of O, but it's, it, we want to know that it's going to
16	go for something specific, and not just going to, you know,
17	some fairly general fund.
18	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, we can propose a condition
19	that makes that a little more clear.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anything else?
21	MR. KAUFMAN: Yes. One other clarification on the
22	coordination of the master utility plan, and particularly
23	with DC Water.
24	So I think there's a little bit of a linguistic,
25	maybe, issue. We have a 30 percent set of a master plan for

	95
1	the utilities that has been shared with all the different
2	utilities, and it's been done in coordination with them.
3	I think what Ms. Elliott is referring to, and I
4	get why she's referring to it the way she is, is that it is
5	only 30 percent, and I think that they're looking to see, you
6	know, it completed, which is the intent.
7	But it, at this point in time, the master utility
8	plan is only 30 percent complete. And because of that, there
9	are still questions - coordination questions, all kinds of
10	questions that still need to be worked through.
11	So, you know, unless I'm mistaken - and maybe I
12	am, but I don't think it's that they don't have the plan, I
13	just don't think it's as far along as they would like it to
14	be, which is, I, which I understand.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Any comments on that?
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yeah, I mean so, I mean, what
17	is it going to take to get to some level of agreement that
18	DC Water is satisfied
19	MR. KAUFMAN: I don't, again, I don't think it's
20	a, again, I'm struggling with semantics.
21	I don't think it's that they're not satisfied
22	that, like there's a, there's issues that we are disagreeing
23	on.
24	I think it's that the plans, they're, there are,
25	it's 43 acres, it's fairly intensive. We've got all the

1 utilities involved. 2 There are several, it's actually being coordinated 3 through a coalition of developers, EDENS and JBG being the sort of leads on it, and it's just going to take a lot, it's 5 going to take more time to get it to the level that --COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. 6 7 MR. KAUFMAN: -- I think the different, you know, with DC Water --9 COMMISSIONER MAY: So it's not something 10 you're going to be able to deliver as part of this project, 11 to the level that they would, they're suggesting they might 12 want to see. 13 MR. KAUFMAN: Correct. Correct 14 COMMISSIONER MAY: So then I --15 MR. KAUFMAN: -- but it will be --COMMISSIONER MAY: So I mean, and I can appreciate 16 17 how that may be the case. But it seems that you, there needs to be, you need to have some further discussion with DC Water 18 about how this will actually eventually be delivered, and 19 2.0 that they need to give some sort of nod that it's okay, 21 because right now they're raising a red flag with OP, and 22 that's all we have to go on. 23 So we need to know that they're going to be,

they're satisfied with the plan for completing these plans,

if not the actual plans in hand.

1 MR. KAUFMAN: Understood. 2 MR. KADLECEK: Just one last thing. I don't want 3 to beat a dead horse, but on the PDR issue. 4 I just want to make a couple of kind of broad 5 stroke points about that. 6 I think Jeff gave a really good explanation about 7 the business of case for why a commitment is challenge, and I think it is important to remember that the goals of the Office of Planning and the Applicant are really 10 quite aliqued. 11 It's just the mechanism by which to get there. And I think what EDENS has done is they made a proffer in 12 such a way that it really does try to encourage PDR uses to 13 the extent that it's possible. 15 And in fact, when you look at the framework element of the comprehensive plan when it talks about a mix 16 of uses on the future land use map, it talks about desire and 17 encouragement. 18 And I think if you look at the proffer that's been 19 put forth here, which is building to a particular PDR 2.0 21 specification - not to mention the commitment that they are making - that really does go towards encouraging, and showing 22 a demonstration of a desire for these types of uses. 23 24 And that is, in fact, quite consistent with the

comprehensive plan.

98 1 I would also note that, as this Commission, I 2 know, is aware, parcel-specific uses as designated on the future land use map are not, it's not a zoning map, it's not 3 a prescriptive map. It's really a map that's in, to be 5 interpreted broadly. And as you've heard and are aware, there's a lot 6 7 of PDR use that occurs in the market. 8 The Court of Appeals has, has agreed that you don't have to provide every use that the comprehensive plan 10 future land use map shows on a specific property. That's not 11 the obligation, or that's not the, what the comprehensive 12 plan is suggesting or requiring. I mean, I think a, one way to think about it is, 13 if, for instance, this project only had PDR uses on the ground floor, I don't think anyone would argue that it's 15 inconsistent with the other stripe, which is the commercial 16 stripe - the same way that proffering a retail use, which is 17 18 ultimately the goal of street activation here, does not make this project inconsistent with the future land use map. 19 2.0 So I think in totality, when you consider all of those issues, really the goals are being achieved here. 21 They're just being achieved in a slightly different way. 22 23 So with that, we have nothing further.

here, but I think that they're actually quite, a fairly small

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

It looks like there are a few outstanding issues

24

1 universe of issues that we could look at. So we would ask that the Commission consider 2 3 taking the proposed action tonight. 4 And with that, we have availability for any additional questions, and nothing further. 5 Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Commissioners, I'm not 7 sure if I'm ready for a proposed action. 8 I think the issues are strong enough that we need to continue to get the work, whatever, I think it was like four or five to my, I didn't keep a count. 10 11 But I am not ready to propose. I think that that work needs to be taken care of before we move forward and 12 propose, but that's just my recommendation. 13 14 I will ask others, and whatever they are, let's work them out, let's get them done, and then we can hopefully 15 move forward. 16 17 Any other comments on that? On our progress? 18 Yes. COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you. 19 I mean, I was not, I'm not quite ready to go ahead. 2.0 I think 21 there are a few substantive issues that need to be worked on. I think the one that's still most concerning is the PDR 22 issue, and I think, you know, further work with Office of 23 Planning would be helpful before we consider taking the 24

proposed action.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, any other comments? Any
2	disagreement? Because there's only four
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, we never do that with
4	you, do we?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, I mean
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: We always agree.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, the courts disagree with me,
8	so I mean, might as well join in. No, I just wanted to hear,
9	and make sure that we're all on the same page.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I'm on the same page
11	with you.
12	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I mean, Mr. Chairman, we've
13	done it both ways. But I think a post-hearing submission
14	that addresses the issues that were raised by us, and by OP
15	and DDOT would be helpful, and we can move forward
16	expeditiously after we get that expeditious submission.
17	Plus we're one Commissioner down today, and maybe
18	he's reading the record as, or watching the record as we
19	speak.
20	Let's make him do it.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No, I'm not going to, I don't want
22	to do that to him.
23	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Anyway, I think we can
24	(Simultaneous speaking.)
25	(Laughter.)

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was going to say, how come you
2	only make me read the record on these ones
3	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I think we can proceed
4	expeditiously, and I think the Applicant is prepared to
5	respond in a submission expeditiously.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think, Mr. Kadlecek, if you
7	cold, if you could give us a, I'm not going to say a one-
8	pager, but a two-pager with the issues, and what the results
9	are, and your discussions with those other outstanding
10	issues.
11	And also in the order, if we get to that point,
12	which, as you get to that point, and I'm probably really
13	going out there. From now on, I'm going to start asking
14	this.
15	All applicants, make sure we put the issues down,
16	and then what the resolve is, the resolve that the Commission
17	put forward. And I want to see that in all the orders going
18	forward.
19	MR. KADLECEK: Sorry, can you explain a little bit
20	more
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Don't ask me to do that.
22	MR. KADLECEK: I wasn't quite following you, I'm
23	sorry.
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm actually trying to streamline
25	some things, and But let's see if this gets approved

1	first. And then, at that time, a proposed action, if it's
2	approved, then I will tell you a little more detail.
3	So basically what I'm looking for is the issues,
4	and what resolve the Commission gave. I'm looking for the,
5	for you to start giving us that in the orders that are
6	presented.
7	MR. KADLECEK: I understand. All right. Thank
8	you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So kind of know where I'm
10	going with this. Okay.
11	MR. KADLECEK: I do, yes. Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. But I will ask for it
13	at proposed action.
14	I don't, I think you all know what
15	Do we need to talk about what the outstanding
16	issues are? I don't think so.
17	I got
18	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: four or five off the top
20	MR. KADLECEK: I, yeah, I think
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: of my head.
22	MR. KADLECEK: we, we have a list. I think
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
24	MR. KADLECEK: we know what they are, and, and
25	I think we can actually respond to them pretty quickly.

	100
1	MS. SCHELLIN: How much time do you need?
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is that for me? I can't see it all
3	the way over there.
4	MR. KADLECEK: We can probably provide our
5	responses in a week.
б	MS. SCHELLIN: A week?
7	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh. Thank you. I've just been,
9	I've just been reminded of a question I normally ask.
10	Who in, I think I've asked you all, EDENS, this
11	before. Who in, who on your development team lives in the
12	neighborhood?
13	MR. KAUFMAN: Who lives in the neighborhood?
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.
15	MR. KAUFMAN: There's a, well, there's a couple
16	different people. We have a couple designers who live in
17	that neighborhood, and we have a developer who lives in the,
18	shoot, I'm going to forget the name of the building that Abdo
19	did on eight, on, just up the block there. His name's David
20	Germakian.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
22	MR. KAUFMAN: But there are
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: On, but they're on 3rd and, what's
24	that, 3rd and H?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.
2	MR. KAUFMAN: That's correct, yeah. And there's
3	a couple other people, like we have a guy, a new guy who
4	came, who just, who we've just hired.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So you have people that live in the
6	neighborhood that's under
7	MR. KAUFMAN: Oh, we have
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: development.
9	MR. KAUFMAN: a lot of people living in the
10	neighborhood. Yeah, he lives in the MRP apartment building
11	
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13	MR. KAUFMAN: over on Newark Avenue.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, well good. Remind me
15	not to ask y'all that no more. I like when people tell me
16	they don't, so I can hassle them, get on them a little bit.
17	But anyway, good. You all keep up the good work.
18	MR. KADLECEK: And for what it's worth, I live in
19	Ward 5 as well.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, I didn't know that. Have to
21	be a little nicer to you when you come here.
22	(Laughter.)
23	Okay. All right, Ms. Schellin. I'm sorry.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay, so
25	MR. KAUFMAN: And just one other thing, and I know
l	

1	you, you didn't ask for this. But we also just moved our
2	office. We moved 75 employees to Union Market. We moved in
3	three weeks ago. We love it, except for our roof is leaking,
4	and there's no one to call but ourselves, so.
5	(Laughter.)
6	MS. SCHELLIN: Okay. So, then that would put you,
7	your submission due by 3:00 p.m. on the 21st of June. And
8	the ANC, being the only party, would respond by the 28th of
9	June.
10	Is OP looking to provide? And OP also would
11	provide DDOT to? Okay.
12	So DDOT, OP, and the ANC would be able to provide
13	their responses by the 28th of June and OAG prefers to have
14	a draft order at least two weeks before the meeting.
15	If we try to put you on for July 9th, so would you
16	be able to provide your draft order?
17	MR. KADLECEK: At two weeks before proposed action?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, they do.
19	MR. KADLECEK: Yeah, I mean if that's, we can do
20	it, yeah.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: I mean
22	MR. KADLECEK: If we can do it before final action,
23	that'd be a lot more helpful.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: That's not what my, yeah. They
25	always give them, they, they have it at proposed, so that way

1	if there's any issues, they can
2	MR. KADLECEK: Okay.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: bring it up. So.
4	MR. KADLECEK: Got it.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: I'll just say, if you could just
6	provide it on the 28th also, how about that. That way it
7	won't be quite two weeks.
8	MR. KADLECEK: Right, say it again?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Provide the draft on the 28th of
10	June. It'll be about a week and a half.
11	MR. KADLECEK: Oh, you, you're not going to give
12	me 'til the 9th? Wait, sorry, sorry, when is the
13	MS. SCHELLIN: Meeting's on the 9th.
14	MR. KADLECEK: Meeting's on the 9th. I got it.
15	MS. SCHELLIN: No, I'm not
16	MR. KADLECEK: Got it.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: going to give you 'til the 9th.
18	MR. KADLECEK: I was confused
19	(Simultaneous speaking.)
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Unless you want
21	MR. KADLECEK: with your dates.
22	MS. SCHELLIN: move it to
23	MR. KADLECEK: No, no, that's
24	MS. SCHELLIN: If you want to go to the last
25	meeting

1	MR. KADLECEK: that's fine. I was, I was
2	confused about what, the dates
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah.
4	MR. KADLECEK: you were talking about. Got it.
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Yeah. Okay. That's it.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Do we have anything
7	else? Okay. I want to thank everyone for their
8	participation tonight, and this hearing is adjourned.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the
10	record at 8:43 p.m.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## <u>CERTIFICATE</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: UM 500 Penn Street NE, LLC

Before: DCZC

Date: 06-14-18

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near aus 9