GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

-----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

Valor Development, LLC

Voluntary Design Review : Case No.

: 16-23

:

-----:

Monday, January 7, 2019

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

The Public Hearing of Case No. 16-23 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 SHAPIRO, Commissioner

## OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN, Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER, Deputy Director, Development Review & Historic Preservation ELISA VITALE

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

MAXIMILIAN TONDRO

DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STAFF PRESENT:

AARON ZIMMERMAN

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on January 7, 2019.

## I-N-D-E-X

	<u>Page</u>
Preliminary Matters	8
Applicant's Case	12

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

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6:36 p.m.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, I think we're ready to get started. Are we ready, court reporter? Thank you. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia.

This is a continuation of a public hearing, Zoning Commission Case No. 16-23. Today's date is January 7, 2019. Miller, Joining me today are Vice Chair Commissioner Turnbull, and Commissioner Shapiro, as well as attorney general, Mr. Tondro, as well as Office of Planning, Steingasser, Ms. Vitale, and the District Department of Transportation, Mr. Zimmerman.

This proceeding is being recorded by a court It's also webcast live. Accordingly, we must ask reporter. you to refrain from any disruptive noise or actions in the hearing room, including display of any signs or objects. Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register and copies of that announcement are over to my left, on the wall near the door. The hearing will be conducted accordance with provisions of 11z DCMR, Chapter 4. preliminary matters, applicant's case, report of the Office of Planning, report of other government agencies, report of the ANC -- in this case, I believe we have two -organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in opposition, rebuttal, and closing by the applicant.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this meeting. The applicant has up to 60 minutes, organizations five minutes, individuals three minutes. The Commission intends to adhere to the time limits as strictly as possible, in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time.

All persons wishing to testify before the Commission in this evening hearing are asked to register at the kiosk. That's to my left. I believe the kiosk is up and working.

MS. SCHELLIN: I'm going to play with it and try to get it working.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: If it's not, we'll work it out. Then we would ask you to make sure that you fill out two witness cards. These cards are located to my left, on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my right before taking a seat at the table. When presenting information to the Commission, please turn on and speak into the microphone, first stating your name and home address.

When you are finished speaking, please turn your microphone off, so that your microphone is no longer picking

1 up sound or background noise. The decision of this case is 2 based exclusively on the public record to avoid any contrary 3 -- we ask that you not engage the Commission during any recess or at any time. The staff will be available throughout the hearing 5 to discuss procedural questions. Please turn off 6 7 electronic devices at this time, so not to disrupt these Before I do that, did I acknowledge that the proceedings. Office of Planning -- did I acknowledge you all, Sometimes I think I've done something. 10 Steingasser? Okay. 11 I quess it's routine. I can't remember whether I really done 12 what I was supposed to, but it's routine. Anyway, thank you. Would all individuals wishing to testify please rise to take 13 the oath? Ms. Schellin, would you please administer the 15 oath? MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Please raise your right hand. 16 Do you solemnly swear or affirm the testimony you'll give 17 18 this evening will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? 19 20 (Chorus of yes.) 21 MS. SCHELLIN: Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, do we have 23 preliminary matters? 24 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir, there were, I believe --

I'm trying to find my sheet, here -- some motions.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me do this. Before we get to
2	the motions, I would like for us to take a moment of silence.
3	We, on the Commission, when one of us hurt, we all hurt. We
4	want to have a moment of silence. Vice Chair Miller shows
5	his commitment to this city just lost his daughter. It
6	shows his commitment to this city to be here to serve this
7	city tonight in this capacity. I would like for you all to
8	indulge me and take a moment of silence because we bleed,
9	too, and we hurt, too. When our colleagues are hurting, we
10	hurt. If you could join me and take a moment of silence, I
11	would appreciate it.
12	(Moment of silence.)
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Our thoughts and
14	prayers will go out to you, Vice Chair Miller, in the
15	remembrance of your daughter, Michaela Miller.
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17	Thank you, everybody, for all the love that's been shown to
18	our family.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, thank you. Ms.
20	Schellin, if we can go to whatever that is to the what
21	is it?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Preliminary matters.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Preliminary matters.
24	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Let's see. We had some
25	responses to the Applicant's submission. There was, I

believe, a motion. I'm trying to find it here. I don't see that she listed it, but I believe it was a motion by the Applicant to strike the submission, it was a late submission. The Commission had given dates by which submissions were to be made and by which the parties were to respond. So the Applicant made a motion to strike Spring Valley's response to the revised plans because it was late, so would ask the Commission to rule on that motion.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm trying to remember it in my mind. Applicant has asked us to file a motion to strike the Spring Valley opponent's untimely response to the Applicant's revised submissions and plans. I think we set out a line -- I think everybody pretty much dealt with that deadline.

I think that was pretty across the board. I am not inclined to -- I am inclined to agree with striking the request, the motion, and I'll tell you why. Because we try to play -- level the playing field and level everybody -- put everybody on the same page.

I understand there was some new renderings that came in, and some new stuff, in this new submissions to this case, but I believe that everybody had opportune time -- everybody's been served notice. They will have a time, through their testimony, however they fix it up, but I would move that we -- I would suggest that we not accept the late filing and rule it's untimely. Because everybody's playing

1 on the same rules and procedures, and we need to hold fast 2 to that. COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I would concur. 3 To your point, I think we're going to hear a lot of the information 5 tonight, in any case. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, any objections? 6 7 I would move that we find that Spring Valley, opponent's, untimely response to what we asked for. They did not meet the deadline. I think it was straightforward and set forward I move that be ruled untimely and ask for a 10 with everyone. 11 second. COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: 12 Second. 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been properly moved seconded. Any further discussion? 15 (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN HOOD: All in favor? 16 (Chorus of ayes.) 17 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? Ms. Schellin, 19 would you please record the vote? 20 MS. SCHELLIN: Staff records the vote 4-0-1 to 21 strike Spring Valley's response the Applicant's to submission, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Shapiro 22 seconding, Commissioner Turnbull and Miller in support, 23 24 Commissioner May not present and not voting. 25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, Commissioner May

1	will be he didn't vote on that, but he will be
2	participating in this case. We will not be making a decision
3	on this case tonight. I probably should have said this
4	earlier. We will not be making a decision on this case
5	tonight, and we will hold the FAR issue in abeyance for when
6	we do our deliberations and make our decision. We'll rule
7	on that at that time. Anything else, Ms. Schellin?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff has nothing further.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any of my colleagues have
10	anything? Okay, Mr. Glasgow, you may begin.
11	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir. I think that there was
12	a preliminary matter with respect to expert witnesses of the
13	opposition.
14	MS. SCHELLIN: The Commission will
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We usually take care of that when
16	we get to the opposition.
17	MR. GLASGOW: Okay, fine, thank you.
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Mr. Glasgow, how much time did you
19	guys need?
20	MR. GLASGOW: Forty minutes.
21	MS. SCHELLIN: Forty?
22	MR. GLASGOW: Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, 40's fine. Let me just say
	,
24	I'm sure your presentation hit the highlights, some of

1	MR. GLASGOW: If we can do it in less than 40
2	minutes, we will.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm not talking about the time.
4	I'm just saying in your presentation, as we go along, that
5	would help us and everyone else to understand what's going
6	on. Thank you.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Chairman Hood? I'm sorry. That
8	means that the two parties in support will have 20 minutes
9	to share.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, thank you. You may
11	begin. Two parties in support? Let's get that clear. What
12	about the parties in opposition? We have four in opposition,
13	right?
14	MS. SCHELLIN: They'll have 60 to split, depending
15	on
16	MR. GLASGOW: I think, Mr. Chairman, we were
17	talking about 40 minutes for our presentation and that of the
18	two other parties the two parties in support.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So 40 minutes total?
20	MR. GLASGOW: Correct.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the four parties, we need the
22	40 minutes.
23	MS. SCHELLIN: They'll have 40 minutes to split,
24	then.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: They have ten minutes aniece

	12
1	MS. SCHELLIN: There are
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Four parties, right, in
3	opposition?
4	MS. SCHELLIN: There's only two parties in
5	opposition.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me look at my list.
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Two parties in support.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
9	MS. SCHELLIN: Then the two ANCs.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's right, we're not including
11	I was including the ANCs. I'm sorry.
12	MS. SCHELLIN: So the two parties in opposition
13	will have 40 minutes to split.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
15	MR. GLASGOW: Are you going to clock us at 40?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, I'm going to fix that. You
17	guys interrupted me.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right, you may begin.
19	MR. GLASGOW: Thank you. Good evening, members
20	of the Commission. For the record, my name is Norman M.
21	Glasgow, Jr., the law firm of Holland & Knight, here on
22	behalf of the Applicant for design review for case in Square
23	1499.
24	I'd like to give a brief opening statement. As
25	we're here for design review for the existing MU-4 zoning,

and the height of this zone is 50 feet, max, we're going to have a proposed building that is a little bit over 43 feet from the point of measurement. We believe that through the testimony of the witnesses, we will establish that we've met the burden of proof, under Subtitle X, Chapter 6. Here with me is Mr. Will Lansing, to my immediate left, then Mr. Erwin Andres and Sarah Alexander and Shane Dettman.

That will be the order of our witnesses. We're pleased to have, in support of the application, the Office of Planning, DDOT, ANC 3E, which is the project is located, ANC 3D, located across Mass Avenue, Ward 3 Vision, and then there are other letters in support in the record. With respect to the Office of Planning report, we have submitted responses to the office and have discussed with the Office of Planning those six items.

When you look at those six items, for the first bullet point, we are continuing the previous commitment that the Applicant made to achieve LEED Gold Version 4, and will achieve LEED Gold as a part of this project. In doing so, as is the case for many projects, we want to maintain our flexibility as to how it is that we achieve LEED Gold, so we do not want to commit to any specific item in meeting that standard. There are a number of cases where the Commission has given the Applicant flexibility in that regard. Next, with respect to the electric charging stations, there will

be eight electric charging stations, given the size of the building, so we're meeting the number of charging stations for the size of the project.

The screening of transformers, we will be screening the sides of the transformers, other than the side that directly abuts the alley, because the alley side has the access gates to the transformers. The Applicant agrees there will be no IZ units in the cellar of the project. The refined flexibility language that was contained in the OP report, we agree with that, and that's at Pages 6, 7, and 8.

There are certain TDM measures that do not extend to the townhouses, such as the townhouses have their own therefore, dedicated parking spaces they would so, unbundled. They would not be unbundled from the sale and lease of the townhouse would go directly to that unit. Ιf there are no preliminary questions, I'd like to proceed with the testimony of the first witness, Mr. Will Lansing. Mr. Lansing, please identify yourself for the record and proceed with your testimony.

MR. LANSING: Mr. Chair, members of the Zoning Commission, good evening. My name is William Lansing. I am a principal with Valor Development, a Washington, D.C. Ward 3 and ANC 3E based development company. This will be our third hearing with you related to this project for the past 12 months.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

With each visit, the project team has made significant strides to enhance the project and respond to the interests and concerns of the neighbors. From the beginning, it has been Valor's goal to design and plan a project that would include both market rate and affordable housing and a long-desired replacement of a full-service grocery store.

We are only able to accomplish this goal through the voluntary design review process, which will allow us to capture some of the unused density on the historic Spring Valley Shopping Center site to re-establish the grocery store use, while requiring an elevated design that is superior to a matter-of-right project. We believe the revised plans that currently before you accomplishes these qoals satisfies all applicable review standards with a design that is thoughtful, context sensitive, within matter-of-right height and density, and far superior to a matter-of-right project in many respects, including creating a home for a new full-service. neighborhood-serving t.he grocery store neighborhood has lacked for many years, providing a quality of design and building elements that are far above what would be delivered as matter-of-right project, providing а significant setbacks and stepping of the building substantially reduces the project's scale and pulls the massing away from the residential streets of Yuma and 48th, delivering larger housing units in both market

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

different affordable categories and in product types, committing to LEED Gold certification, and providing significant pedestrian improvements to public space along streets and alleys, including the elimination of 80 feet of cuts, widening of the alley system onto property, creating sidewalks within the alley that do not currently exist, and committing to significant mitigation measures, to include curb extensions, a robust TDM plan, and the installation of a HAWK signal on Massachusetts Avenue. We believe these significant aspects of the project are the upshot of our commitment to the community engagement process that began back in September of 2015 with a project that was substantially different than what you see before you today and which we believe represents an equitable solution that balances interests the of expressed concerns the community.

On that topic of community engagement, while some continue to assert that the project team has not engaged or negotiated far enough, as our list of community and agency meetings contain, as Exhibit 268 in the record show, the team has conducted over 40 public meetings since late 2015.

Based on the feedback received at these meetings, the team has successfully achieved a balanced design that addresses concerns regarding height, density, traffic, and pedestrian circulation. It is the result of this past and

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

recent history of collaborations that we have submitted the revised plans that are before you this evening. Most notably, you will find that we have reduced the overall building gross floor area by 42,000 square feet, with half of that being completely eliminated, and the other half being created in a basement cellar space.

Additionally, we've eliminated the smaller building of the south and replaced it with lower-scale townhouses, all while maintaining the superior aspects of the project that I have previously described.

We are appreciative to have the continued support of both ANC 3E and 3D, which were in support of our proposal last January and have both reconfirmed their support for the revised plans. With that, I'd like to thank you for your time this evening. We appreciate the opportunity to sit before you and your consideration of this application.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay, thank you. Let's stop the clock for a moment. Ms. Schellin, are you going to make the announcement?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Anyone who plans to testify this evening, the kiosk is now working, so if you would please register. Having your name on there from January last year doesn't count. You need to put it on for this evening. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And we don't all have to go up

there at the same time. When you see two or three people, then you can wait for a few minutes. I'm sure by the time we get there, everybody will have signed in.

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, it will be a while.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. We can start the clock back up.

MS. ALEXANDER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Sarah Alexander, and I am an architect at Torti Gallas Urban. There's been a lot of discussion regarding the size of our project and its appropriateness in this unique context.

In response to years of community involvement, we have made many architectural moves in both the building's massing and the overall design, which I will review during my presentation. One way that we can evaluate the scale and massing of our project and its appropriateness is to evaluate it relative to the matter-of-right envelope, its height, FAR and lot occupancy of what is permitted on our site. I like to think of our project a bit like the Goldilocks tale. The AU building to our south is a bit too large, with an FAR of 4.3, as you can see on the screen. The Spring Valley Shopping Center is a bit too small, with an FAR of .42.

Our site is just right, with an FAR of 2.95, which should be noted falls below the matter-of-right allowable FAR of 3.0. I thought it might be helpful to do a brief overview

of the history of the project, given that it has been a rather long one.

The project started over three years ago, with the initial design shown on the screen tonight presented to the community in January 2016. Torti Gallas was engaged shortly thereafter and, since then, have been working alongside Valor, with the community, to craft a project that we will share with you tonight.

Since the project's inception, the height has always been a concern of the community. Our initial response was to pull back as much of the height away from the streets, and thus the adjacent homes, through the use of courtyards and setbacks, while still maintaining the maximum allowable height of 50 feet. Over the last year, we have further reduced the scale of our building by essentially removing one story of residential and lowering the building height to 43 and a half feet tall. Here, you can see, in red, the outline of the previous -- last year's submission for both 48th Street, shown here on the screen, and Yuma Street, again, the red outline being what we showed previously.

On 48th Street, again on the screen, in addition to lowering our building height, we also replaced last year's submission for Building 2 with 5 three-story townhouses. We had heard numerous concerns regarding Building 2's previously proposed Beaux-Arts-style architecture, so we chose the

Federal style for these townhomes to be responsive and more directly relate to the character of the neighborhood.

The ground floor plan is essentially the same as the previous submission. We are still proposing to provide the grocery store and the public plaza in the northwest corner of the site, and loading and garage access is still proposed in the south of the alley. Additionally, we are still proposing to consolidate the trash, and clean it up, from the Spring Valley Shopping Center, and widen the north/south portion of the alley. This is the previous ground floor plan and the new ground floor plan to compare. Another revision from our submission last year was in the southern portion of the site.

We learned that there was a large heritage tree, shown here -- I'm circling it with the little hand. We had previously thought that was exempt, due to its species, which is not the case, so in order to preserve this tree, we needed to set back our building footprint adjacent to the tree, which made our previously proposed multi-family building in that location not feasible.

We replaced it with the five townhomes you see today. Additionally, in response to some concerns from the community encouraging pedestrian connection via the previously proposed Windom Walk, we in-filled a portion of Windom Walk, as you can see here, this portion right here,

to keep a small pocket park as the terminus of Windom Place. As Chip has highlighted, and Will, our project has reduced its GFA by about 42,000 square feet, yet kept the same number of units, at approximately the same size and mix, while also reducing the project by 21,000 gross square feet. So how did we accomplish this wonderful feat? First, we were able to capture about half of the lost GFA by replacing a level of parking with residential.

Here, you can see the previous design. This level of parking here that I'm highlighting with the little hand, we replaced that with residential and the dropped courtyards to allow light and air. That was about 21 gross square feet of additional space, roughly half of our delta.

And then additionally, through some increased efficiency, we were able to maintain the same number of units at the same amount of mix, same unit mix, as what we had last time, still including a large proportion of two and three-bedroom units.

I'm going walk you quickly around the project, starting at Windom Place, looking west, to the townhouses to the left. Here, you can see the five townhomes and the multi-family to the right. This is a good place to point out that the AU building that you can see over our building here, the surveyed parapet height, per the survey, is roughly 12 feet taller than our building overall parapet height, just

for context.

Here, standing at the corner of 40th and Yuma, we still have the courtyards, the pavilions, the bays, and all the elements to break down the scale of the building. Here, standing on Yuma, looking west, again, the setback here for the northwest plaza and additional setback above.

Here is the view from Massachusetts Avenue, looking east. This was the view previously -- or the only place, previously, where the building's height extended all the way up, without a setback, so this was the greatest view benefitted from reducing the height and removing the story.

This is the previous design and the new design, old and new. I wanted to share this view, looking over the Spring Valley Shopping Center. I think you may remember the blue building that was shared by the opposition using this view. We wanted to clear the record and share our view, both previous and proposed, using the specified 50-millimeter lens, and to note all of our renderings are now using the 50-millimeter lens. I can go through the process in which that was done in more detail, if you want to know.

But, just looking back and forth between the two, as you can see, the reduction in height and elimination of one story has greatly improved our relationship with the Spring Valley Shopping Center. There have been several comments made throughout the process that our project was

going to cause massive shadows on the surrounding neighborhood.

As previously shared, and only improved with our height reduction, our project will cast no shadows on any adjacent home for nine months out of the year between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., as you can see here, depicted on the screen.

And even in December, on the shortest day of the year, only a handful of homes are affected by shadows, and only for small portions of the day. The last view to note is at 4:00 p.m., which the sun sets at 4:30 at that time of day. Then lastly, a very positive, our project is still promising to achieve LEED Gold Version 4, which is the newest and most stringent version. Thank you.

MR. ANDRES: Good evening, Chairman Hood, members of the Commission. For the record, Erwin Andres with Gorove Slade Associates. As Ms. Alexander fires up our PowerPoint presentation, I do want to say that we will keep this short. We've offered some extensive testimony and response to cross-examination questions at the previous hearings.

So this is relative to the current design and plan, just some highlights relative to the plan, itself. The program, we are meeting the zoning requirements for parking and loading. The site is well served by transit. We are committed to implementing a comprehensive transportation

demand management plan, and there are, on site, facilities for all pedestrians, bicycles, and loading.

With respect to the program, itself, the program hasn't changed -- it's changed relatively minimally. The number of total dwelling units relatively stays the same, in that there's 219 dwelling units total. The only difference is a new plan subtracts five apartments and replaces those with five townhomes. In addition to that, there's close to 2,000 square feet of additional retail space.

The resulting trips and the difference in the programs is approximately seven in the morning and 17 in the afternoon. Given that it is below DDOT's threshold, we were not required to update our traffic analysis.

That's been confirmed in their letter. With respect to the elements -- I'm going to go through these quickly, since Ms. Alexander has already gone through them. With respect to the Gl level, we've identified where the access and loading is, in addition to the closure of the surrounding curb cuts that are existing.

With respect to the lower level, we've identified where the access to the garage is relative to the other elements. Then finally, on the first floor, there is no access to the alley system. However, there are residential entrances off of the surrounding residential streets. In addition to that, we're summarizing what we're providing in

our plan, in that we are providing 370 spaces. Eighty-six are allocated to retail, 228 allocated to residential, and 56 allocated to American University. We are looking for flexibility to be able to address the ebbs and flows of the development program. In addition to that, we are committing to restricting the apartment residents from obtaining RPP, which has been vetted with DDOT, as well as the ANCs.

We are committed to implementing the transportation demand management elements for the project.

As DDOT has identified in their review letter, dated January 2, these elements are what we've committed to. And we've confirmed that with one of our own memoranda, dated January 10th of this year -- excuse me, of January 7th of this year.

In addition to that, we've agreed to all of DDOT's conditions, as identified on these following slides, which are consistent with the DDOT conditions from their January 2nd letter. So with that, I'm available for questions.

MR. DETTMAN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission. For the record, my name is Shane Dettman, director of land use planning at the law firm Holland & Knight. My testimony this evening will just focus on some of the main points that were raised in responses received by Citizens for Responsible Development, Spring Valley opponents, as well as recent testimony submitted just this afternoon or this morning regarding the Applicant's

calculation of the IZ set-aside requirement.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to CRD's response stating that the project fails to meet the design review requirements of Subtitle X, Chapter 6 because the project calls for an increase of density, which is expressly prohibited under the design review regulations, we briefed this thoroughly in our response to their submission.

In fact, the total amount of density that could be achieved through the voluntary design review process, across the voluntary design review boundary, which includes the record lot, Record Lot 9, with the AU building and the Superfresh site, as well as the Spring Valley Shopping Center, which are separated by an alley, which the voluntary design review provisions expressly allow, you could achieve a maximum permitted density of 482,364 square feet, 482,000. The proposed new gross floor area that will be constructed -- that's proposed to be constructed on Lot 807, is 234,629. If you combine that with the existing almost 200,000 square feet of commercial density that's already within the boundary of the AU building and the Spring Valley Shopping Center, that brings you to 430,853 square feet, so significantly less than the 482,000 that could be achieved as a matter of right under the existing zoning.

There was also a statement about how the project proposes more density that could be achieved even through a

planned-unit development. Again, our project boundary is 160,700 square feet, consisting of the Spring Valley Shopping Center and Record Lot 9. If this were a PUD, taking into account the 20 percent under IZ and the 20 percent under PUD, you could take that up to 578,000 square feet under a PUD.

total square footage across Aqain, our boundary, including the existing buildings that are there, 430,000 square feet, and we're accomplishing the project through the flexibility and building bulk control that's afforded through the design review process, which has been confirmed by the Office of Planning, in consultation with the ZA and OAG, in its February 12, 2018 supplemental report to the Commission. We also briefed the issue, as well. In terms of the question of whether or not the Zoning Commission can approve transfers of density outside of areas of the combined where you could use old **TDRs** or development credits under ZR-16, we submitted the Heurich Mansion case as a precedent that the Commission does have the authority to aggregate -- to approve transfers of density outside of the downtown area.

We don't -- it's been argued that case is no longer good precedent because that case predated the formation of the HPRB. We did not submit that case as precedent on the basis of historic preservation.

We submitted it on the basis that the Zoning

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Commission, as upheld by the D.C. Court of Appeals, does have the Commission, under its broad authority under the Zoning Act and the zoning regulations, to approve aggregations or transfers of density like it does under PUD all the time. There was a suggestion that what's being proposed requires and the mayor's agent HPRB because bу the effectively are consolidating the lots of the Spring Valley Shopping Center with Record Lot 9, where the new construction Just a note that the Office of Planning, their most supplemental confirmed with recent report Historic Preservation Office that what's being proposed is not in any way consolidating the lots.

The existing lot configuration, which is Record Lot 9 on one side of the alley and A&T Lots 802 and 803 on the other side of the alley, the existing lot configuration will remain exactly the same after the project is constructed.

We did a little bit of research and looked up all of the mayor's agent cases that were cited in CRD's report. All of those were garden variety subdivisions, in that they included either taking land away from an existing historic resource, that is certainly something that is a subdivision subject to HPRB review.

It also included consolidation of several lots, one or more including a historic resource, into a single lot.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That requires HPRB review or a mayor's agent review. And then the one case that was provided as an example that an intervening alley doesn't necessarily preclude or avoid having to get reviewed by HPRB, that was the Gurmuiller case, the Mass court case on Massachusetts Avenue and Third. We looked up that case and, actually, there was an alley involved, but it was several lots.

It included a closure of the alley, and then all of that area, along with a historic resource, got combined into one single record lot. That's an example where the alley was actually being closed and gotten rid of.

In this case, the public alley separating Spring Valley Shopping Center and the development site will remain exactly as is. There was a point that the Spring Valley Shopping Center does not have any density that's unallocated.

I think, again, we briefed this in our response, but you can look across the street and look at Spring Valley Village and know that the existing historic resources do have unused density that's available for development. Across the street, they're just finishing the development with the pizzeria and the Compass Coffee. That was an HPRB case because it took place on that site. We're simply, through the voluntary design review process, moving some of the unused density from the Spring Valley Shopping Center over the alley, through aggregation, onto Lot 807.

Finally, on the topic of calculating inclusionary zoning, I know this has received a lot of attention in this case. I just wanted to point out that there's been an argument that Valor, in some way, was trying to short change or circumvent the inclusionary zoning requirements. That is not at all the case.

The issue that was raised in January of 2018 was actually an interpretation issue that, then, after the January 2018 hearing, we worked closely with the Office of Planning and we resolved the issue.

It had to do with how do you account for all of that existing commercial gross floor area that's within the site, how do you account for that in the IZ set-aside requirement? The result was that in calculating IZ set-aside requirement for the new construction, you had to take that calculation. fact, account οf your Tn conversation, I think, informed some of the new provisions that were recently taken proposed action on by the Zoning Commission, where when you have existing and new gross floor area, when do you trigger -- when does it apply to the new gross floor area only? When does it apply to the existing and the new?

Nonetheless, we're not trying to short change IZ at all. Our currently IZ calculation that was submitted with our most recent filing, on October 16th, is accurate and is

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

calculated exactly how it's required to be carried out under the current regulations and the recent clarifications that are still under review by the Commission and they're out for public comment.

We're relying upon the current regulations, as they exist, and in terms of the question of achievable versus utilized. In 0433I, there was testimony that regardless of how much of the 20 percent bonus density you use in calculating the set-aside requirement, you have to account for all of 20 percent.

I believe that in taking a proposed action on the proposed clarifications, the Commission confirmed, through its vote, with the language from Office of Planning, that the calculation is based on the bonus density that you use and not the full 20 percent. In this case, overall, across the design review site, we are a 2.68 FAR project. That's .18 FAR of bonus, which ended up being -- when compared to the 10 percent calculation, that ended up being the larger number.

We provided that base calculation as an exhibit to our filing, and we specifically noted that the base calculation did not reflect the residential area in the cellar, in the penthouse, and the projections.

However, if you look at our cover letter and our actual plans, it very clearly shows that the base building,

the dwelling units in the cellar, the dwelling units in the penthouse, and the area in the projections is added into our IZ set-aside calculation, for a total set aside of 24, 440 square feet.

The last point I wanted to note was the testimony provided by Ms. Marilyn Simon just this morning on whether or not the residential dwelling units, the area that is devoted to them in the cellar and the projections, actually should get added into the bonus density calculation. I would just read from Ms. Simon's testimony. She cites to a provision that states an IZ development's entire residential floor area, including dwelling units located in the cellar space or enclosed building projections, shall be included for purposes of calculating the minimum set-aside requirements of Sub C, 1003.1.2.

For purposes of calculating the minimum set-aside requirements in -- that provision was specifically addressed in the Office of Planning's report in 0433I. It was the last report that they submitted to the Commission specifically briefing this issue. I'll just read from the report.

In citing to the same exact provision that I just read, DCRA interprets use of the phrase calculating the minimum set aside as meaning the 8 to 10 percent requirement and not bonus density.

So when you're comparing and looking for which is

the larger calculation, the 10 percent or the 75 percent of
the bonus density used, you take the area from the cellar and
the projections and you incorporate it into the 10 percent
calculation. But because that area is not considered to be
gross floor area, as it's defined by the zoning regulations,
it does not get counted into the bonus density calculation,
but that is not to say that it's not subject to IZ. It is.
When you do the bonus density calculation, if
that's the greater number, then you actually add in the
cellar and the projections and combine those numbers together
to get your full set-aside requirement. With that, Mr.
Chairman, I'll conclude my presentation.
MR. GLASGOW: That concludes the Applicant's
direct.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you for the presentation.
Let's see if we have any questions or comments up here. Mr.
Turnbull.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
just had one question. When you were going through, talking
about the points from the OP report that you've addressed,
you talked about removal of the IZ units from the lower
level. What about the IZ on Floors 1 through 4? Did you do
any changes to the rearrange the IZ units, redistribute
them?
MR. LANSING: Commissioner Turnbull, can you point

1	me to the OP report?
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's Page
3	MR. LANSING: There it is, yes.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 1. It's Bullet Point
5	5 or 4.
6	MR. LANSING: I think, and the Office of Planning
7	can confirm, that bullet is to remove the IZ units in cellar
8	area and redistribute them to Floors 1 through 4.
9	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Because there was a little
10	bit of stacking that I saw on the floor, so I was just
11	curious. I think it was two-bedroom units that were all two,
12	three, four. They were all in a row. I was just wondering
13	how much thought you gave to the stacking of some of those
14	units.
15	MR. LANSING: The IZ plan that was submitted is
16	the IZ plan as modified by our commitment to not have any IZ
17	units in cellar area. In terms of stacking, I would defer
18	to Ms. Alexander on that.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm not going to make a
20	big deal. I was just looking on G-09, which is your IZ
21	layouts. On 48th Street, there's a couple of two bedrooms.
22	They're all stacked in a row. Actually, I don't think it
23	would be an unattractive setting. I'm just curious as to how
24	you decided to do that.
25	MS. ALEXANDER: I'm trying to find the units that

1	you're referring to.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's the two-bedroom units
3	going toward the townhouse, next to the townhouse.
4	MS. ALEXANDER: Oh, I see. There's three of
5	those, yes.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think there's a whole
7	row stacked as two bedrooms. They're all IZ, which I'm not
8	
9	MS. ALEXANDER: We could look at redistributing
10	those.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm not totally opposed.
12	It isn't in a bad location, in one sense, because you've got
13	that little park-like setting in front. The only other
14	question is the mechanical unit for the grocery store, up by
15	the alley. How noisy is that going to be? Are you
16	addressing the sound? I'm looking at some of the units right
17	above.
18	MS. ALEXANDER: Right. This is a it's not like
19	a
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Air handler.
21	MS. ALEXANDER: 65,000 square foot grocery
22	store, so it has a smaller amount of overall air handle in
23	the units. We will do acoustical measures to make sure
24	they're not too loud. We have units right adjacent to them,
25	so we have the same concern.
	· ·

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I was just
2	concerned that there was some IZ units, too, in that area,
3	also. I'm just concerned about the quality of life and what
4	people are going to be experiencing there. Those are
5	basically my concerns right now.
6	I guess the only other the solar. I think you
7	had an engineering report said that you didn't think you
8	could do the solar because of the stick frame construction
9	with the green roof and the solar. Are you still on that
10	position?
11	MR. GLASGOW: I think we're continuing to evaluate
12	that. That's why we want flexibility. As long as we get our
13	LEED Gold Version 4
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. It's not totally
15	out, but you need to think about it and
16	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, we see that there's a challenge
17	there, but we
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: There is, yes.
19	MR. GLASGOW: but we want our flexibility to
20	meet our Gold. It's customary for the Commission to give the
21	Applicant the ability to do it by various means.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I'm pleased you're going
23	with LEED Gold. I'm sure the vice chair is also very pleased
24	with that. Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up here? I
I.	1

noticed that, Mr. Dettman, you talked about the IZ. noticed in the report that I read it said some case that the Commission didn't discuss the IZ. A lot of times -- I'm answering to that because a lot of times, we don't discuss the IZ if we agree with what's being presented for us. We don't need to discuss anything. The record's complete. you mentioned again about not -- I don't know if this was the I know there's been a number of cases you mentioned a particular person, Ms. Marilyn Simon's analysis and how she interprets it. I think you said the density -- the bonus density, as opposed to the 8 to 10 percent. Could you explain that again for us, so we can -- so I can understand exactly what your explanation is? Because I'll probably ask her something similar.

MR. DETTMAN: Sure. When you go about setting --calculating your set-aside requirement, we fall under the category of the 10 percent or the 75 percent of bonus density used because we are MU-4. It's a maximum height of 50 feet, and we're a stick-built product.

The IZ regulations are stated in terms of gross floor area, which is defined, in the zoning regulations, as essentially space that's above grade. So if you're in a cellar, that's not considered gross floor area.

If you're in projection above the property line, that's not considered gross floor area. But there is a

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

provision that says when you're calculating your minimum set-aside requirement, you take those -- even though they're not considered gross floor area, as defined by zoning, you incorporate those into your calculation. If you look at the -- this was thoroughly discussed by the Commission in 0433I. If you look at the Office of Planning's report to the Commission addressing this issue, they talked to the DCRA.

Essentially, when you're doing those two calculations to figure out what's the greater number, you take your cellar and your projection space and you add it to your gross floor area and you take 10 percent of that.

But when you're doing your bonus density, because those are not considered gross floor area, they're not included in the calculation of how much bonus density you're using because they're not gross floor area. But again, it's not that you're -- it's not that space is not subject to IZ. It is.

If you have residential dwelling units in the cellar or projections, it's subject to the appropriate percentage. It might be 8 percent; it might be 10 percent. Again, we're 10 percent. It's just that it's added in after you do the bonus density calculation, as opposed to when you're doing the first calculation.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right.

MR. DETTMAN: It's accounted for.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. Got you. Okay, thank you.
2	Commissioner Shapiro.
3	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
4	a quick question. I'm looking at A-02. The question's
5	around any other retail use besides the grocery. I just may
6	have missed that. Is there a plan for that?
7	MR. LANSING: At this point, no. Grocer will be
8	the retail.
9	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: I'm just looking at this
10	one schematic. It pulls out retail amenities separate from
11	grocery.
12	MR. LANSING: Yes, Commissioner, it could be
13	amenity to the building as we finalize planning.
14	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: But it could be retail use,
15	as well.
16	MR. LANSING: It could be flexible, correct.
17	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: What's the square footage
18	of the grocery piece, as opposed to the retail? Is that what
19	bumped up the additional 1,700 square feet?
20	MS. ALEXANDER: The grocery square foot did
21	increase a little bit. It is now at 16,000. Then the
22	residential amenity space, I think it's pretty consistent
23	with what it was before.
24	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: So that's as before, and
25	that's about 1,700 square feet.

1	MS. ALEXANDER: The smaller space, 1,700.
2	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Ish, okay.
3	MS. ALEXANDER: Yes, it is. On Page G-07, we have
4	the square footages broken out for you.
5	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: If it's not amenity space,
6	do you have any sense of how that would be programmed?
7	MR. LANSING: At this point, no, we don't know.
8	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: All right, thank you.
9	Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Vice Chair Miller.
11	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This
12	may be in the record. I don't know. At this point, have you
13	reached a letter of intent with a particular grocery store?
14	MR. LANSING: We have, yes, Commissioner. We're
15	in the process of pursuing that further to a full lease.
16	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Can you
17	MR. LANSING: Sorry, yes, MOM's Organic Market.
18	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay, thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up here?
20	Let's go through the parties. Any cross-examination?
21	Commissioner Kravitz, you have any cross?
22	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: No, sir.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: ANC 3E has two people, Jonathan
24	McHugh and Amy Hall. You have any cross? Okay. And both ANCs
25	are in support. Ward 3 Vision in support. Mr. Wheeler, you

1	have any cross? Okay. And the Spring Valley Neighborhood
2	Association is in support. William Clarkson
3	No cross. Citizens for these are opposition Citizens
4	for Reasonable Development in opposition. Mr. Donohue and
5	he's been here since last January. I forgot the gentleman's
6	name that came.
7	MR. DONOHUE: This is Mr. Sheldon Repp, president
8	of CRD, joining me at the table. My name is Ed Donohue,
9	counsel for CRD. We just have a couple of questions.
LO	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
11	MR. DONOHUE: Mr. Lansing, I'm glad to hear you
L2	tell us that you're moving forward toward from a letter
13	of intent to a lease. What's the commitment for Valor for
L4	the grocery space?
15	MR. LANSING: Can you clarify the question for me?
16	MR. DONOHUE: Yes. We've heard suggestions that
L7	ought to be for the life of the project. I'm lifting that
18	from the Office of Planning report or earlier comments from
L9	OP. The suggestion from ANC 3D is it ought to be at least
20	ten years. I guess what I'm asking you is what's Valor's
21	commitment on the grocery store?
22	MR. GLASGOW: There is a draft order in the record
23	that I believe reflects that.
24	MR. DETTMAN: I can get the answer if you want to
25	Wait a second

1	MR. GLASGOW: If you want to proceed to your next
2	question while he pulls that up, unless it's directed to Mr.
3	Dettman.
4	MR. DONOHUE: No, I'd like to see the draft order,
5	if that's what your answer's going to be. That's great.
6	Similarly, we've had discussion last January, we had a lot
7	of discussion about the HAWK signal.
8	I know that there was a DDOT meeting on site
9	I think you were there and some discussions about HAWK and
10	whether that was going to be moving forward or whether Valor
11	was committed to that. Do you have an answer on that?
12	MR. ANDRES: We are committed to that, subject to
13	DDOT approval.
14	MR. DONOHUE: Have there been discussions with
15	DDOT about that?
16	MR. ANDRES: DDOT?
17	MR. DONOHUE: With DDOT, yes.
18	MR. ANDRES: Yes, throughout the process, we've
19	identified that the potential for a HAWK signal is
20	appropriate here. We'd have to go through all of the design
21	and engineering studies to make sure that DDOT is still on
22	board.
23	MR. DONOHUE: Well correct me if I'm wrong, but I
24	think that was your answer in January of '18, right?
25	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's right. Typically, you
	I and the second

1	don't go through full design of transportation elements while
2	you're getting the project and title.
3	MR. DONOHUE: Alright. And earlier, you mentioned
4	the traffic studies. You've seen some of the criticisms of
5	some of the aging traffic studies and the back and forth
6	about that. You mentioned the AU building at 4801
7	Massachusetts Avenue. Do you know what the use of that
8	building was when the traffic counts were done?
9	MR. ANDRES: I don't believe I brought up the 4801
LO	AU building in my testimony.
11	MR. DONOHUE: Perhaps it was Ms. Alexander. I'm
L2	sorry. I thought you were discussing it.
13	MR. ANDRES: No, all I highlighted was the
L4	difference between the previous program and the current
15	program.
16	MR. DONOHUE: Great, thank you. Shelly.
L7	MR. REPP: Yes, thank you. By the way, our name
18	is Citizens for Responsible Development. I think there is
19	another organization with Citizens for Reasonable
20	Development.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That may be the one that's
22	ingrained in my mind for some reason. Forgive me if I got
23	that wrong.
24	MR. REPP: With respect to the retail space, you
25	say you have a non-binding letter of intent. Is that what

1	you have, Will?
2	MR. LANSING: At this moment in time, yes. That's
3	how letters of intent they're generally non-binding,
4	correct.
5	MR. REPP: Do you have a second non-binding letter
6	of intent, also, with a different grocer?
7	MR. LANSING: We do, yes, correct.
8	MR. REPP: So you have two non-binding letters of
9	intent.
10	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to object
11	because I don't recall him testifying as to that during his
12	direct.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sorry. I actually was trying
14	to make sure I didn't call them the other name, Citizens for
15	they're Citizens for Responsible Development. I was
16	getting that clarified with my colleagues. Could you all
17	repeat the question? Mr. Vice Chair, you yes, if you call
18	could repeat the question, what the question was, so I can
19	
20	MR. REPP: Do you want me to repeat the question?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, please.
22	MR. REPP: The question I asked was whether or not
23	they had isn't their letter of intent with MOM's a
24	non-binding letter of intent. I think the answer was yes.
25	MR. LANSING: That's correct, yes.

1 MR. REPP: Then I asked isn't there a second 2 non-binding letter of intent with a different grocer? MR. GLASGOW: 3 I interposed an objection because 4 there was no testimony as to that, no direct. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to overrule that. Is 6 Because I want to know the answer myself. it? 7 There is, Commissioner, yes. MR. LANSING: 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So you got your answer. 9 REPP: With respect to the other retail MR. amenity that came up before here, didn't you tell me last 10 11 week, during the walk around, as a matter fact, that retail 12 amenity was going to be used up by the grocery store? 13 LANSING: Possibly. That's still MR. to be determined. 15 With respect to -- a question came up MR. REPP: 16 for Mr. Glasgow about flexibilities. You're asking, in your 17 application, for the flexibility to build an extra 10 percent 18 residential units, taking from 219 240 so it up to 19 residential units, is that correct, as flexibility? 20 The flexibility language, MR. **DETTMAN:** as 21 currently in the draft order that was submitted, yes, we are requesting the standard 10 percent in the number of dwelling 22 units within the approved amount of GFA, so we're not growing 23 24 the GFA. 25 MR. REPP: I understand. It's just that the

1	number the density of this, as far as number of people go,
2	is part of the issue with respect to the neighbors here.
3	Erwin, your slide showed that there would be 220 parking
4	spaces for residents, right?
5	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's the plan.
6	MR. REPP: To be able to provide 228 parking
7	spaces, you need to have an agreement, or Valor needs to have
8	an agreement with American University to give up some of the
9	spaces that they're entitled to. Do you know what the status
10	of that agreement is?
11	MR. ANDRES: I believe Will can answer that
12	question.
13	MR. LANSING: We are in the process of finalizing
14	a written agreement with American University at this time.
15	MR. REPP: Which is the same thing you said a year
16	ago, right?
17	MR. LANSING: That is correct.
18	MR. REPP: That hasn't changed. The grocery store
19	hasn't changed. With respect to IZ, Mr. Dettman, you
20	mentioned the history here about a year ago, and you said
21	there was an interpretive question as to whether or not the
22	previous plan complied with the IZ. Is that right?
23	MR. DETTMAN: I said, back in January of 2018, an
24	interpretation issue was raised, which we, following the
25	January hearings, met with the Office of Planning and

1 resolved the issue. 2 MR. REPP: You also mentioned Ms. Simon's filing 3 today. Doesn't that raise a different interpretive 4 question? 5 DETTMAN: No, I would disagree with that 6 The issue raised in Ms. Simon's testimony 7 submitted today has already been addressed by the Commission in the IZ case. 8 9 About whether or not the cellar space MR. REPP: is considered to be bonus density or not. 10 11 MR. **DETTMAN:** That's right. The Office of Planning's report specifically addresses it. 12 As a matter of fact, if you look at the 13 MR. REPP: plain meaning of the statute, I mean the reg, 1003.9, it says 15 the inclusionary zoning development's entire residential floor area, including dwelling units located in the cellar 16 or enclosed building projections that extend into the public 17 18 space shall be included for purposes of calculating the 19 minimum set-aside, basically, and refers back to the bonus 20 density requirement. It doesn't say that it's 21 considered to be on part of that 1003.1. As I stated, in referring to that 22 MR. DETTMAN: very same provision, the Office of Planning's report in 23

0433I, dated November 9, 2018, says DCRA interprets the

phrase calculating the minimum set-aside to mean the 8 to 10

24

percent requirement, and not the bonus density.

I would further state that just below that, Figure 1 -- sorry, Figure 2, on Page 6 of the report, they go through a sample IZ requirement, which very clearly includes cellar and projection areas being 2,797 square feet, being incorporated into the 10 percent requirement, but not the bonus density calculation.

MR. REPP: We'll let Ms. Simon talk about this. With respect to shadows, Ms. Alexander, you talked about shadows. You also showed a slide that showed that the shadow study cuts off at 4:00 p.m. The sun, as I know, during the summer, lasts until 8:30 or later, and the houses along 48th Street are going to be impacted at a time after 4:00, right?

MR. REPP: Once again, this brings up the impact on the neighborhood of what I believe to be an oversized project. Will, going back to what you said, you talked about that the project team had engaged with the neighbors, or with the community. I know you have a bunch of meetings listed.

After 4:00 p.m., yes.

MS. ALEXANDER:

Actually, with respect to us, there was only one that I really consider to be a negotiation meeting. Moving on, you say that the revised plans are a result of the collaboration. Isn't it true that the real reason why you had to come up with revised plans is that this interpretive question with respect to IZ came out against you?

1 MR. LANSING: No. We revised plans for a number 2 part of it being, again, the community reasons; 3 engagement. This project dates back three years of meetings that I've had with many folks. I think at every revision and 5 every change of the project, it's come on the heels of feedback from the community. So respectfully, I disagree 6 with that comment. 7 8 I disagree with the answer, but that's MR. REPP: 9 Isn't it true that with respect to IZ, actually, different. 10 the gross floor area of the IZ that's in the current plans 11 is less than the gross floor area of the IZ that was in your 12 plans from back in January? That's true because it has 20-some 13 MR. DETTMAN: thousand square feet less of gross floor area. We removed 40,000 square feet of gross floor area and recouped about 15 half of that in the cellar area, which, again, is accounted 16 for in our IZ set aside calculations at the 10 percent 17 requirement. 18 One last question for Ms. Alexander. 19 MR. REPP: You talked about how the building has been lowered, and I 20 21 agree that it has been in part. But isn't it true that out in the wings, sort of the corner of 48th and Yuma and above 22 the grocery store, that actually the building is taller than 23 it was in your previous plans? 24

MS. ALEXANDER: There are portions of the building

1	that have increased modestly in height, yes.
2	MR. REPP: Four feet higher, I believe, on that
3	corner on the
4	MS. ALEXANDER: I believe it's about 3, but yes.
5	MR. REPP: Okay. Enough.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. I will say this, Mr.
7	Shelly Repp
8	MR. REPP: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I will say this. We're
10	going to put 1,000, 3.9, in the parking lot because I was
11	sitting here trying to let's you and I make sure we bring
12	that back up when you do your testimony.
13	Let me see. Any other questions?
14	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Could I get a final answer
15	on the grocery store? Is there an answer on Valor's
16	commitment?
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thought we had that. Or was it
18	something I missed? What was it? Oh, the number of years.
19	MR. DETTMAN: The Draft Order that was submitted
20	in February says for a minimum of 10 years. I think that's
21	a result of the is it the ANC resolution that made that
22	request? Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you.
25	Let's go to Spring Valley Wesley Heights Citizens

1 Association. 2 MR. SMITH: Good evening. My name is Tom Smith, and I'm joined by Dr. Jeffrey Kraskin, for Spring Valley 3 4 opponents. I wanted to first follow up on the -- well, I'll 5 I was going to follow up on a question come back to that. 6 7 that Shelly asked. 8 But I wanted to talk about the OP report dealing 9 On page 13 of the OP report, it talks with public spaces. about public spaces. And I just want to be sure I understand 10 11 what public spaces you're providing as part of the new, 12 revised plan. Am I right that there's an interior courtyard with a -- well, at least this is what OP makes reference to. 13 They make reference to an interior courtyard with a swimming pool and a seating area and, also, a roof terrace. 15 Is that 16 correct? 17 MS. ALEXANDER: As building amenity spaces, that is correct. 18 19 Well, are these spaces open to the MR. SMITH: public to gather or are they private amenities for the 20 21 residents? 22 MS. ALEXANDER: Those two spaces you identified 23 are private amenities for the residents. 24 MR. SMITH: Okay. And there's also space outside

the grocery store, correct?

1	MS. ALEXANDER: Correct. There's a northwest
2	plaza outside of the grocery store.
3	MR. SMITH: And will that be available to the
4	public or is that only available to patrons of the grocery
5	store?
6	MS. ALEXANDER: No, that is intended as a public
7	space for the community.
8	MR. SMITH: Okay. And then, you have Windom Park
9	
10	MS. ALEXANDER: Correct.
11	MR. SMITH: as a public space.
12	MS. ALEXANDER: Correct.
13	MR. SMITH: And OP has been critical of Windom
14	Park as a public space in their report. And I just wanted
15	to give you an opportunity to respond to that criticism about
16	Windom Park. They said it basically would not be used.
17	MS. ALEXANDER: I think that is possible, but I
18	do also think that, if you give residents an opportunity to
19	use a beautiful space, then they will use it. And we intend
20	to make it a beautiful space.
21	MR. SMITH: So, are there any other public
22	gathering spaces in the new development?
23	MS. ALEXANDER: Besides the northwest plaza and
24	the Windom Park
25	MR. SMITH: Yes.

1	MS. ALEXANDER: there is the enhancement of the
2	alleyway which is for the public. Other than that, no.
3	MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. All right. So, I
4	want to come back to the alleyway, since you mentioned it.
5	But, before we do that, I want to follow up with the historic
6	designation piece, the 802-803 lots. And I wonder, with the
7	exchange of density that you have, the agreement with Regency
8	Centers for the exchange of density for 802 and 803, we have
9	not seen that agreement yet, is that correct? You have not
10	provided a copy of that agreement, correct?
11	MR. LANSING: Correct, we have not.
12	MR. SMITH: Are there any plans at this point in
13	time to provide that agreement?
14	MR. LANSING: No. That's a private agreement,
15	two-party agreement. However, we have submitted to the
16	record details of that agreement in the form of a sworn
17	affidavit.
18	MR. SMITH: Okay. Are there any, without
19	violating the proprietary issues involved with that
20	agreement, are there any provisions in that agreement that
21	would affect future development at lots 802 and 803?
22	MR. LANSING: Yes, I don't off the top of my head
23	I'm certainly happy to look in the record and see what we
24	did say, I guess, in the
25	MR. SMITH: You didn't really address that.

1	That's why I'm asking the question to you. You really didn't
2	say much of anything.
3	MR. LANSING: I think to the extent that it's
4	proprietary and what we've put in the record is what we
5	are comfortable and willing to, I think, put publicly.
6	MR. SMITH: Okay. Are there any provisions, can
7	you tell us whether there are any provisions in the
8	agreement, in the secret agreement, that could lead to any
9	
10	MR. GLASGOW: Objection.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The secret agreement is the
12	objection?
13	MR. GLASGOW: Yes.
14	MR. SMITH: I'll take out the word "secret" just
15	for convenience.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's strike that from the record,
17	even though we'll see it.
18	MR. SMITH: Okay. Are there any provisions in the
19	agreement that could lead to any changes or alterations of
20	the buildings on lots 802 and 803?
21	MR. GLASGOW: That's a legal question, and that
22	site is a Historic Site. And anything that is done to the
23	exterior of those buildings or to that site needs to go to
24	the Historic Preservation Review Board, whether there's an
25	agreement or not, or whatever it says on that.

1 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Just a minute. Let me ask, where 2 are you trying to go with the --MR. SMITH: 3 Actually, the question I'm trying to find out -- well, first of all, I was trying to find out what 5 was in the secret -- I'm sorry -- in the agreement. The agreement, right. 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 7 MR. SMITH: In the agreement. If we get any more additional information about that agreement that might affect the future of that property at 802, at lots 802 or 803, especially since the Applicant has testified, and also OP has 10 11 confirmed, that the sale -- the density of that site actually preserves the historic character, the historic designation 12 13 of the building. 14 So, if the argument is that this is going to preserve the character of the historic, going to preserve the 15 designation, if 16 there's something agreements that might affect that, then that's not quite 17 And so, that's what I'm pursuing. 18 accurate. 19 I have one other question about the historic designation, and that's it. 20 21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okav. And that just has to do with, based 22 MR. SMITH: on what you're doing with the transfer of density, will that 23 qualify you for federal tax credits under the historic 24 25 designation laws, to your knowledge?

1	MR. LANSING: No.
2	MR. SMITH: Okay. All right.
3	So, let me go back now to the you mentioned the
4	alleyways and the sidewalks. The alleyways will all be
5	two-way, is that correct?
6	MR. ANDRES: Yes.
7	MR. SMITH: Okay. And does that include the
8	portion of the alleyway off Mass Avenue between Massachusetts
9	Avenue and where the other two alleys join
10	MR. ANDRES: Yes.
11	MR. SMITH: into a "V"?
12	MR. ANDRES: The entire internal alley network has
13	been proposed as two-way.
14	MR. SMITH: Okay. On A-21, you show a rendering
15	which has it as "Do not enter". And that's why I'm asking
16	that question. Is that not correct?
17	MR. ANDRES: So, there's an existing "Do not
18	enter" sign that will be removed as part of the development
19	of this project.
20	MR. SMITH: Right. That's on A-20. You have the
21	current, the existing, and then, you have the proposed, but
22	you have the "Do not enter" sign in the proposed. That's
23	incorrect, is that
24	MS. ALEXANDER: So, we actually corrected that for
25	this

1	MR. SMITH: Oh, you corrected it on here? Okay.
2	MS. ALEXANDER: this testimony.
3	MR. SMITH: All right. All right. Great. I
4	wanted to make sure of that.
5	Now the alleyways that you I'm sorry the
6	sidewalks that you mentioned, how wide are those sidewalks?
7	MS. ALEXANDER: Three foot on the north-south
8	alley and 6 foot on the remaining
9	MR. SMITH: Now the 3 foot on the north side
10	alley, the north side alley would run can you show the
11	picture where it runs from? It would run from Yuma to Mass
12	Avenue, is that correct?
13	MS. ALEXANDER: One moment. The 3-foot sidewalk
14	would start on Yuma, be adjacent to the building face all the
15	way to the corner. Then, there's an additional sidewalk
16	proposed for the portion of the site that is available on
17	Massachusetts Avenue. There's
18	MR. SMITH: That's behind the Spring Valley shops,
19	on the side of the Spring Valley Shopping Center.
20	MS. ALEXANDER: On the side of the Spring Valley
21	Shopping Center, correct.
22	MR. SMITH: And are you paying for that or are
23	they paying for that?
24	MS. ALEXANDER: That would be part of our
25	enhancements.

1	MR. SMITH: Okay. So, does that mean that you're
2	widening the portion of the road between the bank and the
3	shopping center there off Mass Avenue?
4	MS. ALEXANDER: No.
5	MR. SMITH: So, how I mean, currently
6	MS. ALEXANDER: Currently, it is landscaping. We
7	would replace the landscaping with sidewalk.
8	MR. SMITH: Okay. I see what you're saying. So,
9	the portion that is by the automatic teller machine, that
10	will have a sidewalk there now? By Wells Fargo? Is that
11	correct?
12	MS. ALEXANDER: On the northern, northwest side
13	of the alley, correct.
14	MR. SMITH: Okay. But the width of the roadway
15	itself will not change?
16	MS. ALEXANDER: Correct.
17	MR. SMITH: And what about the apron there? What
18	about the curb cut there? Will that change?
19	MS. ALEXANDER: No.
20	MR. SMITH: Okay. Is there a sidewalk on the
21	opposite side of that portion by the PNC Bank?
22	MS. ALEXANDER: There is, but only there is
23	only a sidewalk up into the bank itself, and then, it becomes
24	landscaping for this zone right here.
25	MR. SMITH: Okay. So, from Mass Avenue to the

1	bank
2	MS. ALEXANDER: This portion
3	MR. SMITH: is sidewalk?
4	MS. ALEXANDER: is the sidewalk, correct.
5	MR. SMITH: And then, there's no sidewalk?
6	MS. ALEXANDER: Correct. And then, there's a
7	sidewalk again behind the bank.
8	MR. SMITH: Going where?
9	MS. ALEXANDER: To their parking lot.
10	MR. SMITH: To their parking lot?
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can I interrupt something?
12	Because Mr. Smith is bringing up a good point. At least I
13	didn't remember. Coming from Mass Avenue, walking, if I'm
14	walking on the sidewalk, the other side of PNC Bank, when I
15	get to that point of an alley, it's a point right there where
16	you
17	MS. ALEXANDER: Uh-hum.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: How do I get over to, if I wanted
19	to cross, how do I get over to the other sidewalk?
20	MS. ALEXANDER: You would have to negotiate the
21	alley.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, I'd have to take a
23	MS. ALEXANDER: Similar to like crossing
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
25	MS. ALEXANDER: Similar to like crossing the alley

1 if you were to cross, say, at this location here. 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, from a design perspective, we 3 need to look at that. Okay? Because I see that being a -well, I'm hoping nobody gets hurt, but I see that being a 5 potential problem. And I know whatever we need to do, mirrors, or whatever, but that's -- we need to look at that 6 7 because I don't see a sidewalk. And I know I go through -well, I shouldn't say "I cross streets sometimes," but I just see -- we don't want to put anything in place that may be a 9 So, let's see if we can look at that. 10 11 for interrupting the Thank you. Excuse me 12 process. 13 MR. SMITH: Okay. So now, let's -- can you show us again where the 3-foot sidewalk, 3-foot-wide sidewalk is? And that curb, am I correct in saying that's a 2-inch curb? 15 16 MS. ALEXANDER: Yes. 17 A 2-inch curb --MR. SMITH: 18 MS. ALEXANDER: Correct. 19 -- and 3-foot sidewalk? MR. SMITH: And where will that stretch from? 20 21 MS. ALEXANDER: So, a more detailed drawing is found on CL-04, which I can open up, if the Commission would 23 CL-04 shows the entire -- should I open it? 24 MR. SMITH: Can you also, though, tell me how --25 you talked about widening the alley. But when you widen the

	61
1	alley
2	MS. ALEXANDER: Yes.
3	MR. SMITH: what will be the width of the
4	roadway in the alley? It's 20 feet, correct?
5	MR. ANDRES: It would remain as 20 feet.
6	MR. SMITH: It's 20 feet?
7	MR. ANDRES: Yes.
8	MR. SMITH: Okay. So, you may be widening it to
9	30-some feet, but we're talking about 20 feet
10	MR. ANDRES: For the vehicles.
11	MR. SMITH: for the vehicles, and then, another
12	3-foot-wide sidewalk?
13	MR. ANDRES: That's correct.
14	MR. SMITH: Okay. Can you help me understand a
15	little bit? You made reference to this being a valuable
16	public space, this 3-foot sidewalk. Everything that I've
17	read from FHWA, from the Federal Highway Administration, to
18	the Access Board, to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, all
19	say that a minimum width of any sidewalk, minimum width would
20	be 4 feet plus far more than a 2-inch curb for safety
21	purposes. And in fact, it talks about, most of these reports
22	talk about how walking is a social experience.
23	MR. ANDRES: Uh-hum.
24	MR. SMITH: And so, people want to walk next to

25 one another, and when you don't have a wide enough sidewalk,

you force somebody into the roadway. So, can you help me understand a little bit about why only a 3-foot-wide sidewalk? How is that an amenity if it presents a safety issue and it's not accessible for people with disabilities? And what would it take for you to make it wider?

MR. ANDRES: So, with respect to the design of the alley itself, essentially, the Design and Engineering Manual identifies that an alley is used primarily for access for a garage and loading. And that's why we're essentially eliminating all of the existing curb cuts that are on the private -- excuse me -- on the public streets.

So, in focusing all of the traffic in the alleys for access for garage and loading, the condition of mixed traffic in an alley is not uncommon in the District. There are many alleys where there are vehicles traveling at slow speeds that serve uses that are generating mixed traffic, both vehicular and pedestrians, and bicyclists.

So, in this condition, we're creating an opportunity like that. But, in addition to that, we are separating, we are creating a separate path that's exclusive of the 20-foot travel width.

Just to give you a sense of scale, your travelings within the District, where you're traveling upwards of 35-40 miles an hour, are 10-feet wide. So, if you go out to New York Avenue, the lane widths on some of the lanes, you know,

going 35, 40, potentially even faster than that, are 10-foot 2 lanes. 3 In this case, we are trying to promote a zone where this will be pedestrian populated, but still provide access for garage and loading. And this is the concept that 5 we have coordinated with DDOT. And DDOT -- and obviously, 6 7 they could speak for themselves -- but this is a condition that we've incorporated on several other of the projects where you do have this mix of uses. 9 10 MR. SMITH: Are you doing any garage or loading 11 on the north-south alley? 12 MR. ANDRES: No, but it provides you access to the east-west alley. 13 14 MR. SMITH: Yes, but so all the garage and the loading is going on on the east-west alley, which has a 15 sidewalk. talking 16 6-foot Okav? So, I'm north-south sidewalk. So, you have a sidewalk that doesn't 17 even meet the standards for people with disabilities. 18 So, 19 I'm asking you, how is that an amenity? 20 And then, let me also ask, as part of 21 question, are you having a separate bicycle lane there? where will bicycles travel in the north-south alley? 22 23 they be in the roadway or on the sidewalk or a separate bicycle lane? 24 25 Well, given the fact that there are MR. ANDRES:

1 limited speeds in the alley, there's no need for a bicycle 2 You know, case in point, there are no bike lanes on 3 Yuma or 48th. So, in order for the vehicles to -- excuse me -- in order for the bicyclists to share the alley, it is, essentially, they will be riding in the travel lane. 5 I'm a little confused, then, 6 MR. SMITH: Okay. 7 the circulation patterns that you showed in the Supplemental Report. Can you help me understand circulation patterns for this project? 9 Does a car come in, in terms of the east-west alley off of 48th Street, is that 10 11 where the trucks will come? 12 MR. ANDRES: So --That's where the trucks will come? 13 MR. SMITH: 14 MR. ANDRES: Just to make it simple for you, all of the alley connections to the public streets, whether it's 15 Mass, Yuma, or 48th, vehicles, and including smaller delivery 16 vehicles, can use all three entrances. 17 18 MR. SMITH: Okay. 19 And bicyclists can use all three ANDRES: 20 entrances. 21 MR. SMITH: Okav. Now, then, what about the sidewalk on the east-west alley? That's a 6-foot sidewalk? 22 It's a 6-foot --23 MR. ANDRES: 24 MR. SMITH: But it's a partial sidewalk, is that 25 correct?

1 MR. ANDRES: Well, it's a continuous path that runs along the side of the building across the entrances to 2 both the loading and the garage. 3 4 MR. SMITH: So, there is a sidewalk that crosses in front of the loading areas and, also, the garage entrance 5 6 or --7 MR. ANDRES: It's a designated path that runs, essentially, across the frontage of this. 8 9 Because I thought in your report, in MR. SMITH: 10 your filing on the transportation supplement, it talks and it shows a green line of the sidewalk ending right around the 11 12 townhomes, right after the townhomes. And then, there's no 13 sidewalk again? But you're saying it's a path? Can you help me understand the difference? And is that path going to be 6-feet wide as well or --15 MS. ALEXANDER: As shown on Sheet 11 of 16 package, the pathway is continuous and is interrupted. 17 Ιt 18 becomes a flush condition, which is where we delineate the 19 path on a flush condition of surface, but still alerting both pedestrians and those in vehicles that there is a cross of 20 21 traffic to occur there. Continues, continues, again flush 22 condition, and continues. 23 Does that mean you paint a line or MR. SMITH: something that --24 25 MS. ALEXANDER: You can do it through texture.

1	You can do it through color.
2	MR. SMITH: Okay.
3	MS. ALEXANDER: There's different methods.
4	MR. SMITH: And then, where would the sidewalk
5	pick up again?
6	MS. ALEXANDER: It, again, following the cursor,
7	continues alongside along our building, then becomes flush
8	by the loading and garage entry, and then, until the corner,
9	where again it becomes a 2-inch raised curb.
10	MR. SMITH: Okay. So, where do you think the
11	heaviest pedestrian traffic will be on this site?
12	MS. ALEXANDER: The streets.
13	MR. SMITH: The streets? Meaning what?
14	MS. ALEXANDER: Yuma
15	MR. SMITH: 48th, Yuma?
16	MS. ALEXANDER: Yuma and 48th.
17	MR. SMITH: Yuma and 48th? Okay. If you expect
18	the most pedestrian traffic to be on Yuma and 48th, 48th
19	stretching from Yuma to Mass Avenue, correct?
20	MS. ALEXANDER: Correct.
21	MR. SMITH: Okay. And you're planning on putting
22	a HAWK signal near the alley entrance of Mass Avenue, is that
23	correct?
24	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's correct.
25	MR. SMITH: So, if most of your pedestrian traffic
ļ	

is down 48th Street from Yuma to Massachusetts Avenue -MR. ANDRES: Well, actually --

MR. SMITH: Let me finish my question, please.

You already have an existing pedestrian signal at 48th and Mass and Fordham there. Why do you need this HAWK signal?

MR. ANDRES: So, as you can go out -- as you are probably well aware, you can go out there today and there are pedestrians crossing at that location. So, given that this is potentially a destination, we've, obviously, coordinated with the ANCs and with DDOT, and in that coordination it's been brought that there is the potential up to facilitate what currently goes on there today as well as what potentially could be increased with the proposed development.

Now, if you look at the site plan, you know, the way that people would come -- essentially, if you are north and east of the site, and you are walking to the site, chances on you would stay on Yuma to the front entrance of the shopping center. There is no need for you to actually go into the alley if you are coming from those destinations. So, that means approximately a third of the population that would potentially come to the grocery store would, could potentially come from the south and/or from the alley to the south.

So, if you were looking at a map and see how

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	people would walk here, they would eventually need to get to
2	Yuma because the alley doesn't connect further north. The
3	alley dead-ends at Yuma. So, in order for people to access
4	the front of the grocery store, they would either be coming
5	from points north, coming down and, then, turning right or
6	left onto Yuma to access the site.
7	MR. SMITH: Do you know the distance between the
8	proposed site of the HAWK signal and the intersection at 48th
9	and Mass Avenue?
10	MR. ANDRES: Well, again, since the HAWK signal
11	hasn't been designed, we haven't identified where the
12	location would be. Just eyeballing it, it looks roughly
13	midway. You know, I don't have the scale with me right now.
14	So, I wouldn't be able to tell you what that distance is.
15	MR. SMITH: I thought that you all had told us
16	previously that the HAWK signal would be where the alley
17	entrance is off Mass Avenue between the PNC Bank and the
18	Spring Valley Shopping Center.
19	MR. ANDRES: Yes, that's right.
20	MR. SMITH: Okay. So
21	MR. ANDRES: We did. So, the question is, on
22	which side of the alley? We haven't determined. We haven't
23	
24	MR. SMITH: Okay. So, roughly, what distance is
25	that from that point to the intersection of 48th and Mass?
l	

1	I think I asked you this question at the last hearing, and
2	you said you would tell us.
3	MR. ANDRES: You know what? I have, I have
4	MR. SMITH: And you never did.
5	MR. ANDRES: With the beauty of Google
6	MR. SMITH: But my memory may be failing me.
7	MR. ANDRES: My colleague will help me with the
8	answer.
9	MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. Let me move on.
10	Did you make any I'm also a little confused because I
11	thought that there were changes that you made in the loading
12	docks. Have you made any changes in the loading docks, in
13	the loading dock design at the site?
14	MS. ALEXANDER: Yes.
15	MR. SMITH: Can you clarify what those are?
16	MS. ALEXANDER: Yes. We reduced the loading from
17	two 55-foot trucks to one 55-foot truck, and we are still
18	providing the 20-foot service space and the 30-foot truck for
19	the residential.
20	MR. SMITH: Okay. Do you know what the apron is
21	for the the apron length?
22	MS. ALEXANDER: The alley apron or?
23	MR. SMITH: No, I'm talking about for the loading
24	dock.
25	MR. ANDRES: So, the width of the opening?

1	MR. SMITH: No, I'm talking about the length of
2	the apron for the loading dock.
3	MS. ALEXANDER: We have 10 feet from the property
4	line to the building face, and then, we had recessed an
5	additional 10 feet from the building face to the loading dock
6	door. So, there's 20 feet
7	MR. SMITH: No, I'm not talking about that. I'm
8	talking about the apron is the area where that takes in the
9	parking and the maneuvering space to get out of the loading
10	dock. What would that length be?
11	MS. ALEXANDER: Do you mean width or depth?
12	MR. SMITH: I mean this
13	MS. ALEXANDER: The width?
14	MR. SMITH: No, I mean the length, the depth. The
15	depth from the building, but the apron is both the depth of
16	the building plus the maneuvering space.
17	So, I guess my question is, did you all look, when
18	you designed this, did you look at any of the specifications
19	from loading dock design companies, and the like, that get
20	into this sort of thing, to ensure that it is safe and
21	MR. ANDRES: Yes.
22	MR. SMITH: that there's adequate space?
23	MR. ANDRES: So, we have run AutoTURN diagrams to
24	confirm the loading, and the maneuverability of those
25	vehicles using that loading dock has been confirmed. So,
l	

1 yes, the short answer is, yes, we've used AutoTURN to ensure 2 that the loading dock has been designed adequately. So, the companies that do this 3 MR. SMITH: Okay. for a living, that design these things for a living, say that you need an apron space of about twice the size of a truck 5 in order to get out of a loading dock space. So, if you have 6 7 a 55-foot -- I'm sorry, what is it? -- a 55-foot truck, that would be roughly about 110. It could change based on what 9 the center distance is in each of the loading docks. 10 MR. ANDRES: Uh-hum. 11 MR. SMITH: Do you know what that center line 12 space is? So, the way that the loading for the 13 MR. ANDRES: larger trucks, which seems to be what you're concerned about, 15 is that when they come up 48th, they would come west, northwest along the east-west alley -- and Ms. Alexander is 16 showing the path of trucks -- pull forward and, then, back 17 18 up. 19 Actually, that's not my question at MR. SMITH: My question, what I'm trying to find out is whether 20 what you have meets standards, best practice standards, for 21 design of loading docks. And what I'm hearing is that it 22 doesn't, but I just want to kind of confirm in my mind --23 24 I don't understand where, why you MR. ANDRES: 25 think it doesn't.

1	MR. SMITH: Okay. Because it's
2	MR. ANDRES: We have confirmed, then, with
3	truck-turning diagrams, which is consistent with industry
4	practice.
5	MR. SMITH: Well, industry practice says you need
6	about twice the size of a truck. Okay. But I'll just move
7	on.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What we're going to do is, yes,
9	let's do this. Let's do this. If he asks the question, and
10	when you get ready to do your presentation, you want to
11	refute it, you can do it.
12	MR. SMITH: Yes, sir.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me just say this. We have a
14	screen down there that's in front of you. If you want to
15	show a design, because I don't see many people from the
16	Zoning Commission here I think the BZ, I don't know what
17	they might do. But you can draw on that, and then, you can
18	go on and erase it, if you want to show something, so we all
19	can see it and it will show everywhere. I think that works.
20	MR. SMITH: I'm pretty much beyond that point now,
21	but thanks.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: But you can take your finger and
23	just do it, and, you know
24	MR. ANDRES: And to answer your previous question,
25	the potential or possible location for a HAWK signal is

1 roughly 300 from Yuma, 300 feet from -- excuse me -- from 2 49th and 340ish from 48th. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me interrupt one second. 4 Mr. Turnbull? COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes, thanks, Mr. Chairman. 5 6 Maybe, Mr. Andres, to help put this to bed, maybe 7 you can do what you've done before, is provide a proof of scheme, turning radiuses that show actually how these trucks I think if you do that, I mean, I think 9 move in and out. that's based upon -- you base it upon industry standards and 10 11 the length of trucks. So, if you could provide a proof of scheme that shows how trucks enter, I think that might help. 12 13 MR. ANDRES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. 14 MR. SMITH: I just want to go over my notes one more time and just be sure here. 15 We all know you want to go over 16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 17 your notes to make sure here. Okay. 18 One last question here. And it has MR. SMITH: do with the townhomes. 19 You're suggesting that townhomes represent -- and maybe we could show the townhomes 20 21 here? Can you just circle the townhomes? Okay. Okav. And the AU Building, the AU Building, that's not 22 on that page, is it? Okay. You've been talking about -- I 23 24 thought the alley was a street there. I'm sorry. You've 25 been talking about the townhomes as being a transition, that

neighborhood, 1 provide а transition to the their location. 2 3 The question I have is, why did you, beyond the issue of the tree, okay, and I get the issue of the tree. 5 But if you're looking at doing a transition, using the townhomes as a transition to the neighborhood, most of the 6 7 single-family homes are on the Yuma side. Can you show where the Yuma side -- yes, up in that area and across on 48th. Why did you choose to put the townhomes at this end instead 10 of on the opposite end closer to Yuma, if you wanted to do 11 a transition to the neighborhood? This area on the south was not 12 MS. ALEXANDER: feasible for the multifamily, given the heritage tree. 13 14 MR. SMITH: Right. 15 MS. ALEXANDER: On the other side, if you put the townhomes on Yuma, that would make there be even more density 16 pushed towards 48th in order to maintain the same size. 17 18 Well, that's exactly my question. MR. SMITH: On 19 highest density have the in all neighborhood, that being the AU Building. 20 That's the 21 highest, that's the most density that we have right now. Everything else is one-, two-story buildings here. 22 That's sort of the anomaly. 23 24 So, why, then, do you have the highest density, 25 then something lower density, and then, you go back to higher

1	density, and then, you go back to the lower density of the
2	single-family homes along Yuma and on 48th and stretching
3	back?
4	How is that a transition? Isn't that kind of we're playing
5	like a rollercoaster here?
6	MS. ALEXANDER: I don't recall using the word
7	"transition," but
8	MR. SMITH: It's actually in all your documents
9	that you filed.
10	MS. ALEXANDER: That said, the grocery store was
11	also a pivotal point in our discussion, and the grocery store
12	could not be located in the area that we have the townhomes,
13	one, because of the heritage tree and, two, because of the
14	odd shape of the site in that location. So, the grocery
15	store was the more appropriate use, as located adjacent to
16	the Spring Valley Shopping Center, and with the multifamily
17	building above
18	MR. SMITH: Can you show where the grocery store
19	the grocery store is way down, way down there?
20	MS. ALEXANDER: Correct.
21	MR. SMITH: So, I'm talking about moving them to
22	the corner there at Yuma and 48th. I'm just trying to
23	understand if there is a rationale other you mentioned
24	about this idea of a transition, that that was the value of
25	the townhomes, that they would be a transition to the

1	neighborhood.
2	MS. ALEXANDER: The building, our use of
3	courtyards and setbacks and terracing is a use of transition
4	to the neighborhood.
5	MR. SMITH: Okay.
6	MS. ALEXANDER: I don't recall the townhouses
7	being used as transition.
8	MR. SMITH: All right. And then, I do have one
9	last question. In total in total how much retail space
10	are we losing at this site as a result of this project? You
11	already said, you already testified you had about
12	40-some-thousand, there's 40-some-thousand square feet of
13	retail currently at the site. If the grocery store was
14	operational, we'd have 40-some-thousand square foot of retail
15	at the site. So, are we losing are my calculations
16	correct that we're losing about 20-some-thousand square feet
17	of retail services in the neighborhood? I think it's a
18	simple subtraction.
19	MR. LANSING: Chair, we'll submit the specifics
20	of that
21	MR. SMITH: Okay.
22	MR. LANSING: with the answer.
23	MR. SMITH: Okay. Then, instead of answering that
24	question right now, can you answer this question? What
25	retail services are going to go out or are going to have to

1	close, currently operating retail services at the site are
2	going to have to close as a result of this development?
3	MR. LANSING: There are a couple of different
4	answers to that question because some of the current retail
5	users of the site, their leases expire within the next 24
6	months. So, to pin, I guess, the blame, if you will, on the
7	development of the site for those businesses to go out, I
8	don't think I can answer that specifically because, again,
9	lease terms end before we will break ground.
10	MR. SMITH: Okay. If this site were operational
11	now, what businesses would not exist anymore at the site?
12	Do you want me to ask it this way? Will DeCarlo's exist at
13	the site, DeCarlo's restaurant?
14	MR. LANSING: Will they exist how?
15	(Laughter.)
16	MR. SMITH: Will they have a space at this site?
17	MR. LANSING: Our future on the site, they will
18	not, no.
19	MR. SMITH: Okay. Will John Paul Salon have a
20	site?
21	MR. LANSING: They will not have a space on the
22	site, no.
23	MR. SMITH: Will Spring Valley Catering have a
24	site?
25	MR. LANSING: No.

1 MR. SMITH: I don't know if I'm missing anything. 2 the barbeque place. I'm sorry, I forgot the barbeque 3 Would the barbeque place have a site, a place 4 MR. LANSING: No. No. 5 MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. Thank you, sir. 6 Okay. All right. I think that CHAIRMAN HOOD: 7 is all of our parties. So, what we'll do now, unless my colleagues have other comments or questions, we'll go to the 8 Office of Planning, and then, we'll go to the District 9 Department of Transportation. 10 11 Ms. Vitale? Good evening, Mr. Chair and Members 12 MS. VITALE: Elisa Vitale with the Office of Planning. 13 of the Commission. 14 The Office of Planning continues to recommend approval of this subject design review application, and we 15 would like to reiterate that this is a voluntary design 16 application which conforms 17 review to the development 18 standards of the MU-4 zone, with the exception of two items, the Applicant's requested flexibility for rear yard and a 19 special exception for the penthouse stair enclosures on four 20 21 of the five townhouses. OP is recommending approval of those two areas of relief. 22 23 The project would otherwise comply with the zoning regulations, including the Inclusionary Zoning requirements. 24

OP recognizes the importance of the provision of affordable

1 housing. The Applicant hasn't requested relief from the 2 Inclusionary Zoning provisions, and the project would, therefore, have to comply with the regulations that are in 3 place at the time that the Applicant secures building 5 permits, should this project be approved. 6 OP appreciates the Applicant's responses to the 7 six items that were requested. We will continue to work with the Applicant and OAG to refine condition language 8 appropriate in the order to address those items. 9 10 I'll keep things short. This concludes the OP 11 I'm happy to answer any questions that you might report. 12 Thank you. have. 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. 14 Let's go right to Mr. Zimmerman. 15 Good evening, Chairman Hood and MR. ZIMMERMAN: For the record, my name is Aaron Zimmerman 16 Commissioners. with the District Department of Transportation. 17 18 We have reviewed the revised plan set, which shows 19 only relatively minor revisions from the development proposal 20 we evaluated and testified in great depth about a year ago. 21 DDOT has no objection to the proposed revisions and continues to support this voluntary design review application, subject 22 to the conditions previously agreed to by the Applicant. 23 24 Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ms. Vitale, let me ask you,

1 you put a lot of emphasis, when you said you were reminding us that this is a voluntary design review, I can't remember 2 -- and I think I've asked this question before; it shows how 3 bad my memory. I can't remember why we even called this voluntary design review. When we were doing the ZR and all 5 of that, why did we do that? 6 7 Maybe Ms. Steingasser can help me. Because you put a lot of emphasis on it. 8 Well, there are areas in the 9 MS. STEINGASSER: city where design review is required prior to a building 10 11 permit. The Capitol Gateway area down by the stadiums, they're required to go through this. 12 When we had originally started through the zoning 13 rewrite, we were looking at different types of plan unit development, one of which we were calling a PUD light or --15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, okav. 16 Right. 17 MS. STEINGASSER: -- a PUD 1. 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. 19 MS. STEINGASSER: That got removed and got brought into this concept of design review. So, then, we had to 20 21 distinguish between those properties that wanted to 22 through the process and those that were required. 23 Thank you for refreshing. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I remembered, as soon as you said "PUD light," I remembered. 24 25 Okay.

All right. Any other questions of the Office of Planning or DDOT?

Commissioner Shapiro?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a quick question for Mr. Zimmerman.

could talk little bit from you а your perspective about this issue in the alley, the intersection of pedestrian and bicyclists and through traffic and the Where is your comfort level with this? trucks? Give me a sense of the flavor of the conservation with the Applicant approving this, recommending you're or you're approval rather.

So, in our discussions with MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. the Applicant over the last year or two, we have talked about having like the lead sidewalk coming in from Massachusetts and, then, providing something up against the building face on the eastern side of the north-south alley, which is what they're showing as the 3-foot footpath. And with that being I think that's partially why on private property, described it as like an additional amenity, because DDOT typically would not require sidewalks along an alley. Thev typically intended for trucks, vehicle parking, back-of-the-house operations.

But, just given that there is a direct route from Massachusetts Avenue, we thought that having the sidewalk on

the western side, which my understanding is that they have more control over the ability to put the sidewalk on the western side of the alley near Massachusetts, and then, on their property on the eastern side. So, understanding that there are going to -- you know, whether we would like there to be pedestrians or not, this does provide some separation from moving vehicles. COMMISSIONER Pardon SHAPIRO: me for even suggesting that this is anywhere near the Wharf in terms of its intensification of development, but did you consider anything that would put pedestrians a little bit more forward in the process, where rather than focus on the separation, focus more on the merging of the modes? MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, I think, you know --COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: There's not enough traffic for the --Well. think MR. ZIMMERMAN: Ι from our perspective, we understood that there were going to be trucks, that there were going to be trash pickup trucks, recycling trucks, you know, vehicles accessing the parking garage back there. So, our preference would be that people accessible public sidewalk ADA network, understanding that there are going to be some people that

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that would be a direct route for.

COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what

I'm

So, in short,

1 hearing is you actually don't want to encourage a lot of 2 pedestrian use there, but you expect there will be some? 3 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct. All right. 4 COMMISSIONER SHAPIRO: Okay. Thank 5 you. It's helpful. 6 Thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull? 8 Thank you, Mr. Chair. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 9 Mr. Zimmerman, I'm sure you addressed it. talked about it previously. Maybe if you could just go back 10 11 and give your viewpoint again on the HAWK signal and talk about spacing, or whatever? 12 So, my understanding is that 13 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. this was an amenity that the Applicant and the ANC had developed kind of organically from the community. And it was 15 16 pitched to us at DDOT. And so, we took it back to our experts, our traffic signal experts, our pedestrian planners, 17 to kind of get their take on it. 18 over the years 19 Ι quess there complaints about a lot of jaywalking in this area, like on 20 21 And so, kind of based on that, and then, the this block. anticipation of additional development on the southern side 22 of Massachusetts, and then, additional development here, it 23 seemed to the experts back at DDOT that this would be a 24 25 logical location. And then, it being kind of halfway in the

1	block sort of at the alley opening, as Mr. Andres said, you
2	know, we're still finalizing and discussing which side it
3	would go on, but there would be that pedestrian connection
4	coming in, up the alley.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you. Thank you very
6	much for explaining that.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any other questions up here?
8	Other comments?
9	(No response.)
10	Okay. Let's go to the parties. I'm sorry, does
11	the Applicant have any cross of either
12	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Does ANC 3D, Mr. Kravitz?
14	(No response.)
15	Okay. I'll come back. I think he must have just
16	stepped out.
17	ANC 3E, any cross?
18	(No response.)
19	Okay. Ward 3 Vision, any cross?
20	PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No, sir.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any Spring Valley Neighborhood
22	Association, any cross? Okay. Spring Valley Neighborhood
23	Association?
24	(Off-microphone comment.)
25	I'm sorry, I forgot you last time? I thought

1	Neighborhood for Livable Communities and Spring Valley were
2	together. But I'm being told I want to make sure just in
3	case. You know, the courts like to come behind me.
4	MS. SCHELLIN: They were joined together last
5	time.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes. So, I thought they were
7	doing that this time.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. They were all joined
9	together.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Hold on. What I'm trying to do
11	is get that clarified because I don't want to have any issues
12	later on and have to come back and have another hearing. So,
13	is it clear that Spring Valley and I'm asking you, Mr.
14	Smith that Spring Valley and Neighbors for a Livable
15	Community are together, right?
16	(Off-microphone comment.)
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So, I didn't
18	forget that. Okay. All right.
19	Is Mr. Kravitz back? Okay. He may not have any
20	cross. Okay.
21	Let's go to let me see if I can get this right
22	this time Citizens for Responsible Development. For some
23	reason, I have another title in my mind and it doesn't go
24	away.
25	So, Mr. Donohue and Mr. Shelly Repp.

1	MR. DONAHUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2	A couple of questions for the Office of Planning,
3	if I could. Over the many hearings and many discussions
4	we've had about this project, I often ask about the grocery
5	store. So, I'm going to ask about the grocery store again.
6	We've noticed that the Office of Planning has some
7	proposed conditions. OP has got things that it really wants
8	to see out of this project. We've also noticed that the
9	grocery store is not one of those items. Is there a reason
10	that that's not one of the conditions?
11	MS. VITALE: I don't believe OP has proposed
12	conditions. There were six items that we were requesting
13	some additional information and clarification on. So, I
14	don't believe OP is recommending any conditions.
15	MR. DONAHUE: Is OP satisfied with the response
16	from the Applicant about its commitment to the grocery store?
17	MS. VITALE: The Applicant has indicated that they
18	would commit to a 10-year lease with a grocery tenant. That
19	would be satisfactory. OP would note that we would
20	anticipate that, should the grocery go away, that there would
21	be some other retail or commercial use that would occupy that
22	same space that's being designated now for the grocery.
23	MR. DONAHUE: You're assuming that that's going
24	to happen?
25	MS. VITALE: I'm saying that is what would be

anticipated, that the space that is designated for a commercial use on the plans now, what we're talking about tonight as a grocery use, should that grocery use go away after the 10-year period that's been identified, that that space would, then, be occupied by a commercial use.

MR. DONAHUE: And how do you suppose that's going to be enforced?

MS. VITALE: As discussed, there's a condition that would be included in the order. So, this is something that the Applicant, Office of Planning, and the Office of Attorney General would work to memorialize through the approved order. And then, that order would be something that DCRA would review and look at, should building permits be applied for for this property in the future.

MR. DONAHUE: All right. Let me ask you about the size of the grocery store. We're now talking about 16,000 square feet, and we've gone up and down a little bit over the course of this application. But we're now at about 16,000 square feet. And my question is, does the OP have an opinion as to whether that's viable for what's being described as a full-service grocery?

MS. VITALE: I do not.

MR. DONAHUE: Okay. Has OP been involved in any of those discussions about this, I'll call it an amenity? Has OP been involved in discussions with the Applicant about

what this might look like?

MS. VITALE: The Applicant has certainly discussed with the Office of Planning the grocery tenant, and we have met with the Applicant over the course of the multiple iterations of this project, as the grocery has grown and shrunk over time. But I don't think we have any particular thoughts as to viability, no.

MR. DONAHUE: All right. Ms. Steingasser, I'm glad you're here because I want to ask you about a report from last year, from February of 2012. The Zoning Commission had asked, in the January hearings, the Zoning Commission had asked for some background as to how design review came to be. As the Chair says, you know, at one point it was PUD light and now it's no longer PUD light, et cetera. But you issued a report dated February 12th. It's Docket No. -- I'm not quite sure -- 245, I think.

And you were discussing and you appended some testimony from a Zoning Commission case and said, well, really, this was meant to be, what we were looking at is a Stage 1 PUD. And you suggested that we ought to look at that as sort of analogous. So, a design review would be analogous to PUD review. Does that ring a bell?

MS. STEINGASSER: No, I'm sorry, it doesn't.

MR. DONAHUE: Are you able to get that report on your -- or, no, you're not?

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Donahue, did you say 2012?
2	MR. DONAHUE: I'm sorry, February 12th, 2018.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh.
4	MR. DONAHUE: Sorry about that.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thought you said 2012.
6	MR. DONAHUE: I may have. I'm sorry, Mr.
7	Chairman. February 12th, 2018.
8	MS. STEINGASSER: Oh, are you talking about the
9	memorandums on aggregation where we were briefing the
10	Commission, and the other parties briefed to the Commission
11	on aggregation?
12	MR. DONAHUE: It's styled as OP Supplemental
13	Report for Zoning Commission 16-12, Voluntary Design Review
14	for Valor.
15	MS. STEINGASSER: Okay. That was the memorandum
16	on aggregation.
17	MR. DONAHUE: Okay. So, at page 4, we were
18	discussing public benefits.
19	MS. STEINGASSER: Okay.
20	MR. DONAHUE: And the bullet No. 3, below the OP
21	proposal, said, "Should last for the life of the project,
22	unless specified." Do you recall that?
23	MS. STEINGASSER: That's correct. That's from the
24	original discussion of 2012 to the Zoning Commission about
25	PUDs.

1	MR. DONAHUE: All right.
2	MS. STEINGASSER: Uh-hum.
3	MR. DONAHUE: So, is the OP satisfied that the
4	10-year commitment is commensurate with the lifetime of the
5	project or how do you reconcile those two?
6	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, this is relative to
7	another case and to the PUD process, not to the design review
8	process.
9	MR. DONAHUE: All right. Well, what I'm getting
10	at is, since the inception of this project, the grocery store
11	has been held out as an amenity.
12	MS. STEINGASSER: Uh-hum.
13	MR. DONAHUE: It's been suggested that it's
14	important to the community. Superfresh has been going a long
15	time, and to get a grocery store in there would be seen as
16	a real benefit, a public benefit.
17	MS. STEINGASSER: Uh-hum.
18	MR. DONAHUE: So, what I'm asking the Office of
19	Planning is, are you satisfied with the level of commitment
20	from the Applicant to do the grocery store?
21	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, as you know, in the design
22	review, there are no benefits and proffers, the way there are
23	with the PUD. The Applicant has committed through the design
24	that the space will be for commercial retail, and we are
25	satisfied with their commitment to maintain that space
l	

1	commercial/retail and their commitment to focus the first 10
2	years, the first decade, on the grocery store.
3	MR. DONAHUE: All right. In your more recent
4	report, you give a very brief opinion about the historic
5	preservation. You said there was a conversation with
6	Historic Preservation staff and they were satisfied that no
7	historic preservation review is necessary, is that correct?
8	MS. STEINGASSER: They confirmed that no
9	additional preservation review would be required for this
10	project.
11	MR. DONAHUE: And was that done in writing?
12	MS. STEINGASSER: No.
13	MR. DONAHUE: Okay.
14	MS. STEINGASSER: We went down the hall and we
15	asked them, and we showed them the information that had been
16	placed into the record, and got their oral confirmation.
17	MR. DONAHUE: Okay. Well, that makes sense. So,
18	were they asked about this application or were they asked in
19	general?
20	MS. STEINGASSER: They were asked, well, in
21	particular, they were aware that it was relative to this case
22	in particular.
23	MR. DONAHUE: Okay. Thank you.
24	MR. REPP: Okay. With respect to the Office of
25	Planning says that you continue, your report says you
ı	ı

continue to urge the Applicant to ensure that the north-south and east-west alley connections provide a safe and inviting pedestrian environment.

Can you put that slide up about the alley network on here?

But do you think that they are safe right now, Ms. Steingasser or Ms. Vitale?

MS. VITALE: I think that comment related more specifically to the treatment of the facades along those alleys. We would certainly defer to DDOT with respect to pedestrian and vehicular safety along the alley.

wanted to ensure, and we've had discussions with the Applicant -- sometimes when there are grocery tenants or other retailers, windows that originally proposed as clear glass windows end up covered up for back-of-house functions. I think we wanted to make sure that, if people were going to be walking through this alley network, that we had some certainty that there would be eyes on the street, that there would be clear glass in these windows, that it wouldn't be an entire facade that was blank and covered over with no sort of eyes on the street. we've had ongoing discussions with the Applicant, and they've provided additional information that shows where there would be clear glass and visibility through the interior commercial spaces onto the alley network.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

more question MR. REPP: One for Office Your report mentions that there will be 72 parking spots reserved for residents and 236 that will be shared with American University, a little bit different numbers than we heard from Mr. Andres. But, with respect to shared spots -and right now there's a requirement that Valor provide or the owner of the shopping center provide spaces for American There's also a requirement in your report that University. requires that tenants, that there be leases actually, that the residents of the building lease their the tenants, parking spaces. So, if you have a leased parking space in the garage of the Superfresh building, but, all of a sudden, the space that you've been leased to or some of the spaces are shared with AU and they're not available when you pull into the garage, what's going to happen?

MS. VITALE: Can you point to where we're saying that tenants must lease spaces? And to speak to the numbers issue, I believe that the Applicant has refined the parking number slightly. So, if there are certain inconsistencies, we can certainly make sure that the parking numbers are all up-to-date.

MR. REPP: Well, I'm not going to be able to find that this moment, but I know it's in there, that there is a requirement that both the employees of the retail and the residents pay for their parking spots. The only people that

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	don't have to is the customers of the grocery.
2	But I do think there's a problem there. And
3	frankly, if there's no spots available, they're going to park
4	in the neighborhood. They're going to park in American
5	University Park. They're going to park in Spring Valley
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do this. Let's find it
7	first and make sure it's in there.
8	MR. REPP: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And then, we can go into all of
10	that. So, I will allow that one question to come back, once
11	you find it.
12	MR. REPP: Okay. That's fair.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Because if it's not there, that
14	will save us some time.
15	MR. REPP: That's fair.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We don't want to talk about
17	anything that's not there. Let's find it first, because I'm
18	actually looking for it as well.
19	MR. REPP: That's fair.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
21	MR. REPP: Mr. Zimmerman, with respect to the
22	alley network, what we were talking before, with respect to
23	the alley between, at the end there as it moves on down to
24	Massachusetts Avenue, there's a 3-foot sidewalk there,
25	correct?

1	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, that's my understanding.
2	MR. REPP: And that sidewalk there is important
3	to you, as far as pedestrian safety, right?
4	MR. ZIMMERMAN: That's correct.
5	MR. REPP: Yes. And that alley is on private
6	property right now? The sidewalk is on private property now.
7	It's not part of the alley?
8	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct.
9	MR. REPP: Okay. With respect to Citizens for
10	Responsible Development, going back to the January hearing,
11	you said at the time that you hadn't reviewed the materials
12	that I had provided you with respect to parking issues and
13	the consultant report that we had retained from Joe Mara of
14	MCV Associates. Have you looked at that since then?
15	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, I have, and I've also looked
16	at the Applicant's response to comments for that, where they
17	went point-by-point through each one of those.
18	MR. REPP: So, Joe Mara, using Institute of
19	Transportation Engineers' numbers, showed that the traffic
20	being generated by this project, both the residential and the
21	grocery store, would create 3500 additional trips per day.
22	Do you take issue with that or not?
23	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, I would take issue with that.
24	That seemed quite a bit high than what we would estimate.
25	What it appeared to me that Mr. Merritt did and you could

correct me if I'm wrong -- but in our industry we have a little bit of a rule of thumb when trying to estimate daily traffic, where you multiply the peak hour by 10, and that gives you a rough estimate of the daily trips. And it sounds to me like that's what he did.

I took a look at the trip generation estimates from Gorove/Slade, and it looks to me, based on the mode split that we had all agreed to, that the volumes -- we purposely overestimated traffic volumes to be conservative and to kind of prepare for a worst case traffic scenario. So, I mean, I would put it probably closer to the 2,000 daily, maybe not even that.

MR. REPP: Well, I will provide to you the numbers. And actually, it's not his rule of thumb of 10 times or anything like that. He says he has the number based on the use of the property.

By the way, here I have from the Office of Planning -- the Office of Transportation report, January 2nd, 2018, there is a requirement that required in your TDM unbundled cost of parking will be based on the average market rate within a quarter mile. So, I believe that that is a requirement.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Okav.

MR. REPP: With respect to the walkaround last week and this issue about truck access that came up before,

1	I think with respect to 50-foot wheelbase trucks, which I
2	understand can be 55, the truck itself can be 55 to 60 feet
3	in length, and certainly one of the grocery stores that is
4	being under contemplation here uses wheelbase 50-foot trucks.
5	You indicated that if there was a problem with them getting
6	into these loading docks and we certainly talked about
7	that in the question-and-answer a few minutes ago that the
8	trucks would just park in the alley to unload. And it might
9	take, for a 50-foot truck like that, it might take how
10	long would it take to unload maybe?
11	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I don't have any idea.
12	MR. REPP: And you suggested if that were the
13	case, the truck would have to back up 300 feet to get back
14	to 48th Street, is that correct?
15	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thirty-three hundred feet or?
16	MR. REPP: Yes, 300 feet.
17	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I don't remember suggesting that,
18	but I do remember on our tour, at the point that we were
19	talking about the 55-foot loading bay, I had not seen at that
20	point the turning diagrams for the 55-foot trucks from
21	Gorove/Slade. As soon as I got back to the office from the
22	walking tour, I reached out to them and they promptly sent
23	them over.
24	But what I said during the tour was that I wasn't
25	at that point in time gure that the AutoTIIDN had been done

1 but that we would prefer, if they ever had to stop, that it 2 would be in the alley rather than on Yuma or 48th, but I 3 wanted to confirm that first. 4 MR. REPP: With respect to the other alley, the 5 north-south alley, there are trucks there unloading for the CVS in the shopping center. 6 And CVS also uses 55-foot 7 wheelbase, 50-foot trucks. How do you envision those trucks being unloaded? 8 9 Well, MR. ZIMMERMAN: there's a substantial portion of private property on the Spring Valley Shopping 10 11 Center side. They could unload on their property or, if need be, they can unload in the alley. My understanding is that 12 a lot of these larger trucks tend to come outside, 13 outside of the peak hours at night, at off-peak time. So, we would expect probably fewer conflicts with vehicles and 15 pedestrians at those times. 16 17 Those trucks would not, if they used MR. REPP: the alley, they would not be able to exit via Massachusetts 18 19 Avenue, correct? 20 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I don't know that that's correct. 21 I haven't seen any, the diagrams, AutoTURN diagrams, showing that trucks could not make that turn. 22 MR. REPP: Well, Bill Fuchs from Wagshal's, maybe 23 he can talk about it when he's -- maybe somebody can ask him 25 that question later.

I guess that's all I have for now.

MR. DONAHUE: Can I ask one question of DDOT? Mr. Zimmerman, the suggestion has been made that there would be coordination between the Valor Development, Spring Valley Shopping Center, CVS, and others, as to trash pickups and, also, cleanup of the trash collection area in the alley. And about a year ago, we were talking about how that might work. And I realize that a year has gone by and perhaps nothing has really gone further there. But is DDOT satisfied that this is something that can be done as a part of this project?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, we're satisfied. Our No. 1 goal in that respect is to get loading off of Yuma and into the alley and cleaning up the public space, because there's a lot of dumpsters along the Yuma Street side of the shopping center. So, those are all being brought into the alley in a nice, cleaner, less chaotic and messy environment. So, we are satisfied with that.

MR. DONAHUE: Well, it was more than just a cleanup. There was a coordination of pickup, trash pickup, recycling, that kind of thing there.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. I mean, that was something that they've committed to in the loading management plan. With the Spring Valley Shopping Center being within the boundaries of this design review application, we wanted to make sure that there was the coordination, that Spring Valley

1	moves their trash activities off of Yuma and into the alley,
2	and that this Applicant who's pursuing this application
3	facilitate that coordination.
4	MR. DONAHUE: So, when Mr. Repp was asking about
5	the CVS deliveries, that's happening now because that's an
6	ongoing operation. Has DDOT looked at that to see how CVS
7	does its deliveries?
8	MR. ZIMMERMAN: No, we have not looked into that.
9	MR. DONAHUE: On the adjacent side, you have not?
10	Okay.
11	Thank you.
12	MR. REPP: But isn't it one of your requirements
13	that they work out that, this developer work that out with
14	the Spring Valley Shopping Center?
15	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, that's correct. And I think
16	just by moving the dumpsters around to the alley side, that
17	would probably go a long way, right then and there, of being
18	able to have all that activity happen via the alley.
19	MR. DONAHUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you.
21	Let me go back to ANC 3D. Did you have any cross?
22	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: No, sir.
23	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. While I'm
24	calling up let me call the whole name. Spring Valley
25	Wesley Heights Citizens Association, Neighbors for a Livable

1 Community, and Spring Valley West Homes Corporation, if you 2 all can come forward? 3 One of the things, I don't want people staying until 9:30 and, then, we say, "Okay, well, we're going to have to reconvene another meeting." So, right now, the date 5 that we have is January the 24th. It meets our schedules and 6 7 I'm hoping it meets everybody else's schedules. actually, sometimes this can be the hardest part of hearing, trying to get everybody's schedule to synchronize. So, the 24th is the date that we have. We have a free date. 10 11 Our case that night got postponed. So, the 24th is the 12 earliest date that we have. Can we all make it? 13 Yes? Okay. This was very easy. 14 (Off-microphone comment.) 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sorry, do we have a written testimony from you? You can always submit that. 16 Okay. 17 It seems like everybody is able to make it except for the gentleman in the back. He can always submit his 18 19 testimony. 20 Yes? 21 (Off-microphone comment.) To the second date? 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: things are moving, that's why I announced it now before nine 23 24 o'clock. Because I'm going to do an assessment in about 25 another 15 to 20 minutes. My goal is not to have you sit

	liere all hight, but, actually, it would be advantageous, so
2	you can hear what the new proposal is, because it may
3	decrease some of the opposition or it may increase the
4	opposition. It depends on how that goes. So, it's up to
5	you, but I want to give you as much notice as possible
6	because I have had to sit here myself all day and wasn't
7	heard. So, I don't want to put anybody in the position I've
8	been in about 20 years ago. Okay?
9	All right. So, we're going to do a reassessment
10	in about 20 minutes, if that's okay. I'd like to do at nine
11	o'clock, 15 minutes. Okay? And then, we'll see how far
12	we're going to go because I can't predict it.
13	All right. Mr. Smith?
14	MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15	Mr. Zimmerman, I just want to follow up with the
16	questions that Mr. Repp was asking you about the Spring
17	Valley Shopping Center and the loading, because I'm a little
18	confused.
19	You talked about moving the dumpsters, having the
20	dumpsters moved from Yuma Street into the alleyway. Okay?
21	MR. ZIMMERMAN: That's correct.
22	MR. SMITH: And there are already dumpsters,
23	though, in the alleyway, correct?
24	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Uh-hum.
25	MR. SMITH: I mean, not all these dumpsters are

2 MR. ZIMMERMAN: That's correct. 3 MR. SMITH: Okay. So, how does moving the dumpsters -- the trash dumpsters, right? We're talking about How does that affect the truck unloading issue 5 trash now? that he was talking about? I just was very confused by your 6 7 answer. 8 Well, the first thing is that, if MR. ZIMMERMAN: 9 the dumpsters are on Yuma, then a lot of the activities, our understanding is, are happening on Yuma. 10 And so, we want 11 them to be moved off of Yuma for that reason, because we don't want those activities taking place curbside, but also 12 13 just that's public property. And so, we have policies on no trash storage on public property. 15 I don't mean to be sarcastic MR. SMITH: Okay. here, but trucks delivering to CVS, Wagshal's, the gasoline 16 station, they're not unloading trash, right? I mean, they're 17 unloading goods. 18 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, it sounds like we're talking 19 about two different things. 20 21 We are talking about two different MR. SMITH: things, and so were you and Mr. Repp. 22 So, my question is, how does moving the dumpsters from Yuma into the alley affect 23 the loading for the stores, the loading and unloading for the 24

stores at the Spring Valley Shopping Center.

25

1

on Yuma Street, correct?

1	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Okay. I guess it doesn't. I was
2	referring to the trash trucks specifically.
3	MR. SMITH: Okay. The other thing you mentioned
4	was that there was private space at the Spring Valley
5	Shopping Center for trucks to load and unload. Where is
6	that?
7	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, we would consider anything
8	on private property, drive aisles, et cetera, they can
9	certainly do what they want on their own property, but, also,
10	we have the alley network in the back. And we would prefer,
11	if they can't do it on private property, do it in the alley
12	over doing any kind of pickup/dropoff or loading/unloading,
13	trash pickup, whatever, on public streets.
14	MR. SMITH: Do you know where the loading docks
15	for the Spring Valley Shopping Center are? Have you ever
16	seen where when you went out there, did you take a look
17	at where the loading docks for the Spring Valley Shopping
18	Center are?
19	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I've only toured the site under
20	review for this property, for the next property. So, I'm not
21	
22	MR. SMITH: Well, they're on Yuma Street.
23	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Okay.
24	MR. SMITH: So, that's where the loading docks
25	and we're not talking about trucks pulling in. We're talking

1	about just opening spaces. There is no private space there.
2	So, I guess my question is, you're trying to work out a deal,
3	some kind of an agreement with Regency Shopping Center to
4	require trucks to load and unload in the alley, is that
5	correct?
б	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct.
7	MR. SMITH: The north-south alley
8	MR. ZIMMERMAN: To move it out of the public
9	MR. SMITH: Instead of where they load now, which
10	is on Yuma Street?
11	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct.
12	MR. SMITH: And how do you enforce that? And how
13	do you get a truck when they're trying to load and unload,
14	and the loading area is right there on Yuma Street, how do
15	you get them to on a practical level, how do you enforce
16	that they go into the alley to do it? What truck driver is
17	going to do that?
18	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, first, it's a public space
19	violation. That would take DDOT Public Space Inspectors to
20	go out and enforce that.
21	MR. SMITH: And so, then, the community would have
22	to alert the Public Space Department about the violations and
23	wait for all that to happen?
24	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct.
25	MR. SMITH: Isn't that correct?

1	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct.
2	MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. I'm sorry. Thank
3	you. I just wanted to follow up right immediately after his
4	because I just didn't understand what you were saying.
5	MS. GATES: I'm going to follow up on that because
6	I was part of the walkaround. My name is Alma Gates. I
7	represent Neighbors for a Livable Community.
8	Were you aware before the walkaround that the
9	dumpsters even existed on Yuma Street?
10	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, I was.
11	MS. GATES: Okay. I was of the impression that
12	you were surprised to see them.
13	MR. ZIMMERMAN: No. I mean, it was in our report.
14	We have seen those in the past, and that's what triggered our
15	comments to coordinate with the shopping center to have those
16	moved to the alley.
17	MS. GATES: And that is going to add additional
18	trash dumpsters to the alley. Can it accommodate them?
19	MR. ZIMMERMAN: That is correct, they are. From
20	my conversations with the Applicant, it sounds like and
21	they can correct me if I'm wrong that they're moving more
22	to a trash compacter-type system, you know, recycling systems
23	that actually take up less space than the current dumpsters,
24	that it would not be the gigantic ones with the truck that
25	pulls the dumpsters over top.

1	MS. GATES: Yes, we saw that in the alley.
2	The other question I have for you, Mr. Zimmerman,
3	is, are you going to require, will DDOT require that the TDM
4	measures be extended to the townhouses, as recommended in the
5	OP report?
6	MR. ZIMMERMAN: You know, at this point, I don't
7	think so. They are kind of a separate portion of the site
8	with their own parking spaces. And as you heard in the
9	Applicant's presentation, that those few parking spaces would
10	not be unbundled. Because they are "for sale" units, that
11	would be associated with each of those units.
12	MS. GATES: But each of those units has its own
13	parking space, doesn't it?
14	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct.
15	MS. GATES: Okay. Thank you.
16	The rest of my questions are for OP, and they
17	really relate directly to your report. Ms. Vitale, I suppose
18	they're for you.
19	On page 6, under Zoning Relief, at (b) I'm
20	sorry, I'm on the wrong page. Is there a word missing in the
21	statement on the proposed townhouse, penthouses, which
22	currently says "should tend to affect adversely"?
23	MS. VITALE: We were actually joking; we did that
24	to see if everyone was reading the report. No, there is a
25	word missing there And it should read that they "should not

tend to affect adversely" the use of neighboring properties.

MS. GATES: Thank you. I'm glad I read it.

On the top of page 8, at Exhibit CL-09, under Exhibit A of the Applicant's October 16th submission, there are, under the drawings or the depictions of the signage, a number of signage guidelines which in your report you have copied and, then, crossed-out. Are you saying that, by virtue of the fact they're in this report, they are automatically part of the order?

Ιf MS. VITALE: Ι clarify, could the strike-through and underlined, bolded language that you see -- it actually begins on page 6 of the OP report -- this relates to the Applicant's requested design flexibility. This is something that you see frequently with any Zoning Commission application. Applicants frequently request flexibility. So, if they need to make minor adjustments or modifications to the plan, through design as they go development, that they don't end up having to come back to the Zoning Commission to make certain minor modifications.

So, the Applicant, when this application was submitted originally, and we had the hearing last year in February, the Applicant proposed certain flexibility language. The Applicant refined that requested flexibility language. And so, I had just done, you know, a legal black-line or a red-line, if you will, so that you could see

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	how the Applicant was proposing to modify that flexibility
2	language.
3	So, when you get to the item that you're referring
4	to about signage on page 8, the Applicant had initially
5	included those sub-bullets, you know, (a) through (e), the
6	ones that you see let me see if I can the ones that you
7	see right here. The Applicant is proposing to remove those
8	and to revise the flexibility in item (k) to be more general
9	and, then, to refer to the plan and guidelines that are
10	contained in the approved plans.
11	MS. GATES: Okay, but, given that and the
12	flexibility being requested, can the residents, can the
13	neighborhood be assured that they will not have digital,
14	kinetic LED lights flashing at all hours of the night?
15	MS. VITALE: Yes, because the Applicant's
16	incorporating the signage plan that you see on Sheet CL-09,
17	and that stipulates that signage shall not be digital or
18	kinetic.
19	MS. GATES: I think that that was my question.
20	Thank you.
21	On page 12, under no, we've talked enough about
22	sidewalks.
23	However, I do have a question about that I
24	forgot to ask Mr. Zimmerman about the HAWK light, and the
25	fact that this alleyway is going to be walkable. Whether

1	anybody likes it or not, people are human nature is what
2	it is and people are going to be walking through there.
3	But won't the position of the HAWK light encourage people to
4	walk through the alleys?
5	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Correct. That's correct, yes.
6	MS. GATES: Thank you.
7	So, from a safety standpoint, I would also point
8	out that I do have a copy of the Public Realm Design Manual
9	from the Public Space Office, where it talks about how wide
10	sidewalks are supposed to be. And these sidewalks do not
11	meet those standards. So, it seems that DDOT is also very
12	flexible when it comes to putting out guidelines.
13	Did anyone from OP attend the walkaround with Mr.
14	Marudian on January 3rd?
15	MS. VITALE: No, I did not participate in the
16	walkthrough.
17	MS. GATES: Okay. Well, would you be surprised
18	to learn that a truck turning into the north-south alley off
19	of Yuma Street had to cut across the sidewalk to enter the
20	alley? Isn't that the proposed public seating area at the
21	front of the grocery store?
22	MS. VITALE: I was not there. So, I can't speak
23	to that.
24	MS. GATES: But are you somewhat surprised to hear
25	that a truck could not maneuver that turn into the alley

1 without going across the sidewalk? And this was not 2 50-foot truck. 3 MS. VITALE: I can't respond to that. 4 MS. GATES: Thank you. On page 15, the top paragraph, has OP heard back 5 6 from the Applicant -- no, I'm sorry. Strike that. 7 Also on page 15, the fourth paragraph, under Section 604.8, OP notes, "Finally, the design review allows for a reallocation of density across the property which shifts unused density from lots 802 and 803 to lot 807, 10 11 thereby preserving the historic Spring Valley Shopping Doesn't this reallocation or transfer of density 12 Center." appear in conflict with Subtitle X, Chapter 6, 13 600.1(e), "Provide for flexibility in bulk controlled design and site placement without an increase in density or map 15 amendment."? 16 17 No, it does not. The Applicant is MS. VITALE: drawing the project boundary to include the Spring Valley 18 19 Shopping Center site. So, this isn't providing for an increase in density beyond what would be contemplated under 20 21 zoning. But we also said earlier that there 22 MS. GATES: is no lot combining here. So, we're just sort of moving 23 density around on a lot, but owners remain owners and lots 24

remain lots, and it's all within a square?

MS. VITALE: The Applicant isn't proposing a subdivision or consolidation of lots. They're proposing a project boundary that includes multiple lots within a square.

MS. GATES: But aren't they transferring density from one lot to another?

MS. VITALE: They're not -- they're looking at the density within the project boundary as a whole.

MS. GATES: Does the proposed transfer of density actually preserve the historic shopping center or would a hearing before the Mayor's agent or 106 process allow some of or the entire shopping center to be torn down, altered, or rebuilt?

Again, this isn't a transfer. MS. VITALE: looking at a project boundary and its compliance with the zoning regulations as a whole. As you've heard tonight, there is a small amount of remaining unused density. doesn't freeze the Spring Valley Shopping Center in amber. They certainly could come forward with a proposal to change That would be a modification to a Designated that building. That would go to the Historic Preservation Historic Site. You would need to conform to the zoning Review Board. If it didn't conform to zoning, you would need regulations. to seek relief through the Board of Zoning adjustment avenues or through Zoning Commission approval, whatever might be appropriate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 MS. GATES: Thank you. I have no more questions. 2 MR. SMITH: I do. 3 On page 13 of your report, you talk about Windom Park, and you state that it doesn't function to provide a truly public space. And the design review quidelines specify 5 that these kinds of projects are supposed to encourage public 6 7 Have you talked with the Applicant about ways to alter the design of Windom Park to make it a more, in your words, a more truly public space? 9 I think, given its nature, that it's 10 MS. VITALE: 11 surrounded on three sides by the private building, I think that was our rationale for why this felt like a more private 12 Hopefully, people will feel comfortable and 13 space, I think. will use it. 15 The Applicants certainly are providing public gathering space along Yuma with the cafe seating that will 16 17 serve visitors to the grocery store. I hope folks do feel 18 comfortable using this park. Windom Walk served as a very I think people would have used that to 19 direct connection. walk through the site. This is more of a stopping point. 20 So, it may get less traffic than Windom Walk may have gotten, 21 but, hopefully, folks in the neighborhood do see this as an 22 amenity and will use this space. 23 24 I think, obviously, it's not fenced-off; it's not 25 blocked-off in any way. It's directly accessible from the

sidewalk. The Applicant could certainly, through discussions with the community, see if there are ways to make this feel more publicly accessible. But I just think, as compared to Windom Walk, which was a direct pedestrian connection, this won't function in the same way in terms of pulling people through the site.

MR. SMITH: So, you still stand, though, by what you've written in your report, correct, on page 13?

MS. VITALE: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. Has OP signed off on the IZ calculations that have been proposed by the developer?

MS. STEINGASSER: The IZ calculations are being presented as a point of information. The issue of the IZ compliance is not one that's technically before the Zoning Commission as part of this case. It's been raised and repeatedly brought up. But the regulations specifically say — and I want to read this, so that it's — regarding Section 603, Design Review Flexibility, "The design review process shall not be used to vary other building development standards, including FAR and Inclusionary Zoning."

And that's really important because we're going back and forth and spending a lot of time talking about Inclusionary Zoning. The Applicant has not provided, or not requested any relief from IZ, and they have repeatedly made

	The crear that they intend to completely comply.
2	So, we have not signed off on IZ. We don't,
3	typically, as part of any building permit sign off on the
4	Inclusionary Zoning. We have confirmed with the Department
5	of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Office of the Zoning
6	Administrator, that the interpretation and the application
7	of the regulations as they are written now is consistent with
8	the way that they would review that submittal.
9	MR. SMITH: Okay. I asked that question only
10	because are you aware that at the ANC 3D meeting in
11	December that the Applicant testified that OP had signed off
12	on the IZ calculations?
13	MS. STEINGASSER: I'm not aware of that. I'm
14	aware of the fact that we have conferred and concurred on the
15	interpretations
16	MR. SMITH: Okay.
17	MS. STEINGASSER: and how they would be
18	applied. But the actual assessment and the actual
19	determination won't be made until they're in front of a
20	building permit.
21	MR. SMITH: All right. Thank you.
22	MS. STEINGASSER: So, right now, we've got a
23	design that's in flux and we've got regulations that have not
24	yet been finalized by the Zoning Commission.
25	MR. SMITH: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

1	Also, as part of your review, have you seen or
2	asked anything about a lighting plan? I guess I would ask
3	this to both OP and DDOT. Have you seen or signed off on any
4	kind of thing for a lighting plan in the alleyways?
5	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I have not, no.
6	MR. SMITH: Has OP?
7	MS. STEINGASSER: No.
8	MR. SMITH: Okay. And can you clarify the
9	comments that you've made about the blank facades at the
10	windows on the alleyway? Are you supportive of those or have
11	you recommended changes for the blank facade? I believe you
12	mentioned you had some concerns about the facades of the
13	windows in the north-south alleyway where that 3-foot-wide
14	sidewalk is running from Yuma to Mass Avenue well, not
15	quite all the way to Mass Avenue, but
16	MS. VITALE: As I stated previously, we wanted to
17	ensure that there were opportunities for visibility from the
18	interior commercial spaces to that sidewalk. The Applicant
19	has confirmed that that visibility and openness will be there
20	along the north-south alley. So, we're comfortable with the
21	proposed design there.
22	MR. SMITH: Okay. And those are blank windows,
23	correct?
24	MS. VITALE: There is a mix. There are some areas
25	that are screened and will cover back-of-house operations,

1	and there are other areas that will have transparent window
2	glass.
3	MR. SMITH: And are the transparent ones closer
4	to Yuma Street? Is that it?
5	MS. VITALE: There are actually window at both
6	ends
7	MR. SMITH: Okay.
8	MS. VITALE: on both Yuma and, then, closer to
9	Mass Ave.
10	MR. SMITH: Okay. Okay. Can you help me
11	understand this? As I read your report, you seem to suggest
12	that the 4801 Massachusetts Avenue building makes this
13	project compatible with the character of the neighborhood.
14	Is that a fair assessment of my read of your report and your
15	conclusions?
16	MS. VITALE: I wouldn't say that that building
17	makes this project compatible. And I'm not sure what portion
18	of the report you're referring to that
19	MR. SMITH: It runs through several different
20	when you start talking about the character of the
21	neighborhood and that the project is consistent with the
22	character of the neighborhood.
23	Let me ask my question a different way. How is
24	the proposed height and the massing of this building, of the
25	apartment building, consistent with the character of a

1	neighborhood that is comprised primarily of single-family
2	homes and one- and two-story commercial buildings?
3	MS. VITALE: Well, as you just alluded to, there
4	are other structured in the area that exceed that two-story
5	height. There is a mix of building types, particularly along
6	Massachusetts Avenue, which is a bit more commercial,
7	particularly in this location.
8	MR. SMITH: What building, other than the 4801
9	Mass Avenue building, what building exceeds a two-story
10	height on Mass Avenue? On Mass Avenue?
11	MS. VITALE: That is the one building that exceeds
12	the two-story
13	MR. SMITH: But that's it?
14	MS. VITALE: Yes, that's correct.
15	MR. SMITH: Okay. And there are no other
16	buildings like that there, correct?
17	MS. VITALE: Not in the immediate vicinity, no.
18	MR. SMITH: Okay. And that building without the
19	access, without the easement, with the east-west alley, would
20	be a nonconforming building, is that not correct? I mean,
21	that's what all this fuss is about with the parking and all
22	the rest of it. But that would be a nonconforming building,
23	correct?
24	MS. VITALE: I'm not sure what you mean when you
25	say it would be a nonconforming

1	MR. SMITH: AU has there's an easement on that
2	building currently.
3	So, let's forget about that. Let me phrase it
4	another way. If that building was not there and I know
5	that's hard for all of us to imagine but if that building
6	was not there, would you still conclude that this project,
7	the massing and the height, is consistent with the character
8	of a neighborhood whose commercial strip is no higher than
9	two stories?
10	MS. VITALE: That's not the project that's before
11	us. That's not what we're evaluating.
12	MR. SMITH: Well, it is the project that's before
13	you. The question is the neighborhood.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, let me say this, Mr. Smith.
15	That question I'm going to ask you to move on to the next
16	question
17	MR. SMITH: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: because that question is very
19	irrelevant because the building is there.
20	MR. SMITH: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: She doesn't need to be doing a
22	hypothesis and analyzing what we're doing here today.
23	MR. SMITH: Okay.
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, let's move forward to help us.
25	MR. SMITH: I will do that.

1	My point was that that building is an anomaly in
2	the neighborhood, and I probably didn't ask the question
3	correctly.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So, there are a lot of things
5	around the city that I can say, if it wasn't there, could we
6	do this, but it is there.
7	MR. SMITH: Okay. I understand.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
9	MR. SMITH: On page 11, your report stresses that
10	the property slopes downward from Mass Avenue to Yuma Street.
11	Can you explain that? Because the way I'm reading this, Mass
12	Avenue, going up 48th Street is an elevation. So, you have
13	to go up a slight hill and you're going up a hill. So that
14	the rental building is actually higher than Mass Avenue. So,
15	what do you mean that the property slopes downward from Mass
16	Avenue to Yuma? It's on page 11 of your
17	MS. VITALE: I was saying that the low point, I
18	believe, is where the alley let me see. I'm basically
19	saying that, as you go from Mass Ave to Yuma and from 48th
20	to the alley, that kind of the northwest corner of the
21	project is the lower point.
22	MR. SMITH: And can you show us where that is on
23	your the northwest corner is the lower point?
24	MS. VITALE: Yes, that's correct.
25	MR. SMITH: Okay. But you do go

_	
1	MS. VITALE: So, as you go from Mass Ave to Yuma,
2	it's sloping downward. And as you go from 48th to the alley
3	that separates the project from Spring Valley, that's the low
4	point here at this corner.
5	MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you for that
6	clarification.
7	Also, in your report you mention that the project
8	will front on Mass Avenue. Is this building being built on
9	Mass Avenue?
LO	MS. VITALE: Could you point me to that?
11	MR. SMITH: Well, I'll have to go back and find
12	it. Okay? But it's in your report.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Smith, you have many more
L4	questions?
15	MR. SMITH: I have about two more questions, sir.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me do this, though,
L7	because I wanted to stop at nine o'clock, and it's now 9:12.
18	So, just hold the questions. And if you get another one,
19	that's fine.
20	What I would like to do is tell you how far we're
21	going to go. I'm going to try this. I'm going to work
22	backwards on this, Ms. Schellin.
23	We will not hear rebuttal and closing by the
24	Applicant, naturally. We will not hear organizations and
	nersons in opposition. We will not hear organizations and

1	persons in support.
2	What I would like to do, though, is hear from both
3	ANCs and do the cross. And I think that may be a good
4	breaking point. I'm looking at my colleagues to see if it
5	would be fine with them.
6	I really could go to 11:00, but we want to make
7	sure we're all fresh when we are hearing other testimony.
8	So, are we all on the same page? You know what
9	we're not going to do. We're going to stop after we have the
LO	reports of the ANCs and cross examination. That will be a
11	good stopping point.
L2	So, Ms. Schellin, help me remember, when we come
L3	back on the 24th, we will start out with the parties in
L4	support and, then, the parties in opposition. And I think
15	you know your time requirements, what the times are. If not,
16	Ms. Schellin will remind us on the 24th.
L7	Okay? Are we all on the same page and know we're
18	going to stop? We're going to hear from the ANCs. We're
L9	going to do cross examination.
20	So, I ask you a question whenever you're ready
21	to go, unless you're one of those, you may leave. Okay.
22	All right. Okay. I'm sorry. I don't know why
23	I keep wanting to calling you "Commissioner Smith," but
24	anyway.

MR. SMITH: Well, I'm on the Medical Board.

So,

1 it's technically you're being correct. 2 (Laughter.) CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, "Commissioner Smith," 3 4 okay. All right. I want to follow up with former 5 MR. SMITH: 6 Commissioner Gates' question about lots 802 and 803 with 7 respect to what could be built on that site. 8 Again, I don't mean to deal in suppositions, but 9 this is a reality, that when buildings are destroyed -- for example, if there's a fire at that site and the buildings are 10 11 destroyed, if the shopping center, Spring Valley Shopping 12 destroyed, what limits would be placed Center is construction at that site? I mean, the historic designation 13 would no longer exist. Okay? What limits would be placed on that site with this exchange of density? 15 MS. STEINGASSER: 16 That gets to the issue of, again, a hypothetical and trying to determine what would be 17 18 done through a hypothetical development, and that's really 19 not an analysis we've done. 20 Well, but it's actually more than a MR. SMITH: It's about planning. We're talking about a 21 hypothetical. major avenue -- hold on; let me finish -- we're talking about 22 And at the last hearing, the Commission 23 a major avenue. raised some concerns about, you know, why isn't this building 24

on Mass Avenue instead of being on Yuma and 48th Street, and

1	it's not there because we have an historic designated
2	shopping center. If that historic designation goes away, and
3	that shopping center goes away, in terms of planning for the
4	future of the city, are we compromising and that's really
5	my question here are we compromising what we could have
6	in terms of development at that site by virtue of this
7	density exchange now for this building?
8	MS. STEINGASSER: Again, that's a hypothetical.
9	And, you know, I encourage you to testify to that, if that's
10	your position, but that's really not an analysis
11	MR. SMITH: I just don't know the answer to it.
12	MS. STEINGASSER: that OP is
13	MR. SMITH: But I don't know the answer to the
14	question. That's why I'm asking the question.
15	MS. STEINGASSER: It's a hypothetical and we
16	really haven't done an analysis of a hypothetical any more
17	than
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
19	MR. SMITH: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think that's your answer.
21	MR. SMITH: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
23	MR. SMITH: Actually, those are the only
24	questions. I do have a couple of questions, though, for
25	DDOT. I'm sorry.
ļ	

1	When you were responding earlier to Commissioner
2	Gates, you said you hadn't if I got this correct you
3	said you hadn't seen the turning maneuver diagrams until
4	after this January 3rd site visit that was done. Did I hear
5	that correctly?
6	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes.
7	MR. SMITH: Okay.
8	MR. ZIMMERMAN: And I just wanted to go back and
9	confirm that and take a look at them. And I do see that
10	there was a document on the record that the Applicant had
11	uploaded, but they also emailed it to me also.
12	MR. SMITH: So, that means, then, that DDOT's
13	December 27th letter that was introduced in the record saying
14	everything is okay with this project, you had not yet seen
15	those diagrams, is that
16	MR. ZIMMERMAN: We saw them with the earlier
17	proposal, which had more than one.
18	MR. SMITH: Okay.
19	MR. ZIMMERMAN: And then, they were meeting the
20	zoning for that.
21	MR. SMITH: Okay.
22	MR. ZIMMERMAN: So, that was acceptable.
23	MR. SMITH: Okay. And then, also, my last
24	question well, it relates to the HAWK signal. I have two
25	questions about the HAWK signal.

1	This is a followup to a question you were asked
2	by, I believe it was Commissioner Shapiro. And you said that
3	you don't want to encourage people to walk through the
4	alleys. So, if you don't want to encourage people to walk
5	through the alleys, wouldn't a HAWK signal at that location
6	encourage people to walk through the alleys?
7	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, we want to provide, in
8	coordination with the Applicant, provide a HAWK signal based
9	on the already-existing movements that are happening and the
10	jaywalking that's already happening, plus the additional
11	cross pedestrian
12	MR. SMITH: Do you have any data on this
13	jaywalking?
14	MR. ZIMMERMAN: You asked for that the last time.
15	We do not have that.
16	MR. SMITH: I didn't remember asking that, but
17	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, you asked me.
18	MR. SMITH: I don't remember. I'm sorry.
19	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, you asked me a lot of these
20	questions over.
21	MR. SMITH: Well, your answers are good tonight,
22	much better than the last time.
23	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I don't have
24	MR. SMITH: You don't know? You haven't
25	quantified this?

1	MR. ZIMMERMAN: What's that?
2	MR. SMITH: You haven't quantified this?
3	MR. ZIMMERMAN: We do not have that data available
4	for you.
5	MR. SMITH: What are you basing it on? What are
6	you basing it on?
7	MR. ZIMMERMAN: We've had our experts go out and
8	take a look visually and have identified this as a good
9	candidate location in which we'll go out and do the formal
10	design at a later date.
11	MR. SMITH: Okay. So that, even though you're not
12	encouraging it, do you think that a HAWK signal would
13	encourage more pedestrian movement through the alleys?
14	MR. ZIMMERMAN: There probably would be some extra
15	pedestrians going
16	MR. SMITH: So, it runs against your objective?
17	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, we're not trying to
18	completely discourage people from using the alley. But we
19	want to recognize that people are going to use the alley and
20	currently are. So
21	MR. SMITH: Okay. My last question, and it is
22	about the HAWK signal again. There's no diagram that is here
23	that shows the entire width of Mass Avenue, okay, that
24	stretches over to the Crate & Barrel across where the HAWK
25	signal would be located. Okay? At least not that I recall.

1	Someone crossing with the HAWK signal, they have
2	to cross a service road, too. Is that HAWK signal going to
3	be applying to the service road, that narrow service road in
4	front of Crate & Barrel, Chicken Out, all those? So, you
5	cross a two-lane highway. There's a median strip. You cross
6	another two-lane highway. Then, there is a grassy strip with
7	a service road. And then, finally, the sidewalk. So, you're
8	going to be able to do that with the HAWK signal?
9	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. I mean, like I said before,
10	we're going to go into design at some point here this
11	upcoming year. I suspect, without having engineered this,
12	that it's probably going to go from the thick landing, the
13	thick grass strip, and then, go across the four-lane section
14	of Massachusetts. But we have not fully engineered that, of
15	course, but that's what I suspect.
16	MR. SMITH: So, it would not be the service road?
17	So, someone would not be crossing the service road there?
18	MR. ZIMMERMAN: I mean, people could certainly
19	cross by foot with the light, but there's a sidewalk in the
20	grass strip. I'm just looking at the aerial right here.
21	MR. SMITH: There's no sidewalk in the grass
22	strip.
23	MR. ZIMMERMAN: Well, it looks like there is in
24	this drawing or in this map.
25	MR. SMITH: Well, there's not really a sidewalk

1	in the grass strip. It may look like that, but there is not
2	one.
3	So, my question is, they'll still jaywalk across
4	the service road? They won't have the protection
5	MR. ZIMMERMAN: We're going to look into that.
6	MR. SMITH: They won't have the protection on the
7	service road that they would have on Mass Avenue?
8	MR. ZIMMERMAN: We don't know that yet. That's
9	something we will look at in greater detail when we go into
10	design.
11	MR. SMITH: And the fact that there are two lanes
12	of parking along that service road, that's not an issue to
13	you?
14	MR. ZIMMERMAN: We're going to look into that more
15	and find what the correct solution is. It may be to extend
16	it all the way to that shopping center, but I suspect it's
17	probably not going to cut across the service lane.
18	MR. SMITH: Okay. That's all my questions, Mr.
19	Chairman.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you very much.
21	Let's go to the ANC. In this case, I think ANC
22	3E will be first, and then, we'll go with 3D. If they can
23	come to the table at the same time?
24	Okay, Mr. McHugh, whenever you're ready, you may
25	begin.

Mr. Chair, thank you. 1 2 Thank you for the opportunity. I'm going to go through a quick presentation, 3 which, frankly, isn't much different than the one that we did at the hearing a year ago and actually shares a little bit 5 of what the Applicant had. And then, I'll do some quick 6 7 remarks, and then, I'm done, hopefully quickly. 8 So, the ANC 3E supported the project as proposed 9 4-to-1 at our last meeting, December 13th. This is a quick reason, a quick presentation showing the reasons why we 10 11 supported it and possibly some of the concerns we had. Let's see. So, the original PUD proposal was a 12 I'm going to fly through these because I'm 13 long time ago. sure we've been through this plenty of times. 15 What we are going to do is compare that original proposal to where we ended up today and go through a couple 16 17 of the issues that we were concerned about that, frankly, some of the opponents and some of the community brought up, 18 19 and that we felt were well worth looking into. 20 And do you have this on your screens, too? Just so we can fly through it. 21 22 As noted, the retail went up a little bit. of it hasn't really changed. Maybe the Gold certification 23 and the parking spaces went up a little bit and the HAWK 24 25 light.

ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH:

Just a note on the HAWK light. We, as an ANC, have noted that there have been many issues with jaywalking. The crossing at 49th and Massachusetts, if you look at this, you can picture where it is. This actually goes, when you go to the north side, it actually goes at an angle down Massachusetts. So, if you want to get to the Spring Valley Shopping Center, you actually go down to come back. A lot of people just say, no, we're not going to do that, and they just cross over the median in the middle, which is one of the reasons we suggested it was a good idea to create a HAWK light there. Actually, frankly, I preferred an actual light, but DDOT prefers HAWK lights.

So, that was a place where it crosses. A lot of people cross to go to the old AU Law Building. So, we felt that this was a good opportunity to make pedestrian crossing safer.

This Notes on the engagement. has gone up somewhat since the last time we saw you, but we felt that the Applicant had done a lot of outreach to the community and met I would say that, if we're talking about with them. negotiation, these meetings resulted in a lot of changes from our perspective, the ANC, and what we felt the community was pressing for. And so, if there's negotiation, I'm not sure if there was a -- I can't think of a better way of saying it a come-to-Jesus meeting. There was a meeting, but I don't

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

think that's an appropriate thing for this anyway.

So, I think these were an iterative process where they came to us. Frankly, as you'll hear in our testimony, we didn't think it was a perfect project, but few of the ones that come before us are. But we felt that had gone through a lot to try and address a lot of the concerns we had.

I'm just going to fly through these because I think the Applicant has already shown them.

The original PUD we were very concerned about. We felt it was large. It was not appropriate for the community within its massing and the materials and the way it was designed architecturally. We felt this is much better in terms of those concerns.

Again, walking through these, the lot coverage. If anyone ever brings a sketch up to us again, I think that would probably be a bad idea, but people do that. So, that looks like a warehouse. So, that was changed.

The floor plans, again, I'm going to fly through these. The one thing we felt here is the facade is still broken up as it was a year ago in order to create less of a wall effect. And I think I mentioned this in our testimony last year, that our fear is that a matter of right might not be able to get the Applicant to design a building like this. So, you might have something that's much more flattened and not interesting.

The calculations, they haven't changed dramatically, either, as far as we see. The grocery is a little bit bigger, but not much different.

This might be a good place to point out the Commissioner that did have issues with this, one of his issues was that he didn't think the grocery was big enough. He thought that the amenities should be bigger. And this is a Commissioner who has actually lost a Safeway where the GDS is. So, his constituents would like to have a very large grocery store. He also had other concerns, but that was the main one.

Massing, I'm flying through this because I've done this once before. Let's see. The articulation, all this, and clever comments.

Let's see. Again, back, back, back, back.

Okay. And the last part, it seems a very fungible number of what the grocery store is, whether it's 24,000 or 18,000, what's existing there now. Is it 16, 15,300, or whatever, but that's essentially the size they came up with. You'll see in the appendix or Exhibit A in our MOU, which I'll mention in a second, ABRA does have a definition of grocery stores. And this certainly fits their definition. Six thousand was their minimum. This is somewhere around 15,300.

It met a number of the requirements to qualify for

a grocery store, fresh foods, things like that. Those are all in Exhibit A.

The underground streams we looked into, which was a concern of the Murdock Creek, the Murdock Mill, a number of these things. We felt they had been addressed.

Again, every building has issues with groundwater. So, they're all going to have to deal with water, one way or the other. We were just concerned maybe the streams were too close.

Parking, you'll see in our MOU, again, we had the parking easement. But we wanted the restrictive building tenants to get RPP permits. The Applicant agreed to that, with the exception of the townhomes. We also felt the townhomes actually have garage parking in them, anyway. So, we weren't that concerned if they weren't part of the RPP restrictions.

The easement has been addressed a couple of places.

The alley, again, I think there's also something in the MOU that says to work with Spring Valley Shopping Center and its owner on how to deal with the alley, because we think the alley is a very difficult issue to address and to get right, and that it's not something that we could actually put into an MOU without them actually being -- if they have an approved project that this Board would go

through, they would have a lot more interaction with Regency and the Spring Valley Shopping Center. So, we do see that as not -- this is not the end-all of how it's going to be addressed. We expect it will be changed and fixed in many other ways.

Mass transit was something that came up. We would like to have seen some other things, a shuttle or something to get to the Tenleytown Metro Station, but there's also a very strong system of buses that runs down Mass Avenue both directions, one going downtown. I actually take it fairly often, and it works fairly well. It also goes the other way against rush hour. So, you can get to the Friendship Heights Station within five minutes going the other way. So, we felt that it was fairly well served by public transportation.

Let's see. The grocery store impacts. The original size of the store was 55,000, a Harris Teeter, or something like that. We thought, well, we don't really have to think about that because it's not on the table anymore. But we felt it is an adequate full-service grocery and we feel like its impact will be much less than, say, one that was 40,000 square foot larger. I think that's it for that

Mercifully quick couple of comments. In the MOU, we do have a 10-year term in there, just to reiterate. It has been publicly stated that it's supposed to be a MOM's Organic, which is different than the Balducci's that preceded

1 it, which we were not thrilled by, and we find the MOM's to 2 be a much better fit for the neighborhood. Just going through the community meetings, we felt 3 4 that they have done a lot. Let's see. I think that's about it. I think we 5 6 said a lot the last time, too. So, I'm open to questions. 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner McHugh, if you could just hold your seat, we want to go to Commissioner Kravitz. And then, what we'll do is we'll go through the cross, and then, they can direct, if they have any questions, they can 10 11 direct them to whichever Commissioner. Commissioner Kravitz? 12 Okav. ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: Good evening. I'm Troy 13 Kravitz, officially designated to be here on behalf of ANC 15 3D to deliver our testimony in support of this project. ANC, and my SMD in particular, include the neighborhoods 16 immediately across Massachusetts Avenue from the project 17 site. 18 19 Thank you for having me again. 20 In the interest of time, I've condensed our 21 testimony. If you're interested in our full comments, our full written testimony will be in the record. 22 Before you is an application to construct a new 23 mixed-used project on a site that for decades and decades has 25 hosted a grocery store and other retail uses. The grocery

store, however, is no longer operational. It died five years ago last month. The grocery store that occupied the site before that one also died. By and large, the community mourns this loss.

For decades, the exact site being discussed tonight included amenities to the community. Make no mistake, by and large, and by a large margin, my neighbors want the grocery store back. You don't have to take it from me, however; you can take it from the supporters of the project, and you can take it from the opponents of the project. There is no shortage of quotations available in praise of the return of a grocer. I have some here, if you want them, but I will not belabor the point at this time.

This project promises the return of a grocery store. ANC 3D's support begins there. Importantly, returning a grocery store is the one thing that cannot be accomplished by a matter-of-right building. Given this, to us and many of our constituents, the debate has often been about how much residential we'd like in combination with returning the long-missed grocer to the site.

Right now, the Applicant proposes about 30,000 square feet of additional residential for a project that could have 184,000 square feet of residential by right. So, we're talking about one-sixth or 17 percent more residential than a by-right proposal, in addition to bringing back a

highly-valued amenity, the grocery store.

And given the increased density above the new grocery store, this one would, hopefully, succeed where the previous two grocery iterations died. When my constituents talk about this project, and talk they do, that's what they say. That's the transaction at the heart of the matter. And they prefer 17 percent more residential plus a grocery store instead of a by-right building permanently foreclosing the possibility of a grocery store that we already miss sorely.

There are other benefits to this project, of course. And I'll mention some of them for completeness.

The project brings more housing and more affordable housing to an area starved for it.

The Applicant, Valor Development, has agreed to seek approval for, and fund construction of, a mid-block HAWK light to better unite the two commercial areas surrounding Massachusetts Avenue and to help protect the many residents who already cross mid-block to go between Millie's, Pizzeria Paradiso, and Crate & Barrel on one side of Massachusetts and CVS on the other.

The Applicants also promise to clean up the unsightly and unfriendly alley that currently is a hodgepodge of dumpsters, recycling containers, and mechanical equipment.

Many of the recent submissions in the record make reference to an increase in traffic. From the start, we have

found these arguments largely unconvincing. To us, the bottom line is that traffic under the proposal is roughly the same as if the existing buildings were suddenly reoccupied.

Much like the case record being replete with support for a grocery store, it also contains wistful reflections on the small size of the planned grocery store. Again, in the interest of time, I'll spare you the quotations.

It is amusing that those purportedly wanting a larger grocery store are the same people advancing concern about traffic impacts. If you take these comments about wanting a larger grocer as genuine manifestations of the actual desires, you'll inevitably conclude the concerns about traffic cannot simultaneously be genuine.

Take, for example, a modestly larger grocery store, say at 20,000 square feet, and two fewer floors of residential than what's before you today. Traffic counts in the a.m. peak hour for such a supposedly Shangri-La project would be the same as under the current proposal, while p.m. traffic would be 22 percent higher.

During ANC 3D's meeting in December at which we adopted the resolution in Exhibit 245, we accepted proposed amendments to the resolution from the audience. An audience-proffered amendment from an opposition party in this case asked the ANC to instruct the Zoning Commission to not

approve the project until a new traffic study is completed and reviewed. The ANC voted against this proposed amendment.

That's enough about the project. Let's talk about how we got here. I was ANC 3D's lead correspondent, negotiator, pest to the Applicants, I presume, for this project. I was given the role of learning all about the project and provide factual analysis of the proposal. I want to share my personal experience, my personal perspective, because this project has raised some real challenges for me as an elected official. I'm confident enough and comfortable enough in my position to talk about these challenges. I think they shed light on an important, but largely hidden side of this project.

As you may know, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioners take an oath to support good policy for the District as a whole. The climax of the oath is, "I will exercise my best judgment and will consider each matter before me from the viewpoint of the best interest of the District of Columbia as a whole." We are sworn to advance the interests of the District, but we serve on behalf of our constituents.

There are opponents to this project, and their reasons are varied, but the large majority of people with which I correspond support this project. I hear the objectors. Don't get me wrong. I hear them loudly and I

hear them repeatedly. But they don't change the fact that I hear from many more people in support of this project.

Some of the community support you have on the record before you, but more of the community support for the project is not before you. Instead, it was communicated to me by neighbors that have attended some of the almost two dozen community meetings about the project. They understand the project and they tell me they support the project. Not all, of course, I repeat for necessity.

Sometimes they tell me that they don't want to speak up more loudly, for fear of creating a disagreement with their neighbors who more vocally oppose the project. There is nothing wrong with vocally opposing this project, and I intend no such implication by merely relaying that sometimes neighbors don't want to openly support something that they know their neighbor opposes. This doesn't undermine their sentiment of support, though.

The challenge for me is what to do with the supporters' sentiment that is shared personally with me. I tell these neighbors that, now that they've expressed their views to me, I will combine them with the others I received, and nothing more is needed from their end. They don't need to say anything publicly and they don't need to email you, the Zoning Commission, or anyone else.

While this is the right guidance, the only

guidance really, I also know that, by virtue of being less vocal, others will invariably claim their views don't exist. I believe you know better. I just wish others shared your wisdom.

In my opinion, this project could be better. And lately, I've come to the conclusion that it would have been better without my engagement. Like I said, I'm confident enough in my position to speak frankly about the challenges that have plagued this process.

Our mistake, in my opinion, is that the ANCs sent the Applicant to negotiate with the opponents instead of negotiating with the community. The effect was that Valor Development had at least six private meetings with Citizens for Responsible Development, another six larger community meetings outside the ANCs and Zoning Commission, and only four meetings, all of which were formal and open, with ANC 3D.

Despite all of these meetings, the opponents insist that the project hasn't come close enough to their wishes. I'm not surprised the Applicants and opponents didn't get closer. In Citizens for Responsible Development's written testimony in Exhibit 247, it is stated CRD would support a one- to three-story development on the site. That's on page 9.

The project site is zoned MU-4, I remind you. In

audience 1 another amendment from our December meeting, 2 Citizens for Responsible Development proposed an amendment 3 supporting mediation between Valor Development 4 opponents. The ANC voted against this proposed amendment. I used to think there was another way this could 5 6 have played out. Armed with intimate knowledge, personal 7 engagement, and just good old experience, I now know better. This may sounds morose. I contend it's nothing more than a 8 reflection of reality. 9 But we are where we're always going 10 to end up. 11 So, that's where we are. The scene looks a lot 12 like it did a year ago. Both ANCs are in support again. Some neighbors have written in support; some in opposition. 13 14 Some community groups are here as parties in support; some in opposition. 15 The Applicant has had another half dozen meetings 16 with the community and with the opponents. They have changed 17 18 the proposal along several dimensions, all in the direction 19 The opponents remain opposed. of the opponents. 20 The inevitability of it all stings. There are 21 things I would do differently, components of the project that are missing from my point of view, but they wouldn't change 22 where we are. We would all still be here in these same seats 23 24 just the same.

In the end, like the beginning, we're here, ANC

1	3D and our colleagues from ANC 3E, because this project is
2	desired by our community and I believe the project is good
3	policy for the District.
4	Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to thank you both.
6	We appreciate the time and attention, again, that you've put
7	into your presentations to us.
8	Let's see if we have any questions or comments up
9	here of either ANC 3D or 3E. Okay, not seeing any
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I just want to thank you
11	for all your effort. It sounds, again, a lot of work.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Does the Applicant have any
1 2	cross?
⊥3	
13 14	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.
14 15	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.
14	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have
14 15 16	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?
14 15 16 17	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?  PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No cross.
14 15 16 17	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?  PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Spring Valley Neighborhood
14 15 16 17 18	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?  PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Spring Valley Neighborhood Association, any cross.
114 115 116 117 118 119 220	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?  PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Spring Valley Neighborhood Association, any cross.  PARTICIPANT FROM SVNA: No cross.
114 115 116 117 118 119 220 221	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?  PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Spring Valley Neighborhood Association, any cross.  PARTICIPANT FROM SVNA: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Citizens for Responsible
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?  PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Spring Valley Neighborhood Association, any cross.  PARTICIPANT FROM SVNA: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Citizens for Responsible Development, any cross?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GLASGOW: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Ward 3 Vision, do you have any?  PARTICIPANT FROM WARD 3 VISION: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Spring Valley Neighborhood Association, any cross.  PARTICIPANT FROM SVNA: No cross.  CHAIRMAN HOOD: Citizens for Responsible Development, any cross?  MR. REPP: Mr. Kravitz, you quoted a statement

1	I would only support a one- to three-story building?
2	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: Not to my knowledge.
3	MR. REPP: Isn't it a matter of fact that I have
4	told you that I would support a building that was two floors
5	lower than the five- to seven-story building that they had
6	originally proposed?
7	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: You have personally,
8	yes. And the question was whether or not that would preclude
9	legal action, and you said that, for you personally, it
10	would, but you couldn't speak on behalf of others.
11	MR. REPP: And haven't you told me that you were
12	recommending, actually, that they come down two floors from
13	the five- to seven-story building?
14	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: Well, there's two
15	things there. Actually, I think at one point I had said my
16	idea would be a grocery store with parkland on top. But, in
17	reference to the two fewer stories, I was absolutely going
18	between your group primarily and the Applicants and trying
19	to get them to come down two stories.
20	MR. REPP: Yes. Okay. Thank you.
21	Mr. McHugh here, first of all, is there an MOU?
22	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: Yes. And it was posted
23	today.
24	MR. REPP: Okay. Because when you posted before,
25	it was not

1	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: It was draft before,
2	but, yes, I don't think there's it's not changed
3	substantially.
4	MR. REPP: So, you have filed it with the Zoning
5	Commission?
6	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: Yes, it's on the site,
7	yes.
8	MR. REPP: Today?
9	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: Yes. In fact, I have
10	copies. I can give you a copy.
11	MR. REPP: Well, I can, obviously, go to the
12	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: Yes, but it's not
13	dramatically different from the draft we posted for the last
14	meeting.
15	MR. REPP: Isn't it true that at the December
16	meeting that Commissioner Quinn said he's concerned about
17	pedestrian safety and that he thinks this is an imperfect
18	project?
19	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: I'd have to check the
20	minutes. I think most of us said, yes, imperfect project.
21	I'm not sure directly with the pedestrian safety. Possibly
22	with the alleyway.
23	MR. REPP: And did you say that it was an
24	imperfect, you agreed that it was an imperfect project?
25	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: I did agree.

1	MR. REPP: And didn't you say that you liked the
2	project more before than now?
3	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: That is true.
4	MR. REPP: That's all I have.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. Let's go to
6	Spring Valley Wesley Heights Citizens Association, Neighbors
7	for a Livable Community, and Spring Valley West Homes
8	Corporation.
9	MR. SMITH: I'll be very brief. I only have two
10	questions for Mr. Kravitz.
11	What was the vote at ANC 3D for the resolution,
12	in support of the resolution?
13	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: The one in December
14	2017 was 8-to-1. The one in December 2018 was 6-to-2.
15	MR. SMITH: That's what I mean, the 2018, the most
16	recent one, was 6-to-2?
17	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: 6-to-2.
18	MR. SMITH: Okay. And how many Commissioners were
19	absent?
20	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: There were two
21	Commissioners absent.
22	MR. SMITH: Okay. I wasn't able to be at that
23	meeting, but I listened to the recording, actually, earlier
24	today. And I heard three people speak in support of the
25	application, two of the three being parties in support in

this case. But I heard a lot more folks, a lot of folks, speaking out in opposition to the plan.

My question is, why hasn't ANC 3D in its communications to the Zoning Commission outlined the full scope of the community concerns that were expressed at the December 2018 ANC 3D meeting?

ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: Can you be more specific?

MR. SMITH: Well, I don't know how to say it any better. But why haven't you included in your communications to the Zoning Commission about your December 2018 meeting a report that includes the full scope of issues and concerns that were expressed by residents at the ANC meeting who -- you talked a lot about the support of the ANC for this project, but you never reference in any of the communications with the Zoning Commission the degree of opposition from the people who were attending your meeting in December of 2018.

ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: I think the premise of that question is a little mistaken. So, we don't provide opposition or supporter counts in our resolutions. But, during the meeting, we did accept a resolution, and proposed amendments to our resolution from the audience. There were two, both from opposition parties here tonight, that were offered.

One of them had three parts. Two of those three

1	parts were incorporated into our resolution. In particular,
2	a question about parking, a statement about parking we
3	incorporated into our resolution. So, it changed the draft
4	during the meeting. And then, a concern about the grocer,
5	and we also changed the draft during our meeting to
6	incorporate that concern as well.
7	MR. SMITH: Was there not an individual at the ANC
8	3D meeting, Dr. Mordini, I believe is the way you say his
9	name, who lives within the 200-feet area of the building, who
10	actually was so irate that he accused the ANC of trying to
11	stifle community expression of opposition to the I mean,
12	that's what I heard. Did I hear it correctly?
13	ANC COMMISSIONER KRAVITZ: I think the audio
14	recording speaks for itself on that matter.
15	MR. SMITH: Okay. All right.
16	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
18	Ms. Gates has some cross from Neighbors for a
19	Livable Community.
20	MS. GATES: Thank you.
21	Commissioner McHugh, I just have seen this for the
22	first time. But is this agreement between you and the
23	Applicant?
24	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You want to make sure you're
25	speaking right into the mic.

1	MS. GATES: Is the agreement between 3E and the
2	Applicant?
3	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: Well, I'll go through
4	like last time, yes, it's between us and, then, it's
5	incorporated into the record as part of the zoning order.
6	MS. GATES: So, you're asking that it be made a
7	condition
8	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: Yes.
9	MS. GATES: of approval?
10	ANC COMMISSIONER McHUGH: Yes.
11	MS. GATES: Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right. So, I think
13	that's it for tonight. 9:50, okay. Yes, because I said
14	we're going to stop this. So, some people may have left.
15	So, we're going to do that. I can't even move the time up
16	because we didn't change the time before people have left.
17	All right. Ms. Schellin, we're going to make this
18	a part, but we can stop at this point.
19	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would ask if there's anything
21	that we need or anything. I don't think so. I think we just
22	need to continue. I'm hoping that Commissioner May will be
23	back at that time as well.
24	So, can you just give us the date and the time?
25	And we'll go from there.

1	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Again, that is going to be
2	Thursday, January 24th. That's about two and a half weeks
3	from today. And we will start with the two parties in
4	support, Ward 3 Vision and Spring Valley Neighborhood
5	Association. They're going to have 12 minutes to split. And
6	then, we'll go to the individuals in support. And then,
7	we'll go to the two parties in opposition. They will have
8	40 minutes to split. And then, we'll go to the individuals
9	in opposition, and then, individuals undeclared, and then,
10	finish up with the rebuttal and closings.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I really think on the 24th we
12	should be able to complete these hearing proceedings. Okay?
13	So, we're going to all work together on that, unless you all
14	want to see me a third night, and I'm sure that's not the
15	case.
16	Ms. Schellin, do we have anything else?
17	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, I want to thank
19	everyone, and we will see you on the 24th.
20	(Whereupon, at 9:51 p.m., the meeting was
21	adjourned.)
22	
23	
24	
25	

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Hearing

Before: DC Zoning Commission

Date: 01-07-19

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 &