

Holland & Knight

800 17th Street, NW, Suite 1100 | Washington, DC 20006 | T 202 955 3000 | F 202 955 5564
Holland & Knight LLP | www.hklaw.com

Christine Moseley Shiker

202 457 7167

christine.shiker@hklaw.com

July 15, 2014

VIA IZIS AND HAND DELIVERY

D C Board of Zoning Adjustment
441 4th Street, N W - Suite 210
Washington, DC 20001

Re BZA Case No 18772
Post-Hearing Submission

Dear Members of the Board

On behalf of the Applicant in the above-referenced case, this letter submits the information requested by the Board of Zoning Adjustment ("Board") at the June 10, 2014, public hearing regarding the special exception and variance relief requested for the development of a hotel with retail use at 627 H Street, N W (Lot 59, Square 453) (the "Site") One original and one copy are enclosed

Supplemental Report from Gorove/Slade

Attached as Exhibit A is the supplemental report from Gorove Slade addressing those specific items requested by the Board (the "Supplemental Report") The Supplemental Report provides specific analysis as to the number of vehicles that will drive to the hotel based on data obtained from similar hotel products Based on that data, Gorove Slade has calculated the potential parking demand for the proposed hotel at the Site The Supplemental Report identifies specific mitigation measures to ensure that all guests that drive to the hotel can be accommodated within excess capacity of existing garages The Supplemental Report also sets forth specific protocols (1) to ensure that guests are informed that no parking is provided on-site and where appropriate parking is located and (2) to direct vehicles from the site to prevent illegal parking in front of the building

In addition, the Supplemental Report provides the following information requested by the Board

- Photographs of the existing alley system within Square 453

- An inventory of parking restrictions in the vicinity of the Site
- A summary of curbside management discussions with DDOT and WMATA
- Copies of website links for travel and parking resources for similar hotel products.
- Letters from two parking operators in the vicinity of the Site

Supplemental Information regarding the Practical Difficulty

Attached as Exhibit B are annotated plans further demonstrating the practical difficulties associated with providing parking at the Site. As noted in the Prehearing Submission and at the hearing, the Site's small size and narrow width make it practically difficult to provide both adequate ramping and parking in a below grade parking garage. As shown on the attached plans, the required ramp to the below-grade parking facilities would eliminate the loading facilities at the northwest corner of the Site and would eliminate approximately 1,060 square feet of retail area. In addition, transfer girders would be required to eliminate the columns at the middle of the ramp. Furthermore, showing a ramp with a width of 18 feet to provide for two-way traffic, a car would be required to make a 180 degree turn to access the drive aisle. As seen on the attached plans, the turn cannot be made within the extent of the Site.

Assuming that a car could make the turn, the car would then enter a drive aisle which has a width of less than 10 feet - less than one-half of the required 20 feet for drive aisles. This width is directly related to the location of the stair and core and related Building Code requirements for distance between the stairs. With this width, two-way access to the few spaces that could be provided is not possible. Moving the stair and/or the core further to the east to create a wider drive aisle adversely impacts the layout of the hotel floors above and the proposed side courts, which are already both constrained by the narrow width of the Site.

Moreover, due to the Site's small size, narrow width, and the location of the proposed building columns and core elements as well as the length of the ramp, the Applicant could fit very few parking spaces on each excavated parking level, and such spaces would be difficult if not impossible to navigate given the constraints described above. Based on the foregoing and the attached, it is practically difficult for the Applicant to construct the required number of parking spaces on the Site, and the Applicant therefore requests a variance from the parking space requirements of Section 2101.1.

Additional Resume for Architect

At the June 10, 2014, public hearing, Douglas Carter from DCS Design was accepted as an expert witness in architecture and design and testified in support of the project. Mr. Carter will be out of town on July 22, 2014, for the continuation hearing. Two of his colleagues who also attended the June 10, 2014, public hearing will be available for questions, including Hiro Nirmalani and Anita Sircar. Mr. Nirmalani's resume was submitted as Exhibit F to the Prehearing Submission. Ms. Sircar's resume is attached as Exhibit C to this Post-Hearing Submission.

We look forward to the Board's further consideration of this application at its July 22, 2014, hearing. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to have staff contact me.

Sincerely,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP



Christine Moseley Shiker

Enclosures

cc.	Joel Lawson, Office of Planning	(Via Hand Delivery, w/enclosure)
	Stephen Cochran, Office of Planning	(Via Hand Delivery, w/enclosure)
	Evelyn Israel, DDOT	(Via Hand Delivery; w/enclosure)
	Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2C	(Via US Mail, w/enclosure)

bcc	Conrad Cafritz, Cafritz Interests Aaron Katz, Modus Hotels Erwin Andres, Gorove Slade Norman M Glasgow, Jr Steven E. Sher, Holland & Knight	(Via UPS Overnight, w/enclosure) (Via UPS Overnight, w/enclosure) (Via UPS Overnight, w/enclosure) (w/enclosure) (w/enclosure)
-----	---	--