Cochran, Patricia (DCOZ)

From: Marcos DaCruz <mvdacruz2014@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 3:07 PM **To:** DCOZ - BZA Submissions (DCOZ)

Subject: Second Follow-up to BZA hearing - Case #19377-Boundary Companies/St. Paul's

College-3025 4th St, NE

Attachments: DC Zoning Commission #07-27 7-27-08 - Open Space.pdf

To the Board of Zoning Adjustment:

I am writing to present one additional point in opposition to BZA Case #19377-Boundary Companies/St. Paul's College-3025 4th St, NE.

During the Board of Zoning Adjustment hearing conducted on April 25, 2018 regarding the above case, during the traffic discussion there was testimony clearly stating the challenges for directing large volumes of traffic onto 4th Street and how dangerous a new intersection at the southern end of the property (where the current driveway is) or one closer to the Catholic Bishops (where Boundary is proposing their new curb cut) would be and used that information as reasons to reject a 4th Street connection to 7th.

These issues raised at the April 25 hearing are exacerbated by the tremendous density of the project. Sixty homes and an institutional building are too much. We already struggle with parking and we know it will get worse when the school is fully occupied, traffic on 4th Street is going to get worse when the city narrows the roads to add bike lanes, the storm water facility already floods when it rains heavily, there are no local parks for the community other than this land, and so on.

Based on these facts and on statements made in the record of ZC #07-27 by EYA and the Paulists regarding the continued preservation of the western portion of the St. Paul's College property as a significant reason for the density, setback, road width, and building height variances to be granted and the Chancellor's Row PUD to approved, and fact that the Paulists have received more than adequate compensation/fair market value for their land through the sale of the Chancellor's Row property to EYA and a portion of each unit sold as a result of that development, as well as the sale of their building to Building Hope, the Paulists should be estopped from developing the remaining portion of St. Paul's college site due to materially inconsistent positions taken in past and present legal proceedings. If they had wanted to retain future development rights for the remaining portion of their land then should not have been able to take credit for retaining this property in its historic state (i.e. institutional open space) as the attached 2008 transcript clearly shows (see highlighted portions throughout for representations made under oath to this effect during the Zoning Commission hearings)."

Thanks,

Marcos DaCruz

508 Regent Place, NE, Washington, DC 20017

GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

EYA, LLC AND THE MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF SAINT PAUL THE APOSTLE

Case No.: 07-27

Thursday, July 17, 2008

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

The Public Hearing of Case No. 07-27 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Anthony J. Hood, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD, Chairman GREGORY N. JEFFRIES, Vice Chairman CURTIS L. ETHERLY, Commissioner MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, Commissioner (OAC) PETER G. MAY, Commissioner (NPS) OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

DONNA HANOUSEK Zoning Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JOEL LAWSON ARTHUR JACKSON

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on July 17, 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOM																
Anthon	ıy Hoo	d .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	<u> </u>
ZC CAS	SE NO.	07-	27	_	ΕY	Α,	L	LC	&	TI	ΗE	M	IS	SI	NC	ARY
SOCIET	Y OF	SAIN	T	7AS	<u>UL</u>	TH	Œ	AP	OS	TI	<u>E</u> :		•	•	•	4
<u>PRELIM</u> Grant					•	•	•						•		•	10
WITNES																
Phil F Robert	'eola · Voun		oh	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1 7
Jack M	ICLaur. «- 1 a-a-a-	111 .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1 C
Jami M	ittano	V T G U	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	40
Jack I																
Father	r Frani	к ре	Slo	le:	ric)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	51
PERSON	IS/PAR'	<u> </u>	II	<u>. 7 .</u>	SUE	PC	RI	<u>'</u> :								
Victor			rs			•					•		•	•	•	58
Debora																223
Linda	Yahr		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		233
CROSS	EXAM 1	BY A	NC-	<u>- 5(</u>	<u>C</u> :	•	•						•	•		169
OFFICE	OF P	LANN	INC	J:												
Arthur	Jack	son	•													183
Joel I																194
<u> ANC-50</u>	٦.															
Silas																200
CROSS																211
CROSS	EAAM (<u>Jr A</u>	TIC -	<u>-) (</u>	<u> </u>	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		Z
PERSON	IS/PAR'	TIES	OI	PP(OSI	NG	3 :	S	UP	PC	RT	'IN	IG :			
Carol																240
CLOSIN	IG REM	<u>ARKS</u>	<u>.</u> :													
Phil F	eola			•	•	•							•	•		251
an=									.	_						0 = 1
SPECIF																
SET FO	R DEC	<u> ISIO</u>	<u>N</u> -	<u> </u>	SEF	'ΙΈ	:ME	<u>ER</u>	2 2	9,	2	00	<u>8</u> :			262
ADJOUR	RN: An	thon	v I	Hod	od:											269

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

1

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2 6:35 p.m. 3 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is the 4 Public Hearing of the Zoning Commission of the 5 District of Columbia for Thursday, July 17, 6 7 My name is Anthony J. Hood. Soon to be joining us or expected to join us are Vice 8 9 Chairman Jeffries and also joining us tonight are Commissioner Etherly and Commissioner 10 11 Turnbull. We are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff, Ms. Donna Hanousek, Office of 12 Planning staff, Mr. Lawson and Mr. Jackson. 13 This proceeding is being recorded 14 15 by a Court Report and is also webcast live.

by a Court Report and is also webcast live.

Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in the hearing room.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case 07-27. This is a request of EYA, LLC, St. Paul's College for approval of consolidated PUD-related Map

Amendment for property located at 3648. 1 Notice of today's hearing was 2 3 published in the DC Register on May 16, 2008. Copies of the announcement are available to my 4 left on the wall near the door. 5 This hearing will be conducted in 6 7 accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR 3022 as follows: Preliminary matters, applicant's 8 9 case, in this case they will have 40 minutes, report of the Office of Planning, report of 10 11 other Government agencies, report of ANC-5C, organizations persons 12 and in opposition, organizations and persons in support, rebuttal 13 and closing by the applicant. 14 And I did read that in reverse. 15 Support will go first and opposition will go 16 second. 17 following time constraints 18 The 19 will be maintained in this meeting. Again, as 20 Ι stated, applicant the 40 minutes,

The Commission intends to adhere to

minutes,

minutes.

organizations

5

21

22

3

individuals

time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear this case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations, if necessary, and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to 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 and take 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 up sound or background noise.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the

2.

1	public record. To avoid any appearance to the
2	contrary, the Commission requests that persons
3	present not engage the Members of the
4	Commission in conversation during any recess
5	or at any time.
6	The staff will be available
7	throughout the hearing to discuss procedural
8	questions. Please, turn off all beepers and
9	cell phones, at this time, so not to disrupt
10	these proceedings.
11	Would all individuals wishing to
12	testify, please, rise to take the oath? Ms.
13	Hanousek, would you, please, administer the
14	oath?
15	(Whereupon, the witnesses were
16	sworn.)
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. At this
18	time, the Commission will consider any
19	preliminary matters. Ms. Hanousek?
20	MS. HANOUSEK: Yes. There are a
21	few preliminary matters. There is no longer
22	a party in opposition. We have received the

1	Affidavit of Maintenance and it is in order.
2	And then there is the issue of the ANC
3	requesting a waiver of the rule of
4	requiring them having their comments in within
5	seven days of the hearing and their wanting to
6	postpone that until after their September
7	meeting.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
9	Thank you very much, Ms. Hanousek. I think we
10	can deal with the latter, the ANC issue when
11	we get to the ANC report. And everything
12	else, I think, it's okay for us to move
13	forward.
14	The opposition, colleagues, we
15	will not have to decide on whether or not we
16	are going to decide on a party issue, as Ms.
17	Hanousek has already stated. And the
18	Maintenance of Posting has been done.
19	Okay. With that, Mr. Feola?
20	MR. FEOLA: Mr. Chairman, we have
21	one preliminary matter.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

FEOLA: On behalf of the 1 MR. applicant and that is to ask the Commission to 2 3 consider two of our witnesses or three of our witnesses experts in their respective 4 as fields. 5 In our June 30th submission to the 6 7 Commission, in Tab G, as in George, the first individual is Jack McLaurin of the Lessard 8 9 Group, the project's architect. He has been recognized as an expert before this Commission 10 11 as recently as a couple of weeks ago. 12 The second one is Ms. Jami Milanovich transportation 13 as а traffic engineer with Wells and Associates. 14 Ms. Milanovich has also been before this 15 16 Commission as an expert. Her resume is also in Tab G. 17 And finally, Mark Morelock of -- a 18 19 civil engineer with the VIKA Firm. I don't 20 know if Mr. Morelock has testified before this Commission or not directly. If you are 21

interested, we can ask him, but his resume is

1	also attached.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Feola,
3	I think we can dismiss with at least two
4	relatively quickly, as already stated. Mr.
5	McLaurin, actually, we just decided another
6	case with Mr. McLaurin. I think it was on
7	Monday or sometime real recent and also, Ms.
8	Milanovich have already been proffered as
9	experts. Unless my colleagues have any
10	concerns about those two?
11	Now, Mr. Morelock, civil engineer,
12	I have looked at his resume. As was stated,
13	it's behind G. Does any of my colleagues have
14	any concerns? Any questions you want to ask?
15	So he would be proffered also as an expert.
16	MR. FEOLA: Thank you.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We can go ahead
18	and proceed.
19	MR. FEOLA: Thank you, Mr.
20	Chairman. For the record, my name is Phil
21	Feola with the Law Firm of Pillsbury Winthrop
22	Shaw Pittman and we are here on behalf of the

Missionary Society of Saint Paul the Apostle and EYA, LLC, the co-applicants in this case.

We are seeking a PUD approval and corollary map, Zoning Map Amendment, from the R-5-A to the R-5-B Zone District for a portion of the St. Paul's College at 4th Street, N.E., in Ward 5.

The project and a brief overview is a 237 for sale townhome project design in an environmentally sensitive manner preserving large lots of open space and existing mature trees. It follows closely the tenants of the Smart Growth and Good Urban Design principles that this Commission has heard many times in the past.

What we intend to show here tonight is that the project is completely consistent with the District's Comprehensive Plan. It satisfies the requirements of Chapter 24 of the Zoning Regulations and it will have little or no negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood and the District of

Columbia.

We have five direct witnesses and
we may only have four, because I'm going to
apologize ahead, unless he gets here in time,
Father Frank Desiderio, who is a principal
with the Polish Fathers, unfortunately had to
preside at a funeral for a family member today
in Brooklyn. The last check with him, he was
about 45 minutes away in his car on his way
here, so I would ask the Commission's
indulgence if he gets here late to let him
speak a little bit out of turn, since he
represents the property owner.
With that, I would like to ask our
final witness Mr. Debent Vermontel

With that, I would like to ask our first witness, Mr. Robert Youngentob, a principal and one of the co-founders of EYA to lead us through the process.

MR. YOUNGENTOB: Great. Thank you.

MR. FEOLA: Ms. Hanousek, I thought he was going to ask to turn the lights down.

MR. YOUNGENTOB: Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission, for the record, my name is Bob Youngentob and I'm President of EYA. I'm just going to take a couple of minutes. I hope most of you are familiar with EYA and our work, but I would like to take a couple minutes just to give you a brief background on the company.

We have been in business as a specialist in urban residential development for, approximately 16 years. In that period of time, we have delivered about 3,500 homes in 26 different communities throughout the Washington area.

We are very proud of the fact that we have won over 180 local and national awards and our company is made up of professionals in all aspects of the development. We do all our own planning and design work, working closely with the Lessard Group. We do our own construction and we also have a fully integrated sales operation as well.

Our development philosophy is really centered around types of development like Saint Paul's tonight. Everything we have done is either transit-oriented or focused on Smart Growth and we really, I think, are one of the pioneers of Smart Growth before the word or the terminology was even coined.

We have also done a number of mixed-use and mixed-income developments and we also believe we have a very strong community orientation as evidenced by the Aurora Award, which we won from the Capital Hill Civic Association for our work at Bryant School.

As a company, too, we also have a very strong corporate commitment to the District of Columbia. We have developed in a very wide range of communities throughout the District in a number of different wards, in a number of different locations.

We are working with the District on a number of public/private partnerships as well having been selected for the McMillan

Reservoir site also in this general vicinity, as well as working with DCHA on the Arthur Capper Carrollsburg Redevelopment.

And lastly, from community involvement standpoint, we were very involved in the original buff and scrub program. actually underway elementary now at the school, Shaed Elementary, in this particular neighborhood, as well as my partner, Terry Aiken, was one of the founders of D.C. Prep, which is also located, a charter school, in this neighborhood.

We do a number of things throughout the company, basically, involving everybody in the organization within the District of Columbia.

The next slide I'm going to show you is basically just a map of our projects that we have completed over our history.

Again, you can sense -- you can see the orientation all within the Beltway in all the different Metro jurisdictions, but a number of

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

them within the District of Columbia, and again focused on either Metro accessibility, walking distance to Metro or some other type of transit-oriented or Smart Growth development.

I'm going to show you just a couple of pictures of some of the projects that we have completed. I mentioned Bryant School at 14th and Independence and South Carolina up on Capitol Hill. This was a project of 38 townhomes in 20 condominiums. It was actually purchased from the District from the School Department, where we were -basically took an old school, rehabilitated the school and then redeveloped surrounding school yards into an award winning townhome and condominium community.

The next project is Harrison Square, which is 98 townhomes at 13th and V Streets. We were one of the first to go into the U Street corridor and help revitalize that area and very proud of the way not only the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

development turned out, but also as it served as a catalyst for much of the future development that occurred in the U Street corridor.

I also mentioned the Capitol Quarter development which is, approximately, 300 row homes and public housing units located near the new baseball stadium, which is under construction now. This is a joint venture public/private partnership working with DCHA and it's a mix of 212 market rate of work force housing units and 111 public housing units.

And then lastly, I'm just -- as examples of our work, Capitol Square, which is at 7th and G Street, S.W., 93 townhomes near the Main Avenue Waterfront, which is currently also under redevelopment. We're going to skip this section. Really, this is kind of an overview of the Paulists, their history, why they decided to develop their property, their process that they took through and also kind

of the relationship that we have had working 1 with them and their goal and kind of history 2 3 within the Brookland community. Hopefully, they will be here to be 4 able to deliver this directly. 5 If not, then we will be able to jump in and kind of fill 6 7 this -- fill you in on this. Because I think this is an important part of the history and 8 9 story of why we are here tonight. Thank you 10 very much. 11 MR. FEOLA: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, our next witness is Jack McLaurin, 12 13

who is going to walk us through the site plan and the architecture. Mr. McLaurin?

MR. McLAURIN: Thank you very much. Good evening. Again, my name is Jack McLaurin with the Lessard Group. appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight. These are some images of the property as it exists today. And I will refer to some of these later and some of the areas on architecture, but I just wanted to give you an

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

idea.

This is a view from 4 th Street. This is a statuary around the original formal part of the school and then this is an addition back here on the back hand side there. So it's a wonderful Gothic structure that we really tried to respect in the rest of the process.

The first thing I would like to do is orient you to the location of the site.

North being the top of the slide. This is the boundary of the entire Paulist property as it exists today. 4th Street running north/south.

North Capitol is over here. Michigan Avenue running sort of northeast this way.

This is the Brooklyn Catholic
University Metro, which is about four blocks
away, so we're going to be talking a lot about
some of the principles of New Urbanism and
Smart Growth, which relate to the proximity of
the Metro. Catholic University to the north.
Trinity directly across the street.

Washington Hospital Center.

The site is immediately bounded by predominantly residential uses on the south and on the east towards 7th Street. But there is also other various Catholic institutions. We have the Conference of -- United States Conference of Bishops here on the north. We have the Redemptorists directly to the east. And the Dominicans sort of to the northeast over here.

But the rest of the site is really bounded exclusively by single family row homes. There are a couple small apartment buildings.

What I would like to do now is just briefly talk about some of the planning principles that went into the design of the site itself. And the first one is compatibility. We really tried to come up with a plan that was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. And I mentioned predominantly the single family row homes, but

also some of the Catholic institutions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But. we have located the development, the new construction, the site is about 20 acres I should mention. The Paulist property is about 20 acres. And the application covers 10.25 acres, which pretty much what you see here around this road.

You will see a property line kind of running right between the road here. But we have -- on the northeast, the east side and the south is where we have located the new development which is exclusively new single family for sale row homes. There are no condominiums or rental or multi-family. This is all single-family attached row homes.

And we have located them to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood from -- not only from a circulation, the location of the development standpoint, but also height, scale and massing for compatible uses, residential uses, single-family homes.

Scale-wise, we are very compatible. We are anywhere from 2.5 stories up to 3.5 stories. And I'll get into the heights a little bit later on. Connectivity was also a very strong planning principle for us. As you may know right now, 5h Street, 6th Street, Hamlin, Jackson, these are all dead end streets right now. And it was our goal to extend the existing street grid and start to connect into the neighborhood.

None of these streets will Everything will be completely open, so we're -- what we're trying to do as a part of compatibility is extend the existing neighborhood today and extend these street grids and eliminate the dead ends. Every time I have been over there, you know, you have to kind of work these sequetist dead ends. So hopefully this is going to be a nice connection to the surrounding neighborhood.

But then also, we tried to utilize Smart Growth principles. A lot of projects

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you have seen deal with new urban techniques, which are certain prevalent on this site. All our homes are located or accessed with garages, either one or two car garages that are accessed from the rear lanes, so we keep our front doors off the street and result in a more walkable neighborhood.

Back connectivity to and compatibility, of our Smart Growth some principles deal with the walkability of our neighborhood, but also into the surrounding neighborhoods. Our streetscapes are consistent. All new construction, but they are consistent. So we feel like we have really worked with a lot of Smart Growth principles.

Clustering the development and compacting the development at a certain density allows us to maintain consolidated open spaces. I'll discuss a little bit further a large portion of the new homes have their own private open spaces at different

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

varying degrees, but then we have a lot of 1 2 consolidated open space like our corner park 3 here. We have a lot of mews, parks, 4 courtyard parks in here. We have another park 5 over here between 5th and 6th Street. 6 7 another idea of consolidating was the But also, the other result of 8 development. 9 consolidating in a northeast and a south system is to maintain these viewsheds that the 10 11 Paulists currently have. 12 If you have driven by the site on Street, it's just a spectacular openness 13 14 of green space that will be maintained. A lot 15 of very mature trees. So certainly another principle of Smart Growth. The homes have 16 been designed to really build into the grade 17 18 and work with the topography, so there is 19 minimal impact on the grade. 20 Next slide. The plan that you see here on the screen is a different plan and has 21

been modified from -- based on comments from

Office of Planning and the community. This is continuing to be an outreach program for us. And from the Commission itself during the setdown hearing that we had, we heard some very specific ideas and concerns, so that we tried to modify the plan from the application to the prehearing submission, which is what you see in front of you.

One of the first things we heard was the project just, frankly, feels a little bit too dense. It just feels like there is just too much going on. So we have actually had a reduction in the number of units. We have reduced the units from 251 units down to 237 units. So we have tried to free up the site from a perception standpoint.

I know units are numbers, but it was what we heard from the Commission was really it just felt too dense.

The other thing that we did was create more openness on the site. We had some larger units that framed the back of these

2.

courtyards and we have removed those, therefore, reducing the number of units as well and the overall size of the units, the larger units are gone. But we have now opened up these courtyards that used to be kind of framed and blocked off. So that had a result in making the site feel a lot more open.

We have increased the setbacks along the main roadways and we have also increased the setback off the Redemptorists' property over here. So from a walkability standpoint, we feel like, you know, we have made a nicer experience as you walk down the street. The buildings are farther off of the public sidewalk.

Now, we have also realigned the internal roadway here. We have made it a lot more smooth and less impact on the adjoining property. The road used to come over here, come into a 90 degree intersection and you would either turn left or turn right. So now, we felt like we have improved the vehicular

2.

circulation of the site by doing that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The other thing that we have done is realigned and connected, realigned our internal roads to talk about this connection of 5th and 6th Street. There is an enlargement of this area I would like to talk about in more specific detail.

Next slide. I would like to talk about the architecture at this point. And, to work with the you know, we tried architecture in the surrounding areas immediately adjoining us, 5 $^{\rm th}$ Street, 6 $^{\rm th}$ Street, 7th Street, but also branching out a little bit further, the architecture on North Capitol, architecture in the Edgewood District, and come up with a home prototype that we feel like will do a couple of things from -- for us.

So try to address some of these

New Urbanism principles, front porches,

activate the streets, eyes on the streets, the

front doors on the streets, windows on the

streets, activity in the front yards with the front porch.

The vernacular is exclusively bricked veneer on the front facades with shingles in the pent roof here. And you will see a variety of color. Some of it natural brick, some of it painted brick. I have a color and material board up here. When we turn the lights on, we can look a little bit closer at that, if we would like to.

This is an example of a typical building that is what we call our 3.5 story There is a fourth level loft that building. you have seen this applicant present to you before. The loft is setback, so the front facade is a 3 story facade. The fourth level being the loft is setback. And I have a section if you would like to later on understand how that works.

But it is basically the fourth level is setback anywhere from about 12 to 14 feet off of the front wall. What's up here on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

top of this base, a roof terrace, which I'll go into a little bit more detail later on.

This -- we have three buildings that are mostly near the existing St. Paul's College, which is a stone Gothic architecture. What we decided to do -- these buildings really face the college. What we decided to do was really pay respect and homage to the college and create more of a Neo-Gothic, it's not a strict interpretation, but it is a strict use of very similar materials that they have on the school, a natural stone veneer and a red shingle roof up in here.

But these are again fee-simple townhomes in here and a 3 story -- we have a roof terrace, which will be on the rear of this roof, but we really tried to -- as you're driving down 5th Street, you still experience the open space and the natural slope that -- excuse me, 4th Street. You still experience the open space and you have this wonderful vista of the college. But then the building's

2.

sort of frame of the college will be of a like architecture and be very compatible. So we have three buildings that are in this vernacular here.

Now, the other home prototype we have on the site very similar to the row home, porch front row home we talked about a little bit earlier is a 2.5 story. The fronts are buried because of the grade. It's still a 3.5 story home on the inside, but from the street and the public realm, it's only 2.5 story.

But we have also removed some of the porches. But we're trying not to copy the existing vernacular in the surrounding neighborhoods, but it is a reality that the fabric is built of units that some have porches and some don't. In reading some of the historic literature I have in my files today to prepare for this, you know, it's very clear that, you know, people's porches have been demolished or removed at some point and some were forced to bring them back up and

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some of them just left on. So we tried to basically rebuild that fabric.

This is a rear elevation. One of the things that we really tried to focus on was the rears and provide color and architectural detailing and articulation on the rears. This is an example of the alley lane that's in the back where we have access to our garage doors. But you will see a variety of door sizes in here.

We have single car door widths and then we have double car door widths, based on the garage and the size of the unit. What that does is it allows us to enhance the landscaping in the rear. So not only will we have low lying landscaping on some of our narrow strips, some of our wider strips, we're going to be able to actually put trees in there.

So that has a way of really enhancing the alleys of a variety of a color of materials. The units on the ends will be

brick veneer, so that the end units when you 1 2. get a small peak into the rear lane, you will 3 brick veneer and not immediately a transition to siding, which is very awkward. 4 5 And also then you see our cantilevered decks on the rear here. 6 7 an exhibit later on that will show you, be a picture of some decks, but that's again some 8 9 more of our private outdoor space. 10 Regarding open space, speak of the 11 devil, this is a plan that is color coded to 12 distinguish our private outdoor space and our public outdoor space. The sort of the light 13 green is the Paulist property, which remains 14 15 untouched. The sort of medium green is all of 16 our community public outdoor space. of 17 Accommodation the park, corner 18 courtyards that I discussed, the triangular 19 park in here. 20 But then we also have private open space via yards and side yards, front yards 21

and side yards, basically, for every unit in

varying degree. We have about 25 percent open space on our 10.25 acres. So we feel like that that's a pretty significant number.

This is an enlargement of the corner park, which is highlighted here in the key plan in red. It's about a third of an acre, 14,000 square feet. This is one of the changes that we have made based on the Commission and the community's comments and Office of Planning.

This park, basically, has doubled in size from what was originally submitted. So it's about a third of an acre. And you will see we have front doors on the park, enhanced landscaping, retaining walls, so that we are very sensitive to the site. So sort of a gateway through this part of the property the way the road network works. This is a -- this will be a very prominent central park.

This is a typical courtyard. This one specifically is located sort of catty-cornered to that corner park I just showed

1	you, but everything else that you see
2	highlighted in red is a very typical the
3	designs do vary a little bit. The parks
4	the courtyards, some might be programmed a
5	little more actively than others. Some could
6	be a little more passive. Hardscaping will
7	vary, but this is a very consistent courtyard
8	outdoor space for us.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Excuse
10	me, what is the width of that courtyard, the
11	typical courtyard?
12	MR. McLAURIN: When you say width,
13	you mean this dimension?
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes,
15	that's the one, yes.
1.0	
16	MR. McLAURIN: I believe
17	MR. McLAURIN: I believe specifically it's about 36 feet.
17	specifically it's about 36 feet.
17	specifically it's about 36 feet. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Thank
17 18 19	specifically it's about 36 feet. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Thank you.

this is an enlargement to do a couple of things. One is to show you the connectivity that we reworked to try to make 6th Street and 5th Street continuous onto our property and then you hit the main ring road coming around here towards Hamlin and Jackson.

The other thing that we did was rework this entire section here. The original plan had the rears of our homes facing the adjoining property owners. This is an alley that runs back in behind here, but our plan was to basically reorient our homes and create this substantial park here in the middle and have our front doors face the public realm. So we believe that was a nice improvement.

By the way, these are two of the buildings that are in the stone architecture, because the Paulist College is right here.

These are some existing courtyards that EYA has constructed in the past. The upper right is in the City of Alexandria, but this is Capitol Square over here. This is

2.

Courthouse Hill. Over here, this is Bryan

Square and this is Braddock Loft Projects in

Alexandria.

But what it does is it shows you similar sizes to what we are working with, but they have been designed differently. This one here is a little more passive. These here are a little more active. This one here is a little bit more ceremonial, but these courtyards really become specialty pieces for the communities. And the residents there develop a sense of ownership.

I actually have friends who live in some EYA Projects and, you know, you can have some nice social events out in these courtyards. So it's a premium to live on one of these courtyards.

Another illustration of private open space that comes in a couple of forms.

One is the ground level open space that we talked about. That 25 percent number that I showed you, that I told you earlier was

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

strictly ground level open space and does not include any decks or rooftop terraces.

So we have some fenced in yards on the front and the side over here, fenced in yards here with some enhanced landscaping.

All the landscaping will be predetermined and installed ahead of time. And I'm sure we will talk about the HOA Maintenance Agreements.

Then we also have porches up here on the front. So people will have a choice and flexibility to either have a yard, front yard or they would have a porch, depending on, you know, what's important in their lifestyle. The other thing that we have are some rooftop terraces. Every unit will have the ability to have a rooftop terrace.

I don't know if you saw the Washington Post article a month and a half or so ago about rooftop terraces, but it was an interesting article about, you know, today's urban environment and really what it is you are looking for. And you had all the friends

2.

1	in the world you wanted if you had a house
2	with a rooftop terrace, it was kind of fun.
3	The other thing we this
4	illustrates is the decks that we have in the
5	alleys, which are one level above. The
6	rooftop terraces are on the same level as the
7	loft, so it's up a couple of floors, but the
8	decks are the same level as the living/dining/
9	kitchen space. So if you had a need to, you
10	know, have something on your main living
11	level, that's what that's for.
12	The other thing the slide
13	illustrates is our ability to get some
14	additional landscaping and green in the backs
15	and the alleys there.
16	Okay. These are some existing EYA
17	private open spaces. You will see some
18	rooftop terraces here, examples of front
19	yards, the rear decks and then the porch
20	fronts over here.
21	Environmentally, we feel pretty
22	good here. Basically, we have this natural

1	resource that is staying in touch, you know,
2	preserving the slopes and the mature trees,
3	which is certainly a goal of the Office of
4	Planning in the District of Columbia, but we
5	also are using the existing to store upon.
6	We will be at a level of
7	certification for LEED neighborhood
8	development. We will be compatible with that
9	level. At this point, I don't think we're
10	proposing to seek the certification, but we
11	will be meeting that same level of standards
12	as a LEED neighborhood development.
13	And then we also have some bio
14	swales of Energy Star, the entire project will
15	be Energy Star, then bio swales and rain
16	gardens. These are pictures that you may have
17	seen, examples of different bio swales and
18	rain gardens. And I do a lot of running. I
19	run around these areas a lot. It's amazing
20	really the technology in some of the storm
21	water retention nowadays. It's great.
22	And that's I appreciate the

1 time. 2 MR. FEOLA: Our next witness, Mr. 3 Chairman, is Jami Milanovich. MS. MILANOVICH: Good evening. 4 For the record, my name is Jami Milanovich 5 with Wells and Associates. Business address 6 7 at 1420 Spring Hill Road, McLean, Virginia. The purpose of the Traffic Impact 8 9 Study was to evaluate existing conditions in the area, to determine the impact of the 10 11 proposed development and ultimately recommend improvements to mitigate that impact. 12 At the outset of the project, we 13 met with the DDOT actually several times. 14 15 Once at their office to scope the study and 16 then a couple of times actually at the site. And really, the purpose of those meetings was 17 to establish the scope and agree upon the 18 19 scope and the methodologies that would be used 20 in the traffic study. 21 The study area that was agreed

upon was really quite extensive.

22

It was the

intersections along Franklin Street with 4th, 1 5th, 6th and 7th Streets, along 7th Street at its 2. 3 intersections with Hamlin, Jackson and Monroe Streets, and the Michigan Avenue/4 th Street 4 and Michigan Avenue/Harewood Road 5 intersections. 6 7 In terms of the site circulation, access to development would be provided by 8 extensions of existing streets, namely 5 th 9 Street, 6th Street, Hamlin Street and Jackson 10 11 Street. Those are showed by the -- shown by the yellow arrows on the slide. Each of these 12 roadways would be interconnected, so that 13 traffic within the site could circulate and --14 15 in either ingress or egress via any one of 16 these entrance points. The Paulists' driveway would not 17 be used as access to the new residential 18 19 development. 20 The 237 townhomes would generate an estimated 111 a.m. peak hour trips and 132 21

p.m. peak hour trips. However, not all of

those trips would be made by the private automobile.

Given the proximity of the site to the Metro Station, the Brooklyn/CUA Metro Station, a substantial percentage of the residents are anticipated to use public transportation.

Data collected by WMATA suggests that a site of this nature in such proximity to a Metro Station could be estimated to achieve a 50 percent Metro Rail split, meaning that 50 percent of the residents would commute using the Metro.

data in the census area substantiates that information, based on the census data for that census tracks and all tracks, percent contiquous 44.5 the residents currently in the neighborhood are using some form of transportation other than the private automobile. Another 13 percent carpool to work, according to the census data.

You will -- I'm sorry, can you go

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

back? You will notice on this slide we have a non-auto moat split listed at 35 percent. This really came out of our discussions with the DDOT. They -- even though the WMATA data and the census data showed something higher, they had asked us to use 35 percent in order to provide a slightly more conservative analysis.

So with that, the project would be estimated to generate 72 a.m. peak hour trips and 86 p.m. peak hour vehicle trips.

This slide shows the a.m. peak hour trips as they are dispersed over four of the access points. And it really shows the minimum amount of traffic being added to the site. And the next slide shows the same thing for the p.m. peak hour vehicle trips.

Although the development really has a very minimal impact on the study area, the TIS did recommend, the traffic study did recommend, a few recommendations to offset that impact. Those recommendations include

2.

optimization of signal timings at Michigan Avenue and Harewood Road, at Michigan Avenue and $4^{\rm th}$ Street and at Monroe and $7^{\rm th}$ Street.

As well, we recommended the installation of some signage along Franklin Street and the upgrading of pavement markings there really to enhance the crosswalks that are there and help slow down vehicles in the area. And finally, we worked with the DDOT to come up with some incentives for new residents to use public transportation.

And the idea is that all new residents would have a welcome package, which would include \$20 Smart Trip cards, Metro maps and bus schedules in the area, Metropolitan Branch Trail maps, a \$25 fee for the ZIP car application, as well as a list of nearby retailers and service providers.

Finally, subject to DDOT approval, directional signs for the Metropolitan Branch Trail would be provided on the site on new road signs that are posted there.

2.

1	With that, I'll turn it to Jack
2	Lester to talk about the amenities.
3	MR. LESTER: Good evening. My
4	name is Jack
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: You have
6	to turn your mike on.
7	MR. LESTER: Good evening. My
8	name is Jack Lester. I'm with the Firm EYA.
9	And I want to talk to you briefly about
10	community amenities. We have developed a
11	strong and comprehensive amenities plan. The
12	ideas and components of that plan, none of
13	those were developed by EYA, but rather
14	through an effort of a community process,
15	dialogue with the Council Member and his staff
16	and with the ANC.
17	Chief among those is the
18	affordable housing component. This
19	illustration shows that we have dispersed the
20	affordable housing throughout the community.
21	There are 24 for sale affordable homes at
22	prices between 50 and 80 percent of area

median income. The bedroom size of these will be in proportion to those of the market rate homes.

The exterior facades, as shown in this illustration, will be identical, indistinguishable, I should say, from the market rate homes. Same quality of design and of materials.

One of the outcomes of the community meetings was along with the access to the homes was the -- providing information residents and more than t.o area just information on how to sign up and qualify for these homes through the District's process, but also to meet needs of -- special needs that they may have about financing, home budgeting.

And so what we have committed and as we have done successfully and are doing successfully at two other communities currently, is to provide the information and then to match the needs of the individuals

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that are interested in qualified with the appropriate resources.

Another amenity that came out of dialogue with community and other stakeholders was creating a public park where now exists a green space between the -- at the intersections of Franklin, Lincoln and 4 th Streets. We have worked closely with the Department of Parks and Rec to create a plan that they endorse and we have committed to build upon approval.

This park is, approximately, an acre and a third, 50,000 square feet. Here is a blow up of that public park.

The next amenity is -- as part of our package is making improvements to the surrounding community. We have done several walks of the community with ANC Commissioner, representatives from DDOT and identified areas that within the -- approximate to this site that need -- could benefit from improvement.

For example, on 6th Street a

1	missing curb and gutter and sidewalk, these
2	are the kinds of enhancements and improvements
3	we propose to make.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Excuse
5	me, Mr. Lester.
6	MR. LESTER: Yes.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Can you
8	go back to that slide that showed the context?
9	That one.
10	MR. LESTER: Yes.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: We have
12	do we have that in our file?
13	MR. LESTER: I'm not certain that
14	you do.
15	MR. FEOLA: Yes, you do, sir.
16	MR. LESTER: Okay.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
18	Where is that?
19	MR. FEOLA: It's in the prehearing
20	submission. I'll have to find it.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
22	Thank you. I'm sorry, go ahead.
ļ	

1 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Mr. 2 Jeffries, that will be Sheet C-8 in the 3 prehearing statement. Thank VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: 4 5 you, Mr. Etherly. MR. LESTER: And again, this is 6 7 actually photoshop. We haven't actually gone out and poured that concrete yet. But again, 8 9 here is an example of a missing piece of Certainly, this portion could 10 sidewalk. 11 benefit from the improvements there that we propose to do. 12 element 13 Another that is very important to the community, in particular the 14 15 ANC Commissioner, were improvements to Shaed 16 Elementary. As Bob Youngentob said, we have committed to do that and more than that, we 17 have begun to make the improvements to Shaed 18 19 Elementary. The list was developed through a 20 walk-through with the head custodian there and comprehensive list of 21 have we а got

improvements that we are making.

Another element that came from the ANC, in particular, was a college scholarship fund. We have agreed to commit \$45,000 to fund a scholarship fund for worthy high school seniors from ANC-5C09.

In addition, we have agreed to two things as it relates to small business support. One is to fund in an amount of \$40,000 a fund that would provide grants and technical assistance to area small businesses, 5C in particular. And also as we gear up to develop this site, we have committed to meet with those businesses in the area that may have an interest in working on the site well in advance of our need for them on the site.

So they understand what it is that we need as a general contractor and that they have the opportunity to meet our requirements in terms of budgeting and estimating and proposing.

As Bob said earlier, one of the hallmarks of our firm is community-oriented

1	process. We believe well, through this
2	process, we have met the community 13 times,
3	13 public meetings over the past 13 months,
4	countless meetings with neighbors, with
5	elected officials over that time.
6	We believe as a result of that, we
7	have developed a much better plan, a very
8	strong amenities package. And here is a
9	listing of those meetings that we have
10	where we have presented.
11	And with that, I think maybe we
12	would like to go back to Father Desiderio, the
13	last witness.
14	MR. FEOLA: Yeah, in the darkness,
15	the good Father slid into his chair over there
16	on the end and I would like to have him speak.
17	FATHER DESIDERIO: Can you turn
18	the lights on?
19	MR. FEOLA: Yeah, we can turn the
20	lights on, I guess, at this point. And Father
21	Frank Desiderio, the Paulists.
22	FATHER DESIDERIO: Thank you. I

apologize for being late, but I was at a funeral at 2:30 in Brooklyn, so I came down as fast as I could, in spite of Baltimore/
Washington Expressway and Washington, D.C.
traffic. I'm happy to be here and to
represent the Paulist Fathers. I am on the
Leadership Team of the Paulist Fathers along
with Father Duffy and Father Moran.

And the last Council decision that our community made was to reinvest in our building in Washington, D.C. We were the first religious community to be associated with Catholic University in 1894. And we began St. Thomas College there and have long been involved in the Catholic University area.

In 1913, we bought the property which then was farmland and began building our own house of studies and we were credited by the Middle Atlantic States. We came to a decision about four years ago of whether to move from Washington or whether to recommit to being in the Washington area and recommitting

2.

there to put in the substantial financial commitment that that would entail.

The community decided to do that, because of our long involvement with many entities in Washington, D.C. and because we think it is a great base both for training and for service, both for our priests and for our students.

And so we began what is now an \$11 million renovation of the building, some of which we use for our own purposes, others of which we can rent out to organizations that have a similar purpose and a similar commitment as ours, thereby making more our public use space a more private, cooperative use space for other entities in the city.

Part of the formula for doing this was we could get a little bit of rent from people who would use the building, other non-profits, but we wanted to use the land around us and we sought for our ground lease proposal. And the more we pursued that, the

2.

more it came back to us that banks basically don't finance ground leases all that readily and that we would need to think about sale of some of the parcel of our 23 acres, namely about 10.25 acres.

We did an RFP proposal. We had eight proposals come back. And we unanimously selected EYA because of the quality of their proposal and because of the quality of other things that they have done. And in the 2.5 years that we have talked with EYA and discussed various arrangements, we have only grown in our admiration of them and we see ourselves in partnership with them.

EYA has shown tremendous sensitivity to the college, to what we do, to building so that it fits into what we do, to the neighborhood and so that their building would also fit into the neighborhood and help in the growth of that neighborhood.

And the last point I would make in terms of doing this, this partnership which

2.

will greatly help us complete our project with 1 the college, I think it would also greatly 2 3 strengthen the neighborhood. I've been out of Washington, D.C. for a little bit of time, but 4 my brothers here have said wherever there is 5 6 Metro, there has been tremendous 7 development. And every time I come back to 8 9 Washington, D.C. and Brookland and CUA, I I see a little bit of things don't see that. 10 11 changing, but it looks like the same streets 12 I walked on when I was a seminarian 30 years ago and served as a priest 20 years ago. 13 And so I think that this kind of 14 15 development along with what Catholic University is proposing really fits into the 16 whole dynamic of building up the Brookland 17 area and building strong communities within 18 19 Washington, D.C. and we are proud to be 20 associated with that. Thank you. 21 MR. FEOLA: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman, that ends our direct presentation.

We stand ready for questions. 1 2 CHAIRMAN HOOD: First of all, 3 Father, let me say we -- sympathy from the Commission for your loss and, you know, I know 4 it took a great effort to come down here, so 5 if you want a little more time to say 6 7 something additional, you can do that. you made an effort to get here and we greatly 8 9 appreciate that. The buzzer went off, but it didn't 10 11 mean you had to stop. So if you wanted to continue something, you -- please, do so. 12 FATHER DESIDERIO: I think I made 13 my major points. I think the important thing 14 15 for us, from our perspective, is to complete the investment that we made in this building. 16 We now carry an \$11 million loan. And if we 17 can close on this property, that will be a 18 19 tremendous help to us in not only grounding 20 our community at St. Paul's, but also offering amenities to other nonprofits in the area. 21

And that's very important to us

1	along with the quality of EYA.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Is
3	that it, Mr. Feola?
4	MR. FEOLA: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's it, okay.
6	Let me do this, I see we have a representative
7	from Council Member Ward 5's Office. I'm not
8	sure if they are here to read a statement, but
9	I want to ask, at this time, Ms. Chambers, are
10	you here to read the Council Member's
11	statement?
12	What I would like to do, at this
13	time, is to pause and let Ms. Chambers come as
14	we do staff and Council Members especially,
15	because of their busy schedules, including
16	their staffs, we usually pause and let them
17	get in the time to present to us and then we
18	will come back to our the applicant's
19	presentation and our questions.
20	You want to turn your mike on?
21	Oh, just hit the button.
22	MS. CHAMBERS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.

MS. CHAMBERS: Good evening. My name is Vicky Leonard Chambers. I'm a Senior Policy Analyst for Council Member Harry Thomas, Jr. I am here to testify in support of the proposed project at St. Paul's College on behalf of Council Member Thomas.

Since the inception of this project, Council Member Thomas has worked very closely with EYA in creating the exceptional project and community amenities package presented here today. Throughout the planning of this project, Council Member Thomas has been very impressed with EYA's commitment to community involvement.

EYA has been equally responsive to the needs and concerns of the community as the planning of the project progressed. EYA worked very actively with Council Member Thomas in various community organizations to devise an amenities package that would best serve the needs of the Edgewood/Brookland

Neighborhood.

Concurrent with the community amenities, EYA listened to and engaged all community participants and Council Member Thomas in changing and adjusting the project layout and design in order to accommodate the concerns that were expressed. The project's attractive design and appealing layout result from EYA's response to the community's needs and concerns.

This project will provide an ample supply of much needed housing for both the neighborhood and the District. Council Member Thomas particularly welcomes this project because of its ability to offer many District residents the opportunity to purchase their own homes. And the inclusion of affordable units offers all District residents the opportunity to be homeowners.

This project will only contribute positively to both the neighborhood and the District. The proximity to the Brookland

Catholic University Metro Station will
encourage residents to use public transit in
place of driving.
The improved streetscapes and
rehabilitated park will give further will
further improve and beautify the neighborhood.
In total, this project will foster an active
and desirable residential neighborhood.
Because of EYA's tireless efforts in working
with the community and the positive effects of
this project, Council Member Thomas is pleased
to offer his complete support.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
MS. CHAMBERS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
much, Ms. Chambers. Let me just see if any of
my colleagues may have any questions of you.
Colleagues, do you have any questions of Ms.
Chambers?
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Turnbull?
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you,

1	Mr. Chair. I just want to clarify something.
2	The existing college building will function as
3	what?
4	FATHER DESIDERIO: It functions
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That question
6	actually is not for you, Ms. Chambers. But
7	any questions of Ms. Chambers?
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Oh, no,
9	I'm sorry.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay. No,
11	no, we're going to hold that. Thank you very
12	much, Ms. Chambers. Commissioner Turnbull,
13	you can go ahead and get us started.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
15	Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Chair.
16	FATHER DESIDERIO: The existing
17	building functions as a residence for our
18	seminarians who go either to Catholic
19	University or the Washington Theological Union
20	as a residence for our priests who work in the
21	Washington, D.C. area and either run offices
22	from the college or work in various ministries

1	around the city.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And it
3	will still continue to function?
4	FATHER DESIDERIO: Oh, yeah. No,
5	that's the basic purpose there.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
7	FATHER DESIDERIO: Yeah.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So that's
9	still continued.
10	FATHER DESIDERIO: Oh, yeah.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
12	Thank you. All right. Let me I wanted to
13	go back and I was I'm glad when you were
14	Mr. McLaurin was going through when he pointed
15	out the some of the points that the
16	Commission had made at its last at our last
17	hearing on this.
18	And I see that there has been
19	really a tremendous improvement in the layout
20	of the plan. There was one item remaining
21	from our hearing, which you touched upon, but
22	you really didn't show. And I believe it was

1	a comment made by former Commissioner Parsons.
2	And you talk about the slope of the site. And
3	Mr. Parsons was very much concerned about the
4	amount of retaining wall.
5	Now, we don't see any sections to
6	the site in your presentation and we didn't
7	see anything referenced to the retaining wall.
8	I wonder if you could maybe go back and
9	comment on that?
10	MR. McLAURIN: This one here?
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yes.
12	MR. McLAURIN: That's actually an
13	existing wall.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's an
15	existing wall?
16	MR. McLAURIN: That's an existing
17	wall.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Could you
19	show that on a site plan?
20	MR. McLAURIN: Yeah, let's go.
21	MR. FEOLA: I believe, Mr.
22	Turnbull, that was the one that caught Mr.

1	Parsons' very keen eye actually.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah. I
3	was just curious if that's is it the same?
4	Has it changed? I think it's the one by the
5	corner.
6	MR. McLAURIN: It's this right
7	here, right? Okay. This is it right here.
8	Our previous road actually came up
9	significantly closer to this. When you got to
10	right around this point, it turned at a 90
11	degrees and then sort of went directly left/
12	right. But we are significantly away from
13	that. There will be a bio swale that kind of
14	runs right along that, so that all this runoff
15	could be handled.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: All right.
17	MR. McLAURIN: Without any
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So that
19	is
20	MR. McLAURIN: disturbance to
21	the grading.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That

1	retaining wall goes all the way up past the
2	parking area?
3	MR. FEOLA: No. It's just right
4	here by this.
5	MR. McLAURIN: In there. It
6	sorry. It just holds up sort of the grade at
7	the end of the building, so it's level with
8	the building, because it's sloping away. It's
9	sloping down here.
LO	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Hum.
11	MR. FEOLA: That's a retaining
12	wall that is a part of the original building
L3	and the original structure.
L4	MR. McLAURIN: It's a retaining
15	wall that is part of the original building.
L6	So that wall has been there quite a while.
L7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess I
18	thought I saw something else on another I
L9	thought there was another wall. What about
20	around the corner park?
21	MR. FEOLA: There's another wall,
22	yes.

1	MR. McLAURIN: Yeah, those are low
2	walls in an effort to, again, try to maintain.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It sort of
4	surrounds the whole end by the it goes up
5	by the street and then goes all the way to the
6	front doors of those units up by the park.
7	MR. McLAURIN: They are no more
8	than about 3 or 4 feet. So they are really to
9	create level yards and level spaces. They are
10	not really to retain a whole, you know, large
11	amount of dirt.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: So is
13	there a fence on top of them or it's just
14	MR. McLAURIN: There would be, by
15	code, if it's anything over 30 inches, a
16	wrought iron fence.
17	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
18	MR. McLAURIN: Or heavy
19	landscaping to keep people from coming right
20	off the wall.
Į.	Off the wair.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.

that it does is it helps and part of the
reason we did some of that intentionally was
to hold up the yards of the homes above the
park, so that there is a separation. I mean,
what you don't want to do when you have front
doors on a park that doesn't have a street,
you don't want to design it so that people in
those homes feel like they own the park. So
we have been very successful in previous
projects elevating this walkway, elevating the
yards and then landscaping it heavily, you
know, on a lower level park in there.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
Thank you. I guess the other, how wide are
the drives, the alleys?
MR. McLAURIN: The driveway itself
is, the drive aisle, 20 feet and then there is
3.5 feet and 3.5 feet, so building to building
it's 27 feet.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And the
balconies would overhang?
MR. McLAURIN: They cantilever.

1	There are no posts. They cantilever 4 feet.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 4 feet?
3	MR. McLAURIN: Right, on each
4	side.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
6	There is a park. I'm curious, I was trying to
7	figure out where it was in your book Sheet
8	L104. It's called Public Park.
9	MR. FEOLA: Yes, the off-site
10	park.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is that
12	MR. McLAURIN: That's the off-site
13	Triangle Park.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's the
15	off-site Triangle Park?
16	MR. McLAURIN: That's part of the
17	community amenity package.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
19	Whereabouts, how far away is that?
20	MR. McLAURIN: It's basically
21	across the street.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Across the

1 street? MR. McLAURIN: And it's about an 2 3 acre and a half. Here is the site right here. So this is 4th Street, 5th Street, 6th Street. 4 This is the dead ending I was talking about. 5 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: 6 7 MR. McLAURIN: So literally, it's right across the street. It's about an acre 8 9 and a half. So it's a very substantial park. 10 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. All 11 right. Thank you. That's my questions right now, Mr. Chair. 12 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Thank 13 Mr. Chair. I will agree with 14 you, 15 Commissioner Turnbull that there definitely 16 have been some changes to the site plan. I think one of my concerns during setdown was 17 that I did feel that it was somewhat dense. 18 19 And it was really exacerbated by all the green 20 It really seemed to press upon just space. how dense the townhouse part of the campus 21

looked.

1 I just have a few questions. one thing that I'm having difficulty with here 2 3 is trying to see how this campus with the with townhomes interfaces the adiacent 4 Now, I believe the chair 5 neighborhood. mentioned to me that some of this was shown 6 7 before I got here, and I apologize for being late. 8 9 just trying But I'm to make certain I'm clear about what 10 someone is 11 looking at. Once this development is up, someone from the existing neighborhood, what 12 exactly they are looking at. And not from a 13 site plan perspective, but from how we exist, 14 15 how we experience. If you would, if 16 MR. McLAURIN: the Commission wouldn't mind, I can just kind 17 of quickly go back and do the first three 18 19 slides I think you missed. 20 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Sure. MR. McLAURIN: This is the site. 21 22 And the site is bounded by, this

1	Street here. It's exclusively single-family
2	row homes here.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
4	MR. McLAURIN: But there are a
5	couple very small apartment buildings. There
6	is Trinity across the street. There is the
7	U.S. Conference of Bishops, the Dominicans and
8	the Redemptorists on this side. But
9	everything else is really exclusively single-
10	family row homes.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And north
12	is up, right?
13	MR. McLAURIN: North is up.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
15	MR. McLAURIN: And then you have
16	the Catholic, the Brookland Metro is about a
17	4 block walk.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
19	MR. McLAURIN: Right over there.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
21	MR. McLAURIN: So this is North
22	Capitol and this is Michigan here.
	I

1	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
2	MR. McLAURIN: But a couple of our
3	planning principles. No. 1, is exactly what
4	you speak about, compatibility.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
6	MR. McLAURIN: So the reason the
7	homes are over here in this particular area is
8	to be compatible with the surrounding
9	architecture and use over there. That's a
10	residential use predominantly. It's single-
11	family row homes. So that's why we don't have
12	multi-family. We don't have apartments. We
13	actually have single-family row homes as well.
14	Everything is for sale market
15	for sale fee-simple ownership.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
17	MR. McLAURIN: It's not
18	condominium regime or anything like that. So
19	compatibility from the height, scale, massing,
20	anywhere from 2.5 stories to the 3.5 stories.
21	I think you were here when we were going over
22	the architecture for that.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
2	MR. McLAURIN: Connectivity was
3	very strong for us. If you drive out there,
4	5 th Street dead ends, 6 th dead ends, Hamlin
5	dead ends, Jackson dead ends. The
6	neighborhood just dies right when it gets
7	there, you know.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: It dies
9	right at those points?
10	MR. McLAURIN: It dies right
11	there. I mean, you can see the white line and
12	it just stops. Now, there is an alley that
13	connects 5 th and 6 th , but, you know, I did it
14	today before I came over here, just to make
15	sure I go back over there. I always try to do
16	that before a hearing, but it just
17	everything dead ends. Those white lines
18	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: You mean
19	like cul-de-sacs or they just
20	MR. McLAURIN: No. No, it just
21	dead ends.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Just dead

ends.

MR. McLAURIN: And, you know, it took me a bunch of turns to try to get back around, so in some cases up here by the Redemptorists, you kind of turn into a parking lot for the adjacent building. But, you know, our idea basically is to continue the street grade. I mean, you know, bring Hamlin in, continue 6th Street, continue 5th Street, give these people connectivity to the neighborhood.

So the neighborhood can come in, nothing is gated. We can go out and really -- but also pedestrian and walkability to give people a way to walk to the Metro. So, you know, part of the improvements on Jackson Street that Mr. Lester talked about that part of the purpose is, you know, to continue the pedestrian connectivity.

And then Smart Growth alleys, rear loaded garages, porches, activate the porches, some of you are very knowledgeable on, you know, design principles there.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um, so
2	okay. I think my issue is clearly I see the
3	word compatibility, but I'm just trying to
4	understand if let's go to the larger.
5	Yeah, if I'm south of the site and I'm in one
6	of the row in one of the homes, and these
7	are single-family detached homes?
8	MR. FEOLA: Attached.
9	MR. McLAURIN: Attached.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Attached.
11	MR. McLAURIN: Row homes.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Attached
13	homes. They are row houses. They are row
14	dwellings.
15	MR. FEOLA: Right.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. So
17	if I'm looking in to the new development, I'm
18	looking in some cases at alleys in the back of
19	homes. Am I ever looking at an alley?
20	MR. FEOLA: Sure.
21	MR. McLAURIN: Go back to the site
22	plan. In this particular case, can we go

1	through the
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Can you
3	talk get in the mike?
4	MR. McLAURIN: Yeah. He's drawing
5	it.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
7	MR. FEOLA: Having been very
8	involved in the design of the site plan, I
9	think what you are focused on is what is that
10	view that you see when you are on an existing
11	street of the neighborhood.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:
12 13	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Absolutely.
13	Absolutely.
13 14	Absolutely. MR. FEOLA: In every case, we try
13 14 15	Absolutely. MR. FEOLA: In every case, we try to continue the streetscape. So if there was
13 14 15 16	Absolutely. MR. FEOLA: In every case, we try to continue the streetscape. So if there was an existing front of the house on a particular
13 14 15 16 17	Absolutely. MR. FEOLA: In every case, we try to continue the streetscape. So if there was an existing front of the house on a particular street, that we continued that row of row
13 14 15 16 17	Absolutely. MR. FEOLA: In every case, we try to continue the streetscape. So if there was an existing front of the house on a particular street, that we continued that row of row homes.
13 14 15 16 17 18	Absolutely. MR. FEOLA: In every case, we try to continue the streetscape. So if there was an existing front of the house on a particular street, that we continued that row of row homes. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. FEOLA: So you would have that 2 3 continuation or the feel. On the -- there is one area between 6th Street and Hamlin where 4 there is an existing alley that makes the 5 In that particular case, yeah, 6 connection. there, but going up to the north between 6th 7 and Hamlin, that's where we actually backed up 8 9 units to the alley, because you weren't on a public street. 10 11 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. FEOLA: So then when you, if 12 you go back to the site plan, actually hit 13 Hamlin, then you are again coming into looking 14 at the fronts of houses as opposed to looking 15 16 at rears. You are looking at front yards. Now, at Jackson, it's interesting, because on 17 one side you have an institutional use, on the 18 19 other side you have multi-family. 20 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum. 21 MR. FEOLA: And again, we had

fronts of houses lining the street as you came

1 | in.

2.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.

MR. FEOLA: So there is really no place that you would be coming into the site looking at an alley. I mean, there is one instance, as Jack pointed out, in the lower part of the site where we actually fronted a public park and our houses between 5th and 6th against the community alley --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.

MR. FEOLA: -- but that was in direct response to community suggestions about how they wanted that area treated. Not necessarily in an ideal way from the development standpoint, but more importantly from what the community was looking to see.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah. I mean, one of the reasons I asked the question is that I see you are really dressing up the backside, the rear of your row homes. And so normally when that happens, you know, you are trying to address a potential problem, but

okay, I'm happy with your response.

And I guess it might be helpful and, you know, I have been known to swing through some of these things, but, you know, obviously, this isn't in site plan, but it might be good to, you know, get a couple of vignettes, you know, showing perspectives or just so that we are clear about exactly what those views are.

I just -- you know, because how it's illustrated here, it looks like, you know, a campus, which is what it is, and those lines seem very hard, but they really are not that hard. They just -- the illustration seems to make it look as if it's hard. But it's more integrated, so that's where my question was.

And then also, I would like to see a couple of volumetric studies within the actual campus. I see the perspective that -you know, again, we're getting all these impressionistic renderings that are coming

through here, but just something that shows some volume, particularly for the 36 foot wide courtyard, your typical courtyard.

I just want to see and if you can put something in scale, people or whatever, so I get a sense, because 36, I was trying to count these ceiling tiles. It's pretty close, but then I don't have the height to get a sense of what that space feels like.

MR. FEOLA: It's almost --

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah, I figured it out. It was almost 36, but again, I don't have the height, so I don't know. So if -- you know, I don't think you need to do it all over the place, but I just need to get a sense of just what that feels like. Because again, it goes back to just making certain that I'm -- it's not too dense.

MR. McLAURIN: You know, I'm not sure we can satisfy tonight, but we did provide some photographs. The photo in the very center of the image there is a project

that we built in Arlington, which won the ULI 1 Award of Excellence and that is a 36 foot wide 2. 3 courtyard with basically three stories plus a dorm or level facing the courtyard. 4 And the other thing it is closed 5 off at the end, basically. In all of our 6 7 courtyards now, they are opened at both ends, which also helps to, you know, soften that 8 9 But we have been very -- we have not had an issue with regard to that relationship 10 11 between height and width. And we felt comfortable, having built it numerous times 12 before, that it would work in this particular 13 case as well. But we can provide you --14 15 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah, 16 I look at Harrison Square and this is a wonderful example of showing sort of the 17 existing -- well, actually, that wasn't there 18 19 when you did it. 20 MR. McLAURIN: Correct. 21 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: But you 22 know, it shows the new and the old and how it

1	interfaces and so forth. And again, it gives
2	some, you know
3	MR. McLAURIN: Context.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah,
5	context. And that's now, can you show me,
6	where is it exactly? I mean, I have seen it,
7	but I don't know exactly where.
8	MR. McLAURIN: Which?
9	MR. FEOLA: What are we looking
10	at, Commissioner Jeffries?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No, I'm
12	trying to see that slide. Where is it?
13	MR. FEOLA: Oh.
14	MR. McLAURIN: Oh, in the
15	MR. FEOLA: PowerPoint.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Sort of
17	in the open space section?
18	MR. McLAURIN: The open space
19	section. I think we should number these.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah.
21	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Right after the
22	5 th and 6 th Street.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh, okay.
2	Okay.
3	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Street
4	provisions.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
6	Ah, there we go.
7	MR. YOUNGENTOB: And it's also
8	important to note, and we will illustrate this
9	per your request, that some of those
10	buildings, some of the homes in those
11	courtyards would be 2.5 stories because of the
12	way the grade works.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
14	MR. YOUNGENTOB: The fronts would
15	be partially buried.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
17	Okay. The other question I had was the
18	affordable units. So did you comment? I know
19	that the Office of Planning had concern that
20	all the affordable units were 14 feet in
21	width. Has that changed or is that still
22	where you are?

1	MR. YOUNGENTOB: That has not
2	changed, correct.
3	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
4	MR. McLAURIN: That's correct.
5	Part of the concern was that we matched
6	proportionately the bedroom count in the
7	units. So for instance, the majority of our
8	market rate homes are three bedrooms on this
9	site. The majority of the homes, the
10	affordable homes will be three bedroom.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Three
12	bedrooms. So the second floor, so what size
13	bedrooms are we looking at with the 14 foot
14	wide?
15	MR. McLAURIN: Basically, on the
16	ground level, there is a smaller bedroom. I
17	believe it is probably, I think, 9 x about 10.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
19	MR. McLAURIN: On the ground
20	level.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
22	MR. McLAURIN: And then on the
l	

1	main living level, there are two bedrooms that
2	are the full width of the house, so basically
3	those are
4	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
5	MR. McLAURIN: 13 feet wide by,
6	in most cases, 10, at least 10 feet. And then
7	the master would either be in the front or the
8	back and that would also be 13 wide x
9	potentially 12 or 13 feet long. So we have
10	built a 14 foot affordable house numerous
11	times.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
13	MR. McLAURIN: Not getting up to
14	fall back on past experience saying it's
15	always right, but it has been a very
16	successful affordable dwelling unit that has
17	been used in Montgomery County as well as in
18	the District.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: But you
20	have done a 16 foot wide affordable unit as
21	well?
22	MR. McLAURIN: Um, at Arthur
ļ	

actually, most of them have been 14 feet. 1 2 Capper, they are -- actually, there are some 3 20 foot units, but they are much shallower. They are not the full depth of the houses that 4 5 we are doing here. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum. 6 7 MR. McLAURIN: So they are like 20 opposed to And so 8 30 14 36. as X 9 volumetrically, they are very similar in size. We are just using the width and the length in 10 11 a different manner. 12 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. Then my last question, and these are real 13 basic questions, is that I'm just curious 14 15 about the Neo-Gothic design that you came It just seems so literal and safe and 16 I'm just wondering what was the driver behind 17 that? 18 19 just -- I mean, it is just 20 always sort of -- I'm always curious about, you know, when you have an opportunity to sort 21

do a breakout different kind of

contemporary design and you sort of give us 1 something that looks very much like what you 2 I'm just curious about 3 already have there. the philosophy. 4 5 MR. McLAURIN: I quess, you know, from the developer perspective and giving 6 direction to the architect, I think part of 7 this was in response as we went through the 8 9 RFP process with the Paulists. One of the things, I think, that was really -- that we 10 11 tried to respect was this viewshed and view 12 corridor of the existing college building. And it is a spectacular view. 13 When you drive down 4 th Street 14 15 today and you look to the left and you see, you know, the open space and the existing 16 17 mature trees and you see that building sitting 18 up on the hill, I quess we really wanted to 19 try to create something that reflected that 20 college, especially in the buildings that were most prominent in your view of the main 21 22 college building.

1	Now, could we have gone
2	contemporary Gothic? I mean we probably could
3	have. I think, you know, we kind of looked at
4	it from a traditionalist perspective and said
5	let's try to reflect the history of the
6	building, not try to create kind of a modern
7	interpretation. And, you know, there is no
8	right answer in my view.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah. I
10	mean, you know, it almost looks like a dorm of
11	sorts, you know, from the period. I mean,
12	listen, you know, it's just, you know, one
13	man's taste. But I just, you know, sort of
14	wish that it could have been a, you know,
15	different departure, that's all. I mean,
16	just, you know, that so
17	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Just for a
18	reference, I didn't specifically call it out,
19	but it's these two buildings here.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I got it.
21	MR. YOUNGENTOB: And then it's
22	this one up here.

1 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum. 2 MR. McLAURIN: But, you know, I 3 think Bob is right. I mean, it's the very initial decision. How respectful are you? 4 5 You know, we have tried to create, you know, an entire frame as you would see 4th Street. 6 7 And really that first decision, you know, is backed up by stone or no stone. And once you 8 9 do that, you know, it's kind of hard to go 10 modern with -- unless you start using cut 11 stone. 12 This will probably be more field stone, because the college is very 13 blocky and is cut stone. But you know, we 14 15 felt kid and play wasn't really the right way 16 to go on this one. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And one 17 18 last question. Is there any -- other than --19 you know, sorry, kid and play. They really do 20 pay attention to what we say up here, huh? MR. FEOLA: And even worse than 21

that, it's transcribed.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: 1 Yeah, qot 2 it, got it. 3 MR. FEOLA: So people can read it later. 4 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Got it. 5 You know, one of the struggles that, you know, 6 7 I always have with these townhome developments that are wide sweepings, is that they are so 8 9 incredibly horizontal. And you know, I wish a few things could just pop up and just show 10 11 some variety of roof lines and so forth. Ι clearly understand the 12 I understand what you are trying 13 limitations. to create. So obviously, the college, the 14 15 main building is -- you know, serves that. 16 You know, I just -- again, it's just these are more observations. And again, you know, I 17 think the project is a very good project. 18 19 you know, I'm in favor of it. But I just --20 you know, just general observations, you know. I think you have done a wonderful 21 22 job of really articulating and really trying

to create some variety and some texture to the 1 2 place. But, you know, when you look at that, 3 that's a horizontal plane. And I know you've got a setback. I know you got the third --4 you're going to mention something else? 5 6 MR. YOUNGENTOB: If I may, you 7 know, that was one of our very early drawings. If you look at some of the more technical 8 9 elevations that are part of the application, there is so much grade and topography on the 10 11 site that what you are looking at up on the screen is probably a very rare occurrence. 12 there will be a lot of articulation. 13 And it was actually extremely 14 15 challenging to work with the engineer in the 16 grading to get this to work. So you're going 17 rolling architecture to see some 18 streetscapes. 19 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Then it 20 goes back to the illustration, because it would be nice if I could see something like 21

that, because then I think, you know, at least

1	I get more comfortable that this is going to
2	be an interesting, you know, campus, townhouse
3	campus plan and not just you know, so I'm
4	appreciative of that. Thank you very much.
5	That's it, Mr. Chair.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
7	Etherly?
8	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Thank you
9	very much, Mr. Chair. Very, very briefly.
10	First of all, just a very full and complete
11	presentation, so thank you to all of the
12	presenters for an excellent body of work.
13	I wanted to follow-up on Mr.
14	Jeffries' question again coming back to kind
15	of the Neo-Gothic architectural decision. And
16	I think in part, Mr. McLaurin, your response
17	was very helpful to me in terms of
18	understanding what was the thinking behind it.
19	I think I was very clear at the
20	start from the presentation about the respect
21	and the homage, if you will, to the primary

building on the Paulist campus and a desire to

1	be respectful of that.
2	So just to make sure I'm clear,
3	the buildings that will have that presentation
4	or the buildings that you are suggesting for
5	that presentation are 28 and 29 and then
6	Building No. 9 in your site plan?
7	MR. FEOLA: Yeah, I'll dig it out.
8	We can confirm that.
9	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: No, no
10	problem. No problem.
11	MR. FEOLA: Again, it's the
12	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Those two
12 13	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Those two there.
13	there.
13 14	there. MR. FEOLA: red roofs.
13 14 15	there. MR. FEOLA: red roofs. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes.
13 14 15 16	there. MR. FEOLA: red roofs. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes. MR. FEOLA: Here and then that one
13 14 15 16 17	there. MR. FEOLA: red roofs. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes. MR. FEOLA: Here and then that one up there.
13 14 15 16 17	there. MR. FEOLA: red roofs. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes. MR. FEOLA: Here and then that one up there. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: And again,
13 14 15 16 17 18	there. MR. FEOLA: red roofs. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes. MR. FEOLA: Here and then that one up there. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: And again, the driver was from a 4 th Street perspective,

quess our feeling was, you know, stepping back 1 2. like Commissioner Jeffries saying if we 3 continue the same architecture without any nod towards the college, it would look like who 4 5 was there first and maybe the college just kind of landed in the middle, you know, of 6 7 this block. So I think it was intended to be a 8 9 transition. It was a very literal interpretation of the school within the mass 10 11 and form of a row home. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: 12 Okay. 13 MR. McLAURIN: You know, with flush fronts and whatnot. But the materials 14 15 will be slightly different. Today's technology is different. 16 The craftsmanship is different. So we were comfortable with the 17 limitations we have today that it wasn't going 18 19 to be an exact duplication and end up feeling 20 like a dorm just because you have front doors and stoops. And by the time you have your 21

front yards and your street trees, we think it

1	will blend into the topography, you know, a
2	lot more.
3	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. And
4	with respect to the representation of that
5	building, one of the representations in the
6	prehearing submission information, shows this
7	building color elevation of that, of what
8	those three buildings potentially would look
9	like. Is that meant to be fairly
10	representative or
11	MR. McLAURIN: No, that was an
12	old
13	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Gotcha.
14	MR. McLAURIN: matched an old
15	land plan. And when we made changes to the
16	site plan and changed the main roadway, the
17	configuration of the building and we no longer
18	have a garage that is entranced off of that
19	main roadway
20	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yeah.
21	MR. McLAURIN: which is in the
22	alley

1	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yeah,
2	gotcha.
3	MR. McLAURIN: the rendering
4	changed.
5	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: But the
6	coloring, the coloring you are hoping to stick
7	fairly close to?
8	MR. McLAURIN: And again, you
9	know, I didn't bring the stone sample, because
10	it was just too heavy for me.
11	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: I
12	understand.
13	MR. McLAURIN: But you know, what
14	you see up there is respectful of what we
15	intend to build.
16	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
17	MR. FEOLA: Commissioner Etherly?
18	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes?
19	MR. FEOLA: It is Building 9,
20	Buildings 9, 28, and 29.
21	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. I'm
22	tempted to ask when you first used the word

1	viewshed, I for a moment thought that you were
2	speaking about the view from the Paulist
3	campus looking out. So is it correct to say
4	that the driver for those three buildings is
5	the viewshed looking in from 4 th Street?
6	MR. McLAURIN: Yes, that's a true
7	statement. But I think it's also the college,
8	you know, like Father said, will exist in its
9	continued form. They have activity there.
10	They have occupants. They have residents.
11	They want to feel like, you know, they are in
12	a campus. Maybe that makes some sense. These
13	two buildings here sort of geometrically
14	frame, you know, the inside corner of this Y-
14 15	
	frame, you know, the inside corner of this Y-
15	frame, you know, the inside corner of this Y-shaped college
15 16	frame, you know, the inside corner of this Y-shaped college COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum.
15 16 17	frame, you know, the inside corner of this Y- shaped college COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum. MR. McLAURIN: in the circle.
15 16 17 18	frame, you know, the inside corner of this Y- shaped college COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum. MR. McLAURIN: in the circle. That's a prominent location for the college.
15 16 17 18	frame, you know, the inside corner of this Y- shaped college COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum. MR. McLAURIN: in the circle. That's a prominent location for the college. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Indeed.

1	college, but we are framing that specific open
2	space right there.
3	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Did you
4	give any thought to potentially extending that
5	to Buildings 27 and 26?
6	MR. McLAURIN: Which I'm assuming
7	are these two?
8	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes, sir.
9	MR. McLAURIN: No, because we
10	did. Of course, we discussed it, but, you
11	know, now we are really relating more towards,
12	you know, the existing homes and completing
13	the block pattern over there. As Mr.
14	Youngentob said, there is an existing alley
15	there.
16	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: I see.
17	MR. McLAURIN: Yeah, so we are now
18	creating the other half of the alley in the
19	block pattern.
20	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
21	MR. McLAURIN: I mean, at one
22	point we had to sort of stop.

COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: 1 Okay. Ι see. 2 I see. 3 MR. McLAURIN: And we did discuss, you know, it's quite expensive for them to do 4 buildings. We did discuss 5 stone these potentially going back, you know, when the 6 7 market went down, but we feel really strong about trying to tell the right story out 8 9 there. 10 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. So we stuck with 11 MR. McLAURIN: it. 12 And just to 13 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: make sure, I'm going to jump to another topic 14 15 now, but still on the architectural piece. 16 One of the presentations of the town, and I'm looking for the representation of it, the 17 typical 2.5 story elevation here, I wanted to 18 19 be sure that I'm clear, is it the wrought iron 20 or iron work quard rails, are those optional those are intended to be kind of the 21 or

standard presentation as you move across the

1	frontage here?
2	MR. McLAURIN: Right here?
3	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes.
4	MR. McLAURIN: They are there.
5	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
6	MR. McLAURIN: I mean, because the
7	porches and again a lot of topography and the
8	grade, this is our buried front here. And the
9	porches will be more than 30 inches out of the
10	ground pretty much in all the cases. So it is
11	our intention to put a metal railing up there.
12	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. Were
1 2	there other options that you considered? And
13	
14	clearly, of course, I'm the one up here who
14	clearly, of course, I'm the one up here who
14 15	clearly, of course, I'm the one up here who doesn't have an architectural background, so
14 15 16	clearly, of course, I'm the one up here who doesn't have an architectural background, so sometimes perhaps my reaction to wrought iron
14 15 16 17	clearly, of course, I'm the one up here who doesn't have an architectural background, so sometimes perhaps my reaction to wrought iron may be vague or most certainly uninformed.
14 15 16 17	clearly, of course, I'm the one up here who doesn't have an architectural background, so sometimes perhaps my reaction to wrought iron may be vague or most certainly uninformed. Were there other options?
14 15 16 17 18	clearly, of course, I'm the one up here who doesn't have an architectural background, so sometimes perhaps my reaction to wrought iron may be vague or most certainly uninformed. Were there other options? MR. McLAURIN: We could certainly

1	simplistic wrought iron. And part of the idea
2	with wrought iron is make it disappear
3	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum.
4	MR. McLAURIN: to some degree
5	and let the brick work and the other materials
6	kind of speak for themselves. But wood would
7	not be wrong as well and we would be happy to
8	have a mix and a variety.
9	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: And I'm
LO	most certainly not animated enough about it to
11	say yeah, change it to wood. I just wanted to
L2	kind of get a little sense for the
13	understanding.
14	MR. McLAURIN: Right.
15	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: And as you
16	indicated, if it does help to blend or
L7	disappear somewhat, so you have a clarity in
L8	terms of the presentation, then I'm fine with
L9	it.
20	MR. YOUNGENTOB: We have a
21	photograph actually of Bryant School, a South
22	Carolina frontage, that actually has a similar

1	treatment that I'll give I think will give
2	you a better sense of how it actually looks.
3	And it does kind of disappear in the
4	elevation. Let me see if I can find that
5	really quickly. There it is. The no.
6	Keep going. Right here, the lower right.
7	Maybe if we can turn the lights down once
8	again?
9	MR. McLAURIN: Wrought iron is
10	such a prominent element in the District of
11	Columbia. I mean, there is some wood. To
12	some degree, we want to be maintenance
13	friendly.
14	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum.
15	MR. McLAURIN: Not maintenance
16	free, but maintenance friendly.
17	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
18	MR. McLAURIN: If this was a
19	colonial town like Alexandria, it might be
20	more wood that you would see.
21	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: I see. I
22	see. So it's safe to say that I mean,

1	would you describe it as being consistent with
2	some of the other architectural cues that are
3	present in the existing neighborhood?
4	MR. McLAURIN: Yes, I would.
5	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
6	MR. McLAURIN: But I would, you
7	know, preface it by saying the pallet is wide.
8	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
9	MR. McLAURIN: You know,
10	aesthetically, there is a lot to work from,
11	but it is consistent.
12	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
13	Okay. Let me make sure I'm clear. Again, I'm
14	kind of staying in the architectural context
15	for a moment, but let me make sure that I'm
16	clear on the rational for the brick on the
17	corner buildings. If I recall correctly from
18	the presentation for all of your buildings on
19	the rear elevations, you are doing brick on
20	the corner. Is that correct?
21	MR. McLAURIN: Well, the end
22	units.

1	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: The end
2	units.
3	MR. McLAURIN: We take the you
4	know, they are brick fronts. Can you just go
5	one go to the okay. So, you know,
6	everything is brick fronts.
7	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum.
8	MR. McLAURIN: So but on the ends
9	we will turn and put brick on full brick on
10	the sides. And then go to the site plan. And
11	then we bring it, one unit, into the alley
12	because even though we do a pretty good job of
13	trying to make the alleys go away and dress
14	them up, you know, and make them look
15	attractive and put some landscaping, there
16	really are physical vistas into the alley. So
17	as you are driving down this street, you are
18	really going to kind of see the end of these
19	buildings in the rear.
20	So the idea is, you know, that
21	transition from brick right at the corner and

it just goes to siding, it always looks like,

1	you know, you made the wrong it's a cost
2	decision. And that's not what we're about.
3	We're really about creating, you know, a sense
4	of place and environment, so we bring the
5	brick into the alley.
6	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay, okay.
7	MR. McLAURIN: One unit.
8	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: No, no, I'm
9	very appreciative of it. I have the good
10	fortune of trying to pretend like I was
11	playing golf earlier this week and I won't
12	discuss my score, but it happened to be up in
13	Montgomery County, Hampshire Greens. It's a
14	course with million dollar homes, brick front
15	and then boom you are hitting siding.
16	MR. McLAURIN: Right.
17	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Literally
18	in my golf games case, I am actually hitting
19	siding. But I get it. I mean, again, it's a
20	nod towards trying to improve the aesthetic,
21	if you will, as you are traversing the

So that makes sense to me.

22

streetscape.

1	Okay. Let me, if I could, Ms.
2	Milanovich, for a moment, thank you very much.
3	Thank you, Mr. McLaurin, that was most
4	certainly very helpful to me in that regard.
5	Ms. Milanovich, good evening to you.
6	MS. MILANOVICH: Good evening.
7	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: A very
8	quick question for you on the traffic piece.
9	I just wanted to make sure I was clear on the
10	rational for the study area that was selected
11	for the traffic plan. Was there discussion
12	with DDOT about extending that study area in
13	any way or was there fairly quick and fast
14	agreement that those were the most appropriate
15	corridors to kind of look at?
16	MS. MILANOVICH: Yeah, I think it
17	was a fairly quick agreement. And again, as
18	I said, that's a fairly significant study
19	area, considering the size of the development.
20	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. And
21	I'm not suggesting that I'm skeptical. Okay.
22	I'll leave it there for the moment. There was

another slide that you indicated which showed the proposed vehicle trips that you would anticipate being created in the a.m. and p.m. rush hour. And I just want to make sure I understood the subtraction math that is happening here.

MS. MILANOVICH: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: For the non-auto trips, the 39 and the 46 number, the 39 in the a.m. and the 46 in the p.m., those are adjustments that you are making, if I'm reading the asterisk correctly, based on census data, you are assuming that those numbers of trips are going to come out of your total trip number?

MS. MILANOVICH: Right. Actually, the census data is slightly higher than 35.

It's nearly 45. The 35 came about with discussions with DDOT. They felt a little more comfortable with the 35 percent. The thing to keep in mind is the top numbers that are shown there, the total person trips, the

2.

1	111 and the 132 p.m. peak hour
2	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Meaning
3	regardless of how someone leaves the property,
4	that's a person trip?
5	MS. MILANOVICH: Right. Whether
6	they leave in their car or whether they leave
7	by foot to go to the Metro.
8	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Segue?
9	MS. MILANOVICH: Exactly.
10	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Whatever.
11	Okay.
12	MS. MILANOVICH: The manual that
13	we use, it's a national manual.
14	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum.
15	MS. MILANOVICH: It's the
16	Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip
17	Generation Manual. Those rates are based on
18	sites that are not proximate to any type of
19	public transportation. They are largely
20	suburban areas that don't have that
21	connectivity to Metro or readily available
22	public transportation.

COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum. 1 2 MS. MILANOVICH: So in order to 3 adjust that, we need to make an estimate in terms of what we believe, what percentage we 4 5 believe will use public transportation. looked at two sources. One was data from 6 7 WMATA, which actually indicated a 50 percent reduction. And then the other was the census 8 9 data, which about the was 45 percent reduction. 10 11 Again, little we are а more We only took a 35 percent 12 conservative. reduction on the recommendation of DDOT. 13 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: 14 15 Okay. And with respect to some of the mitigation 16 traffic recommendations, optimization of the traffic signal timings, 17 are those intended to be such that you are 18 19 going to markedly impact the level of service 20 at those particular intersections or are they more kind of subtle tweakings if you will? 21

MILANOVICH:

MS.

22

They are more

1	subtle tweakings. Because of the signal
2	system in the District, all of the
3	intersections are interconnected such that if
4	you make significant changes at one, it could
5	greatly impact the downstream intersection.
6	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: It's a
7	domino. Okay. Okay. And I think finally,
8	with respect to the thank you very much,
9	Ms. Milanovich.
10	MS. MILANOVICH: You're welcome.
11	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: I'm moving
12	off of you and I'm perhaps coming back to
13	close on a discussion about the corner park.
14	I just wanted to make sure I was clear about
15	if I understood in the presentation and it
16	might have been under your remarks, Mr.
17	McLaurin, did I understand you to say that
18	there are doors on the vicinity an I believe
19	it was a slide that had the greater level of
20	detail. There are doors along that side?
21	MR. McLAURIN: Yes, that's right.
22	We are fronting the park with a building of

1	row homes here.
2	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
3	MR. McLAURIN: So there will be
4	front doors and a combination of porches and
5	front yards. Again, you know, coming out onto
6	a lead walk elevated by the 3 to 4 foot
7	retaining wall above the park. So eyes on the
8	you know, part of our philosophy, eyes on
9	the public spaces, front doors on the public
10	spaces.
11	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: And what
12	is
13	MR. McLAURIN: And that park
14	again, that park doubled in size.
15	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
16	MR. McLAURIN: Approximately
17	doubled in size between the change.
18	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: And so on
19	the other side of the park
20	MR. McLAURIN: About 50 percent.
21	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: as you
22	come back towards the amphitheater, the

stadium steps, if you will, those are rears on 1 the other side, correct? Yes, sir? 2. 3 MR. McLAURIN: Well, they are sides. 4 5 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. They are sides. 6 MR. McLAURIN: 7 you know, you will have one of the courtyards right here that, you know, will be -- you will 8 9 be able to be here and kind of look all across This is an alley here. 10 the courtyard. And 11 then this is another courtyard here. So these are the sides. The front door is here. 12 that -- what you call an amphitheater it's 13 really a hardscape area where --14 15 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum. 16 MR. McLAURIN: -- people can sit or gather or congregate with a focal point, a 17 focal feature which, you know, I don't think 18 19 we have really determined what that is yet. 20 But so here is the corner park right here. the front doors for these units face into the 21

courtyard, eyes on the courtyard, and then the

1	ends of the buildings, which will be all
2	brick, are what you would see. So it's not
3	uncommon -
4	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: I see.
5	MR. McLAURIN: for the District
6	to see ends of buildings like that. You know,
7	public streets, that's a very typical pattern.
8	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: I see. Was
9	there any thought given to and again, this
10	line of questioning is fairly unusual for me,
11	because I kind of leave it to our architects
12	on the Board to kind of veer into some of
13	this, but given that they do border onto the
14	park, was there any discussion about any
15	different treatment in terms of articulating
16	those sides? And as I orient myself on the
17	site plan, Building 21 and 20, to an extent,
18	yeah 21 and 20, because they are bordering the
19	park, was there some discussion about doing
20	anything different with those side elevations?
21	MR. McLAURIN: Well, the we
22	feel like we have are in pretty good shape,
Į.	

that the sides are ready. I mean, we didn't downplay the sides. We feel like the attention we naturally put into the architecture, full brick, symmetrical window patterns.

COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum.

MR. McLAURIN: You know,
traditionally in the District sides are
ignored. And quite often they are very blank,
you know, but we want again windows on the
street and whatnot, so we feel like we have
provided a sufficient level of architectural
detail in materials on the sides.

COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.

MR. McLAURIN: We did discuss, you know, fronting that street, but that means we have to front, you know, or back up to some of the adjoining property owners. So this building orientation gave us the courtyards which would connect, you know, visually to the adjoining property, but give us, you know, the ends on the public street like we're talking

2.

1	about.
2	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
3	Excellent. Thank you. Thank you very much
4	for your responses. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,
6	colleagues for asking your questions. Mr.
7	Turnbull, you have?
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I wonder
9	if I could just add two more questions that
10	came up after, especially after, Commissioner
11	Etherly was talking about the park. And it
12	brings the the parks are seen as being used
13	how? I mean, you can walk your dog. I see
14	some benches. I don't see any playground
15	equipment though in any of the parks or
16	anything.
17	MR. McLAURIN: There is,
18	obviously, a variety of public open spaces in
19	the community. There is where we are
20	building the public park off-site, there is a
21	significant playground there.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:

22

Okay.

1	MR. McLAURIN: What the way the
2	property is used today, the community does
3	come in and basically, you know, use some of
4	the open space to play, to throw footballs,
5	throw softballs, and I think that is the
6	intention of the Paulists to allow that
7	community use to continue, especially on the
8	broader areas of the campus.
9	So I think what we tried to do
10	with regard to the more formalized parks was
11	to create both passive and really smaller
12	recreation areas where you might be able to
13	throw a frisbee with a young child, but not
14	have a formal softball game or things like
15	that.
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
17	MR. McLAURIN: So we are
18	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But it
19	seems defensive.
20	MR. McLAURIN: I'm sorry?
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Those
22	faces are still somewhat defensive spaces?

1	MR. McLAURIN: Defensive in terms
2	of?
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah, I
4	mean, there is still some privacy.
5	
	MR. McLAURIN: Absolutely.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean,
7	okay.
8	MR. McLAURIN: Absolutely, yeah.
9	And so we do have a variety of open spaces
LO	between the smaller courtyards of the corner
11	park and a larger expanse. There is a tot lot
12	located on-site, which is located, which is
L3	the sheet here, L1.01, in your package and
L4	Jack is going to locate it, right there
15	directly off of where Jackson Street comes
16	into the site, as well as down in the area
L7	between 5 th and 6 th Street in the small
L8	courtyard there.
19	And what we tend to do is we
20	don't, you know, put in, you know, typical
21	large scale playground equipment, but there
22	are smaller scale equipment that is more

1	compatible with younger children in
2	residential settings
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Sure.
4	MR. McLAURIN: like that. So
5	there is a balance between both young children
6	playing active play areas, passive
7	recreation areas, places to walk your dog, a
8	place to just sit and read a book on a bench
9	and then you still have the larger scale open
10	space as well as community open space in the
11	broader area.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I
13	wonder if we could go back to the elevation of
14	the typical the 2.5 story row house
15	elevation? I guess what I'm seeing here, most
16	of these fronts are painted brick on this
17	particular grouping? I mean, I look on the
18	panel
19	MR. McLAURIN: I mean, it looks
20	like 50/50 maybe.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is there
22	am I looking at three panels of painted and

1	three panels of not?
2	MR. McLAURIN: Well, it looks like
3	we are showing you four painted, two that are
4	not.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Not.
6	MR. McLAURIN: On that one.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay. I'm
8	just curious, as we go up into the loft area,
9	you are shifting to the hardy plank?
10	MR. McLAURIN: Hardy panel, right.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And it's
12	reading as a complete monolithic color all the
13	way across? Will it be like a ghost image
14	back there?
15	MR. McLAURIN: Yeah, sometimes we
16	do vary the shades of the colors, but the idea
17	is that when we use the hardy panel versus a
18	plank or siding material, it does disappear a
19	little bit more. They really are hard to see
20	from the public realm. I mean, if you are in
21	an upper floor directly across the street, you
22	would see them. But, you know, walking down

1	the sidewalk, they are very difficult to see.
2	So instead of calling attention to
3	them and painting them bright colors, matching
4	the fronts, we tend to just basically play
5	them down.
6	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
7	Question, what's and I couldn't tell on the
8	plans, what happens between the units? Is
9	there a fence?
10	MR. McLAURIN: There is a parapet
11	wall at a guard rail height of 42 inches
12	between the two. So there is no fence. That
13	parapet wall at the guard rail height is the
14	same height as the parapet on the front.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
16	MR. McLAURIN: So there is no
17	there are no projections that you see. I
18	mean, so you know, they really just disappear.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Uh-huh.
20	And there is now, you have lights at the
21	top of each of those?
22	MR. McLAURIN: We just have a

1	it's a very simple light at the door, which we
2	need by code. There is a door that accesses
3	the roof terrace up there.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: How does
5	that read? I mean, I'm just curious with they
6	are all on at night. I suppose that during
7	Christmas time, they could all get together
8	and light the whole thing up.
9	MR. YOUNGENTOB: It's
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: A joint
11	MR. YOUNGENTOB: a great
12	comment, because I think what really does
13	happen, it does become a very communal type
14	environment.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah.
16	MR. YOUNGENTOB: That people do
17	tend to interact across one deck to the other.
18	They don't climb over the parapet walls, but
19	they may be passing a drink one night or
20	whatever. But when you are sitting down in a
21	chair, the parapet wall basically, you know,
22	hides view from one deck to the other.

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Yeah.
2	MR. YOUNGENTOB: So there is some
3	sense of privacy, but it does become a social
4	area. And as far as, you know, the lighting,
5	the lighting is kept low. I mean, in terms of
6	the wattage of bulbs.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Is it
8	down-laying or is it
9	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: It's
11	primarily down?
12	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Down lighting,
13	correct.
14	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
15	Thank you.
16	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Yep.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
18	I have the opportunity of presenting questions
19	from Commission May tonight. Commissioner May
20	will he only has 14 tonight, so but I think
21	a lot of the submittals and he has already
22	read the transcript. I was just joking,

Commissioner May.

2.

But anyway, I will say that I think a number of submittals that were given to us this evening will address some of these issues. But I would ask Mr. Feola and to the applicant that we address this as succinct as possible. So if we do propose and get the final, it will help address some of his concerns.

And I think this first one has already been addressed by a submittal we had this evening. He says, and I'm going to read exactly as he has it, what steps has the applicant taken to address the concerns of the Provincial or the Redemptorists?

And I will say that I think that that has been addressed in the submittal that we had tonight. But if you don't think so, I would ask that you comment on that.

MR. FEOLA: That is correct. And the Redemptorists filed a letter in the record indicating --

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right.
2	MR. FEOLA: that they are now
3	satisfied.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think
5	that has already been addressed.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Question
7	2?
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Question 2.
9	Commissioner Jeffries is asking for Question
10	2. It's an inside joke. Can anything be done
11	to reduce or eliminate the side yard relief
12	being requested? In particular, the 1.5 foot
13	side yard at Units 1 through 5 is too small.
14	No, I'm sorry, is too small. And the 6.5 foot
15	side yards along the east side is also too
16	small.
17	MR. FEOLA: Mr. Chairman, could
18	you repeat those numbers again, please?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. It says can
20	anything be done to reduce or eliminate the
21	side yard relief being requested? In
22	particular, the 1.5 foot side yard at Units 1

1	through 5 is too small and the 6.5 foot side
2	yards along the east side is also too small.
3	MR. MORELOCK: Do you want me to
4	address that, Phil?
5	MR. FEOLA: Yes. Yeah, I am
6	assuming he means by units, he means the
7	building, because Lots 1 through 5 are
8	townhouses that abut against each other. Mr.
9	Morelock, the civil engineer, can talk about
10	that specifically.
11	MR. MORELOCK: Hello, I'm Mark
12	Morelock with VIKA. Our business address is
13	in Germantown, Maryland. The Buildings 1
14	through 5 face the north side of the property,
15	that's the Council of Bishops.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Um-hum.
17	MR. MORELOCK: We have entered
18	into an agreement with the Bishops for 15 foot
19	new build zone, I mean, a fire restriction
20	zone, so there is a green space adjacent to
21	those five units off-site that will be entered
22	into the record that won't allow any structure

1	closer than that. So in reality, you will
2	have a setback that's larger than the foot and
3	a half.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So that's
5	something that will get submitted before
6	proposed?
7	MR. MORELOCK: Yes.
8	MR. FEOLA: It's in the drawing,
9	yes.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We already
11	have it? Do we already? No. And the reason,
12	if it wasn't something that was submitted
13	tonight, he reviewed this record. And I know
14	if we if it was not anything that was in
15	our packet, we need to address it, because he
16	reviewed this record. And he is pretty good
17	about that.
18	MR. McLAURIN: Mr. Morelock, could
19	you give us the number of the sheet, please?
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Can we
21	also let's just if you have a pointer,
22	do you have a pointer there?

1	MR. MORELOCK: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And you
3	can just point to, so that we are clear
4	exactly, I see one, two, three, four, okay.
5	MR. MORELOCK: That is five.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
7	And then the side yards that he is referring
8	to?
9	MR. MORELOCK: Are right along
10	this edge.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
12	Okay.
13	MR. MORELOCK: Along this edge.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
15	MR. MORELOCK: And they are a foot
16	and a half and the reason being is when the
17	survey to mark was done and the Bishops
18	actually built their parking lot
19	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
20	MR. MORELOCK: they took 15
21	25 feet away from or actually purchased 25
22	feet or an easement was granted to allow that

1	parking lot to extend into that area of which
2	they used only about 18 feet. So there is
3	still 7 or 8 feet of green space there. And
4	we have requested in on the other side to
5	get a reciprocal no build to allow no
6	structure to go in that zone.
7	So that the foot and a half would
8	then really reflect approximately a 15 or 16.5
9	foot clear area between the side units and
10	wherever the drive aisle would be or any
11	future structure might go in.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: So, Mr.
13	Chair, do you need something in addition to
14	what's on the record now?
14	what's on the record now? CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think we have
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think we have
15 16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think we have that. I think I was told that we were going
15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think we have that. I think I was told that we were going to get something submitted.
15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think we have that. I think I was told that we were going to get something submitted. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Or if Mr.
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think we have that. I think I was told that we were going to get something submitted. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Or if Mr. Morelock has I think Mr. Feola was heading

1	would be helpful. I'm going through some of
2	the detailed engineering.
3	MR. MORELOCK: Sheet C9.
4	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: If you
5	could say that again?
6	MR. MORELOCK: Sheet C9.
7	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Sheet C9.
8	Excellent. I happen to be right there.
9	MR. MORELOCK: You can see tax lot
10	807.
11	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: So one,
12	two, three, four, five.
13	MR. MORELOCK: We currently
14	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes.
15	MR. MORELOCK: You see there is a
16	2 foot dimension shown on each of those units?
17	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes.
18	MR. MORELOCK: Okay. And then
19	because of change in building material or
20	construction tolerances, we have shown in the
21	setback table a foot and a half to allow a 6
22	inch tolerance as we move into final design

1	plans. So that's where he is pulling out of
2	the setback table the foot and a half.
3	So in addition to that on tax lot
4	807, you can see how far the parking area is
5	away.
6	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes.
7	MR. MORELOCK: So it will be
8	that zone in itself gives the greater setback.
9	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: I see. And
10	so that distance you are saying is 15 or 16
11	feet?
12	MR. MORELOCK: Correct.
12 13	MR. MORELOCK: Correct. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
13	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay.
13 14	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. Gotcha.
13 14 15	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. Gotcha. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will,
13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. Gotcha. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will, for the record, see C9 will suffice for this,
13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. Gotcha. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will, for the record, see C9 will suffice for this, the answer to this question.
13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. Gotcha. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will, for the record, see C9 will suffice for this, the answer to this question. Let me see, can you provide a
13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Okay. Gotcha. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will, for the record, see C9 will suffice for this, the answer to this question. Let me see, can you provide a no, I'm sorry. Has the developer built many

to how narrow that is and how difficult it is to occupy and furnish.

For example, there is not room for a reasonable dining room space next to the stairway as shown in some plans." Let me go back. The thrust of his question is has the developer built a 14 foot wide house before? That's the first part of it. And the second part is are they successful?

MR. YOUNGENTOB: Again, my name is Robert Youngentob from EYA. For the record, we have built numerous 14 foot units in the past. We are currently building them in a variety of communities and they seem to be one of the most successful units, because what they do offer is a more affordable price point. And that dining room dimension actually does work.

You are in a situation where the unit at 14 feet, by the time you take up the party wall on both sides, you lose about 10 inches to a foot of the house and then the

2.

1	stair takes up about 3 feet. So you are
2	sharing the circulation of the dining room,
3	but the dining room does end up to be just
4	under a 10 foot width dimension. But it can
5	be as long as 11 or 12 feet in length.
6	And what we do in most of your
7	floor plans, unlike possibly an older 14 foot
8	house, we don't have large walls or hallways.
9	We keep the unit as open as possible. So even
10	in the kitchen to the dining room
11	relationship, there would be a counter or an
12	island as opposed to a wall dividing the
13	space. There is not a wall dividing the
14	stairs from the rest of the rooms.
15	So you really do get the full
16	benefit of the width and they have been
17	incredibly successful from a marketing
18	standpoint.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So what I took out
20	of that is Mr. May, obviously, lived in an old
21	14 foot wide.
22	MR. YOUNGENTOB: I don't know

1	exactly where he lives. We don't have a
2	formal
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sure he made a
4	joke of all of this. Mr. Jeffries?
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No, I
6	just, you know, I mean, obviously, you know,
7	EYA, you know, I mean, is pretty much, from
8	what I understand, known for townhome
9	development. And obviously, I don't think
10	they would be building a 14 foot building if
11	they didn't think they could sell it.
12	I mean, they are in the business
13	of, you know, making profits and so forth. So
14	I you know, at some point, you know, I
15	think we have to up here recognize that, you
16	know, people are experts at what they do.
17	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Let me just
18	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And they
19	have ever incentive to sort of you know, so
20	I'm not going to get into questioning a 14
21	foot. I mean, you know, if you have had
22	experience selling it, then my assumption is

it works, because people are buying them.

MR. YOUNGENTOB: And again, let me just say it only represents a relative small mix of the overall development. We have units that are as wide as 18 feet with two car garages. We have 16 foot units and 14 foot units. And one of our goals is to provide as wide a variety of price points.

And so, you know, the person who can only afford, you know, \$400,000 or \$450,000 or \$500,000, those people would like a smaller house. They may be singles and therefore don't need as much square footage. And that's how we do it, we do it basically by providing a variety of widths and then we have the larger units as well. So there is choice and they do work.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I'm appreciative of Commissioner May's comments though. I mean, when you first hear 14 feet, it just seems like wow, what are you getting into, but so --

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let me see
2	if I can get through the rest of these. Can
3	you provide a site plan that shows more of the
4	context, so that we can better see the
5	relationship between the private streets and
6	the neighboring streets? And I think in your
7	presentation tonight, the one with the yellow
8	arrows, but I'm not sure if that gets what
9	goes beyond the site. Do you follow me?
10	So that's something that may in
11	trying to figure out this, I think that may
12	answer his question if we go beyond the site.
13	Because you had a site plan that was within
14	no, not that one. You had a circulation, I
15	would say, pattern.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: That's
17	the one I asked for. The one I asked for, you
18	remember it?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And, Mr.
	I

1	Chair, I do think that they that question
2	is pretty much my question. So whatever
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we got
4	the answer.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: yeah,
6	we have sort of
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
8	MR. FEOLA: I think we're going to
9	have to submit something to the record.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes,
11	absolutely.
12	MR. FEOLA: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I think
15	that question is almost directly tied to the
16	question that I asked.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
18	MR. YOUNGENTOB: I don't know if
19	this is helpful, but this is just one portion
20	of the site at 5 th and 6 th Street and I think
21	if we provided this around the entire
22	property, and may be a little bit further off

the site, you would get a sense of the 1 relationships and the connections. 2. 3 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: that's what I -- and not just again, not in 4 5 site plan as well, but also in terms of what you experience. You know, we can get a shot 6 7 showing the old and the new and just what you did, what we saw in Harrison Square. 8 9 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioner Jeffries, Vice Chair, I'm going 10 11 to probably ask for this too, but I need to it. Can you provide some three 12 dimensional views of the development, so that 13 they can -- so that we can see in relation to 14 15 the rest of the grounds and the context of the 16 neighborhood? Okay. So we are all on board with that. 17 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: 18 19 Viewsheds. If we can get some of these 20 viewsheds that you talked about that shows 21 topography and shows some of the varying

heights and so forth, I think that would be

1	very helpful.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. And also,
3	can you provide photos? Now, this is the one
4	thing, I think, that is very interesting. Can
5	you provide photos of the surrounding
6	neighborhood houses, so that we can better
7	understand the context?
8	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think
10	these are some good questions. Can you
11	provide larger scale?
12	MR. FEOLA: He must have been
13	laying on
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I can tell you
15	this. If I was I'm probably going to get
16	in trouble here. Okay. Can you provide
17	larger scale, more detailed renderings in
18	color of the row houses? It is very difficult
19	to understand the detailing and materials with
20	the very vague drawings provided.
21	And I think I will say this to
22	that, Mr. Feola, you know what you submitted

1	tonight. If you think that is addressing his
2	questions, then leave it at that. If not
3	MR. FEOLA: I think we need to
4	submit something.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Submit.
6	MR. FEOLA: I know what he is
7	looking for.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
9	Since there will be roof decks at the fronts
10	of the units, does that mean that the units
11	will have a downspout at the front? If so,
12	please, show them on the elevations. I see
13	everybody smiling.
14	MR. FEOLA: Yes, yes. We can do
15	that.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's something
17	we can get, right?
18	MR. FEOLA: We can do that. They
19	will be on the hard line elevations he wants
20	to see from the previous question.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:
22	Downspouts?

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: He wants
3	downspouts?
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: He wants he
5	doesn't want them. He said does that mean
6	that the units will have downspouts at the
7	front? If so, please, show them on
8	elevations.
9	MR. McLAURIN: It does not
LO	necessarily mean that there would be
11	downspouts on the front. Some of that is
12	related to the what the requirements are
13	for the storm water. We do have techniques
14	where it is collected on the rooftop terrace
15	and actually exits through the rear of the
16	house. So I think internally we just need to
L7	figure out what we want to do and make sure
18	the drawings show so.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. And I
20	think that will cover his question. The next
21	question is since the top floor seems to be

optional, does that mean we will have some 3

1	story units and some 4 story units? If so,
2	will there be fake downspouts for the 3 story
3	units? He is on downspouts.
4	MR. McLAURIN: There would not be
5	any fake downspouts for the 3 story units.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Assuming
7	there will be a sample board at the hearing
8	tonight, it is and we do have copies, can the
9	be left with the Office of Zoning, so that I
10	can see it next week? Do you believe this?
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes, I
12	can.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is there any way
14	you can leave that here tonight? Ms. Hanousek
15	and we will
16	MR. McLAURIN: We can leave it.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: guard it.
18	
	MR. McLAURIN: We can email it.
19	MR. McLAURIN: We can email it. We can leave it. We have digital hard copies
19 20	
	We can leave it. We have digital hard copies

_	
1	MR. McLAURIN: So maybe it's a
2	little
3	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Maybe he
4	wants to touch it.
5	MR. McLAURIN: Yeah, I know.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. Because
7	he's asking if you could leave it.
8	MR. LESTER: I'm sure Jack would
9	like nothing better than to leave it and not
10	carry it home with him.
11	MR. McLAURIN: That's right.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. You have
13	already done this. Please, provide photos of
14	the sample board. We have that.
15	Would all the brick be painted? I
16	think this goes back to a question that
17	Commissioner Turnbull had. Would all the
18	brick be painted on the row house? Is that
19	typical of the neighborhood?
20	MR. McLAURIN: 50 to 60 percent of
21	the brick would be painted. And when you say
22	the neighborhood, you have to really kind of

1	figure out where you are talking about. 7 th
2	Street? No. It's a lot of a natural brick,
3	but North Capitol, Edgewood, there is, and
4	5 th , a lot of painted brick.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I guess
6	MR. McLAURIN: So it's a mixture.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: the properties
8	that are right on the outline of the site is
9	what he is referring to.
10	MR. McLAURIN: It's a mixture.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. What are
12	more of the row why okay. Why aren't
13	more of the row houses cladded in stone,
14	particularly those that face the college
15	building, which I presume is stone?
16	MR. McLAURIN: I think we covered
17	that.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So you covered
19	this sufficiently?
20	MR. McLAURIN: I think we did,
21	yes.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, I'm
	I

1	asking it, because
2	MR. McLAURIN: We're hoping.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would say
4	Commissioner May is on his game. He is
5	definitely on his game.
6	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yeah, I
7	would say a portion, a good portion of this
8	was discussed
9	MR. FEOLA: I think he wants more
10	Gothic.
11	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: in the
12	exchange about
13	MR. FEOLA: It sounds like he
14	wants more Gothic.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Will you
16	seek, and I think you alluded to this, LEED-
17	certification? If not, why not? And I think
18	you said you weren't, but you were going to
19	have just as many points or whatever. But if
20	not, why not?
21	MR. FEOLA: I think it's simple.
22	The process and the cost, it's fairly
	I and the second se

expensive to go through the LEED-certification process.

MR. McLAURIN: And I think the other thing is there is a value to it in a commercial building. You know, in a residential building, really if delivering the same product, they don't really get the same -- there is no marketing value or anything like that to have in the certification.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Mr. Turnbull, in fact, thank you. So in terms of, LEED-certification, I mean, you know, obviously, you know, depending on the use of the building, residential versus commercial, I mean, obviously, there is depending on, you know, what kind of return you get on that building, I mean, you know, LEED-certification isn't it typically more prevalent in those types of buildings? I mean, you don't have the same certification across all property types.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And I
2	think typically we haven't been covering in
3	residential as much as
4	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:
6	obviously, in the commercial. I mean, other
7	than unless he just wants to get a checklist
8	included just as a verification of where you
9	are going.
10	MR. FEOLA: We have submitted such
11	a checklist.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That's
13	what I thought.
14	MR. FEOLA: Yeah, yeah.
15	MR. McLAURIN: Just as additional
16	information for your knowledge, LEED is you
17	are exactly right. It's basically a
18	commercial building type of analysis.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Um-hum.
20	MR. McLAURIN: International Code
21	Council, who writes all the building codes, in
22	partnership with the National Association of

1	Home Builders have unveiled their version of
2	Green Building Guidelines for new
3	construction, which are excellent. There is
4	a LEED-home in a draft version.
5	There is a program called Earth
6	Craft in the south and in Virginia. So there
7	are a lot of residential programs.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Right.
9	MR. McLAURIN: But LEED is really
10	still oriented mostly towards commercial.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL:
12	Commercial.
13	MR. McLAURIN: Well, the LEED we
14	are talking about here is for the development,
15	the community, which is a lot of the site work
16	and the impact on the environment, right.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Now, let me
18	go to my questions. One of the things I
19	noticed in the Office of Planning report that
20	popped out is it says "The applicant requested
21	the flexibility to shift the locations of

affordable units within the associated unit

groups." Normally, unless my colleagues feel differently, we like to know where those affordable units are.

But Office of Planning goes on to say "OP supports the granting of the flexibility," which is reverse of what we normally do, "but recommends expanding the range of affordable model options to include units more than the 14 foot wide." Do you follow?

MR. FEOLA: Yeah, with regard to the flexibility, I think what we had asked, and I think what the Office of Planning has because this is agreed to, a townhome community that is going to be built in sticks and a couple of them at a time, you know, if the affordable housing units -- we committed to building in each stick, but if it happens to be, you know, two doors over, because that's the one that's going to be done affordable first and that's where the live or across the purchaser wants to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	courtyard, we wanted just the flexibility to
2	move them within the delivery of that stick of
3	townhouses.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So they all won't
5	be in one area or one section?
6	MR. FEOLA: No, they will be
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Similar to what we
8	see here?
9	MR. FEOLA: Exactly. But instead
10	of the red dot on the lowest one on the left
11	being right there, it might be one door over.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
13	MR. YOUNGENTOB: We are willing to
14	commit within a string, but I think what we
15	want is flexibility within that townhome
16	string the ability to move a unit, you know,
17	one unit one direction or another. But in
18	terms of the spread throughout the site, they
19	would look exactly like this.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And we just need
21	to make sure in the order that it specifically
22	signifies that.

1	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Yes.
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I think
3	what people may be concerned about is that
4	they don't appear in the same location in
5	every string.
6	MR. YOUNGENTOB: They don't appear
7	in the same location in every string.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: No, I know
9	they don't now, but I think what we're saying
10	now is
11	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Oh.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: the
13	flexibility and all of a sudden when the thing
14	is done, they happen to be always in the same
15	place.
16	MR. YOUNGENTOB: We would commit
17	to that, too, that they would be in a variety
18	of locations within the strings.
19	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
20	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Similar to the
21	plant that is presented here.

request.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
Thanks.
CHAIRMAN HOOD: The next thing is
the Bryant School. Bryant School, I thought,
was a model. I mean, I have said it. It was
a record the way they worked with the
community, the developer. Mr. Youngentob, the
way the community it was a model. I mean,
if you look back at the transcript, I'm sure
I said that, because I remember Bryant School.
It was a model. It was a good partnership in
working with the community.
Is that same intensity or
partnership going on here in with ANC-5C in
that community?
MR. YOUNGENTOB: I would say, I
mean, in terms of the number of meetings, the
type of communication both with the ANC, the
broader community, both the institutional
neighbors, as well as the Council Member. I

think it clearly is. I think what we have the

benefit of Bryant School is the completed project as we went through.

And I think, you know, sometimes, you know, when we are new to a neighborhood, you know, we are still a developer and I think people are skeptical of how much, you know, they can trust the developer and will they deliver on all their words. And I think, you know, we pride ourselves on that and we wouldn't, you know, be successful, I think, time and time again if we didn't live up to, you know, the written word and to our verbal representations.

And so I'm confident that, you know, even if, you know, the ANC didn't have complete 100 percent confidence, which I think they do, about, you know, where they are today, I think at the end of the day, they too will come back like Bryant School, like the community on the Hill and feel that that too was a model. This too will be a model of successful community relations.

2.

Of the things that -- I saw the list of the community meetings and one of the things I'm looking for from Chairman Bonds, Chair 5C, one of the things he talks about the motion, but one thing that I have underlined here says "need more community input."

So I mean that just popped right out at me, especially knowing that you dealt with the Bryant School and how that went. But one of the things that I see here is "need more community input." And we have Commissioner Grant here, who I can ask what that means.

I signify two of the letters.

Let's talk about parking. I'm taking this straight from -- and I'm trying to ask some of the questions that I see are concerns straight from Commissioner Grant's letter. It says "The existing community wants to be insured that the project is self-sustained with parking."

I mean, what kind of assurance does -- do we have that parking -- I mean, you know, I understand about the garage and everything, but what type of assurances has the community been given?

MR. YOUNGENTOB: I think we find ourselves in somewhat of a unique position where Office of Planning with their preference for Smart Growth development has taken positions to try to limit the amount of parking that exists in a lot of these new communities, to encourage the use of Metro and other modes of transportation.

What we have tried to do is to balance that desire with the community's goal to have sufficient parking. So what we have is we have the exact number is shown here on the chart, but both our 14 and 16 foot units have a standard of one space per unit. Our 18 foot units have a standard of two spaces per unit, which comes out to the 326 or the 1.38 spaces per unit.

Now, we also have the option for our buyers to actually purchase a second space in the ground floor of those units. It would be in a tandem configuration, but if somebody did absolutely have two cars and wanted to park in the smaller units, they could purchase the second space.

I know this doesn't go as far as the community would like to see it go in terms of absolutely guaranteeing two spaces in every townhouse, but I think it is this delicate balance between what Office of Planning is trying to achieve in terms of encouraging the use of Metro and the protection of having enough parking.

Now, we also have additional guest spaces on the street in the total of 80 spaces. So we believe between the in-house parking within the units themselves as well as the guest spaces and the flexibility to add parking, that there is sufficient parking, but I do understand the community's concern. And

again, I think we are just trying to balance 1 OP's concern and this motivation to use other 2. 3 modes of transportation with the neighborhoods. So we think we have struck 4 that balance. 5 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Also, it 6 7 appears that there was a discussion about possibly widening the roadway where the United 8 9 States Conference of Catholic Bishops And obviously, that talk fell off. 10 housed. 11 Where are we with that? 12 MR. YOUNGENTOB: I'm going to actually let Jack Lester address this. 13 mean, he has been intimately involved in the 14 15 variety of discussions on the Office Bishops as well as -- Council of Bishops as 16 well as the potential of a 4^{th} Street tie in. 17 So, Jack, why don't you address this? 18 19 MR. LESTER: Yes, Commissioner. 20 The 4th Street connection is a larger issue. An element of that is this connection through 21 22 the Bishops' property. Prior to getting to

1	that point, we looked at in response to
2	community raising this issue, we looked at a
3	number of potential connections to 4 th Street.
4	And for a variety of reasons, and
5	I can talk about those in detail, they didn't
6	work. Either it was too close to the existing
7	intersection at Lincoln, Franklin and 4 th,
8	which would make for an unsafe intersection,
9	near where the driveway currently exists,
10	which would then push it to a mid-block
11	configure location.
12	The problem with the mid-block,
13	given the topography of the site of the
14	Paulist property at 4 th Street would do a
14 15	Paulist property at 4 th Street would do a number of things. No. 1, to make those grade
15	number of things. No. 1, to make those grade
15 16	number of things. No. 1, to make those grade connections, you would have to cut,
15 16 17	number of things. No. 1, to make those grade connections, you would have to cut, approximately, 160 foot wide swath through the
15 16 17 18	number of things. No. 1, to make those grade connections, you would have to cut, approximately, 160 foot wide swath through the existing open space, that portion preserved in
15 16 17 18	number of things. No. 1, to make those grade connections, you would have to cut, approximately, 160 foot wide swath through the existing open space, that portion preserved in the front of the Paulists' property, and
15 16 17 18 19 20	number of things. No. 1, to make those grade connections, you would have to cut, approximately, 160 foot wide swath through the existing open space, that portion preserved in the front of the Paulists' property, and eliminate all those mature trees.

1	the first potential of a connection here.
2	And you can see with this intersection, that
3	just wouldn't work. And again, we have vetted
4	all this with DDOT. These weren't our own
5	assumptions and conclusions.
6	The second thing that we looked
7	at, as I mentioned, was this mid-block
8	connection. And you can see here trying to
9	make up this grade differential, the impact
10	that has on the existing mature trees. Here
11	is the slope of that hill. Here is 4 th Street
12	along here. And here is an image of some of
13	those woods right there in the center.
14	So the idea came from and this
15	was actually raised probably back in December.
16	One of the residents at a community meeting
17	suggested well, why not approach the Bishops
18	Conference and ask if they would permit their
19	driveway to be turned in, in essence, to a $4^{\rm th}$
20	Street connection.
21	What I have recently committed to

do is to make that request. I have been very

clear to the community and given my dealings and I have had many dealings with the Bishops over the past year, that they are unlikely to give up their property for a 4 the Street connection, you know, probably for a variety of reasons, not the least of which would be their concern for security.

I have made that commitment to the Commissioner that I will arrange that meeting. The person, the key person at the Bishops Conference is out on vacation this week. And then the other thing, as a part of that though, that request, the citizen, I think it's the letter you are referring to, has also asked that Hamlin, Jackson, 5th and 6th not be opened and that only this connection to 4th Street be made. And that's just antithetical to really all that we have heard from OP and DDOT. And then --

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think I know which letter you are talking about, but I don't think it's -- at least I didn't see it

2.

1	in the one I'm reading from.
2	MR. LESTER: Right.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I do remember
4	reading it. It may be in this one, but I
5	think it's a different letter.
6	MR. LESTER: And Commissioner
7	Grant may be thinking of having the five
8	connections. And we did study that and we
9	have reviewed this with DDOT. And given the
10	and I'm going to summarize for Jami and she
11	can talk in more detail, but, in essence, the
12	additional benefit of that 5 th , that
13	additional connection was de minimis in the
14	eyes of DDOT and not worth the cost.
15	And not the cost financially, but
<mark>16</mark>	the cost of splitting that large open space
<mark>17</mark>	and taking down all those mature trees and
18	they had concerns about making a connection
<mark>19</mark>	onto an arterial. And, Jami, if I think if
20	I have said that correctly, would you confirm
21	or not? Okay.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. She said

1	yes. Okay. All right. The other thing is
2	before I talk about the amenities package
3	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Mr. Chair?
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure, Mr. Etherly?
5	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Pardon the
6	interruption, but let me as a follow-up to
7	that traffic question for Ms. Milanovich, is
8	it your sense then that those other streets
9	are situated such that they will be able to
10	handle the traffic, the additional trips? And
11	those other streets, those are defined as
12	what? Those are what would you call them? I
13	forget the terminology, neighborhood? They
14	are not arterials clearly.
15	MS. MILANOVICH: They are local
16	streets. Well, yeah. 4 th Street is an
17	arterial.
18	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Yes.
19	MS. MILANOVICH: 7 th Street is a
20	collector street. Hamlin, Jackson, $5^{\rm h}$ and $6^{\rm th}$
21	are all local streets. Hamlin and Jackson,
22	obviously, collecting connecting to a

1	collector street. And typically speaking,
2	when you have access to residential
3	developments, such as this, the preference is
4	to tie those to collector streets.
5	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum.
6	MS. MILANOVICH: But as you move
7	into the arterial classification, the primary
8	purpose of an arterial street is to move
9	traffic.
10	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Gotcha.
11	MS. MILANOVICH: Not necessarily
12	for access.
13	COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: But based
14	on your experience and your analysis here, is
15	there any concern that you would potentially
16	run the risk of overburdening the local
17	streets?
18	MS. MILANOVICH: No. You know, as
19	I indicated in my testimony, the impact of the
20	trips generated by this site is really
21	anticipated to be very minimal. And in fact,
22	we actually looked at if there were to be a

Street connection, if somehow we could 1 make it work, what would be the benefit to 2. 3 Jackson, Hamlin, those streets. COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum. 4 5 MS. MILANOVICH: In other words, how much traffic could be bled off --6 7 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Um-hum. th MS. MILANOVICH: -- to the 4 8 9 Street connection. And then we actually did our level of service analysis. And when you 10 11 compare the two scenarios, I mean it's a very, very minor change in delay, if you will, and 12 frankly would be imperceptible. 13 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: So even if 14 you could make a linkage on 4 th Street, 15 16 sounds like you are basically saying you are using a hammer where you should rather be 17 using a scalpel, so to speak. I mean, the 4th 18 19 Street connection is a huge solution that you 20 don't think is warranted by the circumstances as they currently exist nor by the traffic 21

that would be generated with the introduction

of this property?

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. MILANOVICH: Correct.

3 COMMISSIONER ETHERLY: Understood.

Okay. Pardon the interruption, Mr. Chair. I normally don't like to do that.

5 normally don't like to do that

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh, I'm sorry, I forget that you were asking questions, Mr. Etherly.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: The amenities Now, let me back up. Let's go back package. to the traffic. Thank you. That was a good lead in. Ms. Milanovich, can you help me with a slide and just show me how the circulation is? And you may have done it, but it has been so long where I have forgotten. But if you could just show me the -- how the circulation How that is going to work is going to work. through that whole site. And also be inclusive of the streets that we are talking about opening and, you know, making them So show me how all that is going to longer. work.

MS. MILANOVICH: Today, 5th Street dead ends, basically, right at the property line. 5th Street will be extended into the site here providing access to the site. Likewise, 6th Street also dead ends right at the property. That as well will be extended into the site providing access. And then you have got the same thing off of 7th Street. You have Hamlin that comes in and dead ends and Jackson Street, sorry, Jack, that comes in and dead ends.

So those streets will all be extended into the site, basically, extending the grid network that currently doesn't extend. So access will be provided by 5 the Street, by 6 the Street, by Hamlin and by Jackson. And then within the site, there is interconnectivity, so that if you live here, you are not precluded from traveling through the site, you know, to perhaps exit via one of the other access points. There is that interconnectivity that really happens because

of the extension of the grid system. 1 2 So to access these townhomes, 3 there is internal roadways that provide access interior to the site. The same thing through 4 here and then this road right here. 5 Now, if I didn't CHAIRMAN HOOD: 6 7 live in -- on the site, I guess the north side from what I'm looking at, would I have a 8 9 reason to drive into the site? 10 MS. MILANOVICH: You mean to cut-11 through the site? CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah. 12 Not under this 13 MS. MILANOVICH: configuration, I would not anticipate. 14 15 mean, perhaps if you lived on the sub-street of 5th Street or 6th Street, you know, perhaps 16 if you were heading north, you may come up and 17 go out via 7th Street. But unless you lived 18 19 right along that perimeter, I don't see any 20 reason why you would cut-through, why there would be an increase in cut-through traffic 21

through the site.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. My last question and we want to make sure we allow enough time to hear from the community, but my last question is the amenities package, Mr. Feola. And I think Office of Planning alludes to it, alluded to it in their report.

For example, the ANC, and I'm going off the top of my head, because I don't have it in front of me, was getting some money for the scholarship program. We need to know how that's going to be administered. It may already be there, but I didn't see it. But it needs to be something, because we all know that the ANC cannot receive any money.

is, whether they are going to work it through a nonprofit and not just with that, with some other things I saw. For example, I saw one thing in Commissioner Grant's letter about something just germane to ANC-5. Was it home ownership training? Just germane to ANC-5C residents.

1	Whatever it was, we need to make
2	sure that all those amenities packages,
3	especially dealing with funds, need to be
4	shown to us of how it is going to be
5	administered for the record.
6	MR. FEOLA: We can do that,
7	actually can do that before we leave tonight.
8	We have put together a memorandum for the
9	Office of Planning that addressed those
10	issues. Unfortunately, we haven't seen
11	Commissioner Grant's letter, so we're a little
12	bit at a loss.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
14	MR. FEOLA: When you are reading
15	it, but I understand what you are asking.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: But, Mr.
18	Chair, I mean, they you have seen Office of
19	Planning's recommendation.
20	MR. FEOLA: Yes, yes, and we
	MR. FEOLA: les, yes, and we
21	responded to the Office of Planning.

1	MR. FEOLA: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
3	MR. FEOLA: But I don't know if
4	the ANC has different ones, I guess is what
5	I'll say.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
7	Maybe they word it different. It may be the
8	same thing, but, okay. Whatever, we get the
9	logistics of where we're trying to go. That's
10	all we have. Any other questions, colleagues?
11	Does the ANC, Commissioner Grant, do you have
12	any cross examination of the applicant?
13	MR. GRANT: I do have three
14	questions.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure, come forward
16	and introduce yourself and you can and this
17	is cross examination. You will have time
18	MR. GRANT: Fine. Good evening,
19	everyone.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good evening.
21	MR. GRANT: I just had three
22	questions. Actually, two. The first is about
ļ	

the census for the traffic study. It's at 1 44.5 and I guess my question for Jami is are 2. 3 there any projections yet for the census coming in 2010 and what that percentage will 4 be at that point? 5 MS. MILANOVICH: No, that data is 6 7 not available, to my knowledge. We are still working with the 2000 census. 8 9 MR. GRANT: Okay. Also, in terms of affordable housing, 10 it was mу 11 interpretation that the affordable units, of course, will be spread out and not in the same 12 But also, there will be a different 13 section. range of size for each affordable dwelling 14 15 And I quess my question is based on what I heard and maybe I have this incorrect, 16 now it seems as if every 17 but tonight affordable dwelling unit will be 14 feet wide. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's a good 20 question, because that is not exactly what I got from when I looked at the rendering. 21 Ι

saw some wide and some slimmer, so I figured

1	it was a mix.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No, no,
3	there well, sorry, I'll let you them
4	testify.
5	MR. LESTER: What you may have
6	seen on that exhibit was two together where it
7	was side to side, so it may have appeared to
8	be a wire one. What we have offered is all 24
9	to be 14 feet. But again, that bedroom size
10	will match in proportion that of the market
11	rates.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Did you
13	get your question answered?
14	MR. GRANT: Yes.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah,
16	okay.
17	MR. GRANT: Yes.
- /	
	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
18 19	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. Thank you. I do have a question.
18	
18 19	Thank you. I do have a question.

Office of Planning, because that was one of 1 the things they highlighted in their report. 2 3 Any other questions? VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Just one 4 5 question though in terms of the census. Is there not a method by which you could 6 7 extrapolate or project? I mean, do you have to -- I mean, it's 2000 and then we go right 8 9 Is there not a way in which to to 2010. extrapolate or project? Is there any method 10 11 by -- in terms of doing that? Because, I mean, a lot of these neighborhoods, I mean, 12 there's lots of growth, I don't know so much 13 this neighborhood, but I'm just wondering. 14 15 MS. MILANOVICH: We have not come 16 across a method to do that. Certainly, that 17 would take some more research. But again, we had also consulted the WMATA data, which is 18 19 much more recent. It's a 2005 study that they 20 published. 21 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. 22 MS. MILANOVICH: So I feel like

1	that kind of makes up for the gap, because
2	there is, you know, an 8 year period between
3	the
4	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: So you
5	saw a gap? Did you see a gap?
6	MS. MILANOVICH: No, I'm sorry.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
8	MS. MILANOVICH: You know, the
9	2000 data admittedly is eight years old.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
11	MS. MILANOVICH: You know, so, you
12	know, we want to make sure that it is still
13	current, but the WMATA data is a 2005
14	publication, so it's more recent. And it
15	actually shows a slightly higher percentage
16	that can be predicted compared to the census
17	data. So that's what we kind of use to gauge
18	and make sure that the census data is still
19	accurate to use.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And in
21	doing that, when you made the comparison, it
22	was pretty much still in alignment?

1	MS. MILANOVICH: Right.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah,
3	okay.
4	MS. MILANOVICH: The yeah, the
5	WMATA data showing 50 percent, the census data
6	was showing 45.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
8	That's what I was trying to get to. Okay.
9	Thank you.
10	MS. MILANOVICH: Um-hum.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Grant,
12	you have any further cross examination?
13	MR. GRANT: No, I don't.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
15	With that, we will go to the
16	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Mr. Chair,
17	could I just ask one question
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure, Mr.
19	Turnbull.
20	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: getting
21	back to traffic?
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.

_	
1	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: The
2	entrance to the college is still on 4 th
3	Street?
4	MS. MILANOVICH: That's correct.
5	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Can I
6	if I'm in the Gothic units or the stretch just
7	to the north, can I go in 4 th Street and make
8	my way up to my unit? I don't think you want
9	me to, but
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And also,
11	tie that back to the Chairman's question about
12	cutting through, which I thought was a very
13	good question, in terms of are people who
14	don't live here, can they use, I don't know
15	why they would, but could they use it to cut-
16	through? Is that another way in which they
17	could cut-through when they don't necessarily
18	live in the development? Starting at 4 th
19	Street, I think that was I think, the
20	testimony was 5 th Street, I think, that Ms.
21	Milanovich brought up.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And what

1	happens here?
2	MR. YOUNGENTOB: The Paulist
3	driveway is a private driveway. And so when
4	you come in off of 4 th Street onto their
5	driveway, you either go to the circle or you
6	go up to the parking lot that serves
7	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Can we
8	get a pointer?
9	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Sure.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Just to
11	make certain we are
12	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Yep. When you
13	come in off of 4 th Street, basically, you
14	either come up to the main circle in front of
15	the college building or you can come up and
16	circulate into this parking lot here. I mean,
17	this is all a private drive that has the loop.
18	The Paulists do want the ability, basically,
19	to circle around the back of the building
20	where they do have their service area here.
21	So that will still exist, but
22	there will be sidage and, basically, a

1	prohibition of public vehicles, you know,
2	coming onto their driveway and going this way.
3	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: But
4	Commissioner Jeffries could sneak up in there
5	and
6	MR. YOUNGENTOB: You know, again,
7	we have our
8	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Or
9	Commissioner Turnbull knowing how he is could
10	get in.
11	MR. YOUNGENTOB: We haven't
12	figured out exactly, you know, how to protect,
13	you know, that gated or not gated.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah,
15	that's what I was going to say. I mean, you
16	just sort of say it's prohibited.
17	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Put, you know, do
18	not enter signs, I think, is the initial
19	intent. And, you know, one way, you know, not
20	that direction would be the way we would
21	intend to do it at first. I mean, the last
22	thing we want to do is have a gated, you know,

1	area there. But I think, you know, based on
2	making it look like a driveway as opposed to
3	a street, the widths of the roads are
4	different.
5	We think we can, you know, limit
6	that pattern of access. Can you stop
7	everybody from doing it? Maybe not.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And some
9	people are just not dutiful, you know, they
10	just don't follow directions well.
11	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: People
12	from Chicago.
13	MS. MILANOVICH: Could I just I
14	wanted to get back to your point about the
15	cut-through traffic with regard to potential
16	forestry connection.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah.
18	MS. MILANOVICH: Under this
19	scenario they just explained, there would not
20	be the ability to cut-through using the
21	existing driveway. Back to the point of the
22	potential forestry connection in some other

1	location, such a connection would open that up
2	to cut-through traffic. You know, people on
3	Michigan Avenue trying to avoid the 4 th Street
4	intersection
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
6	MS. MILANOVICH: would come
7	down 7^{th} , cut-through to 4^{th} .
8	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Um-hum.
9	MS. MILANOVICH: And then continue
10	to head south. So that's a consideration as
11	well regarding that 4 th Street connection.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
12 13	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner
	_
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner
13 14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner Grant has come back to the table. We've ended
13 14 15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner Grant has come back to the table. We've ended cross examination. Mr. Feola, you don't mind
13 14 15 16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner Grant has come back to the table. We've ended cross examination. Mr. Feola, you don't mind if we
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner Grant has come back to the table. We've ended cross examination. Mr. Feola, you don't mind if we MR. FEOLA: No.
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner Grant has come back to the table. We've ended cross examination. Mr. Feola, you don't mind if we MR. FEOLA: No. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I see Commissioner Grant has come back to the table. We've ended cross examination. Mr. Feola, you don't mind if we MR. FEOLA: No. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. MR. GRANT: No, it's just a point

1	that a two car garage, they are actually my
2	interpretation was that there is a second like
3	garage type room space and that that
4	instead of designing it that way, they can
5	actually scratch that particular design and
6	make that room the second car garage. So if
7	they could just explain how that process
8	works?
9	MR. YOUNGENTOB: Sure. This is
10	exactly what we did at Harrison Square
11	actually at 13 th and V. It's basically we had
12	the option for a two car tandem space, so you
13	would have the ability, basically, to have the
14	depth that would handle two cars. But in the
15	alternative, it would actually be living space
16	on the ground level and a one car garage.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Now, did
18	you understand? You know, this is the time to
19	straighten it out. Are you clear,
20	Commissioner?
21	MR. GRANT: I guess the question
22	is are these are there going to be extra

1	fees? Is there going to be a purchase for
2	this particular option?
3	MR. YOUNGENTOB: To purchase the
4	second space, there would be a charge to
5	purchase the second space, that's correct.
6	MR. GRANT: Okay. So I guess
7	initially, that house would be somewhat
8	different in terms of price than the two car
9	garage house?
10	MR. YOUNGENTOB: It's a relatively
11	small amount. We haven't figured out exactly
12	what it would be, but yes, there would be a
13	standard price for the one car garage with the
14	living space and then it's somewhat, I guess,
15	counter-intuitive. We are eliminating living
16	space
17	MR. GRANT: Right.
18	MR. YOUNGENTOB: and adding
19	garage space.
20	MR. GRANT: Right.
21	MR. YOUNGENTOB: But we are
22	charging more for that.

MR. GRANT: That's where I was 1 2 trying to --3 MR. YOUNGENTOB: Yes. MR. GRANT: -- understand, yeah. 4 It is somewhat 5 MR. YOUNGENTOB: counter-intuitive, because it actually costs 6 7 us more to build the living space as opposed to the garage space, but again, there are 8 9 numerous people. There will be singles, there will be people especially with -- you know, 10 11 everything that read nowadays and we everything that kind of relates to our 12 businesses, people are going to buy here, 13 because of access to Metro and with \$4.50 or 14 15 \$5 gas prices, the propensity to have one car and live in the city and use Metro is becoming 16 more and more. And the preference will 17 actually be for that living space either as an 18 19 additional bedroom or a home office in the 20 And that's what we are seeing from a unit. 21 marketing standpoint. 22 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You all straight?

1	MR. GRANT: Yes, we are, sir.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's a
3	Commissioner that listens to his constituents.
4	You're a good man. Okay. Next, we'll go to
5	the Office of Planning's report. Mr. Jackson?
6	MR. JACKSON: Good evening, Mr.
7	Chair and Members of the Zoning Commission.
8	My name is Arthur Jackson. I'm a Development
9	Review Specialist with the District of
10	Columbia Office of Planning. And I'll present
11	a brief summary of the Office of Planning's
12	final report on this application.
13	For the sake of time, we won't
14	take a lot of time going through the report.
15	Just to highlight the particular issues that
16	are more pertinent to this approval.
17	First of all, the revised proposal
18	now consists of 237 units, instead of 251 row
19	dwellings. That will be individual lots
20	constructed in two phases. The zoning change
21	will allow the development to be a floor area

ratio of 1.27, heights of 30 to 48 feet and 4

stories, both which exceed the minimums -- the maximums allowed in R-5-A.

Because of the dwellings and residential lots created would lack frontage on a public street, the proposal requires approval of a theoretical lot subdivision. Additional flexibilities requested because none of the proposed lots individually would have the minimum required open space and side yard setback.

We find that the proposal meets the minimum requirements for consideration as a Planned Unit Development. Primary demands are urban design, distinct architecture, home ownership and affordable home ownership opportunities, site planning, employment and training opportunities.

The applicant has also presented a number of additional benefits that they are offering. We found that based on the information provided that \$58,000 of the \$1.2 million and improvements to infrastructure

2.

could legitimately be counted toward as a benefit to the community. Of course, the applicant has more additional detail about how those improvements, the \$1.2 million improvements, what portions of those actually would be a general community benefit. Then we could add to that number obviously.

And then, of course, there is the \$315,000 investment in the Triangle Park that is near the site. The supplemental submittal by the applicant provides some other benefits, which they have clarified to some extent in their additional memo.

Although this proposal represents a change from institutional, the proposed development associated its own map amendment will not be inconsistent with abutting land use designations. The general Land Use plan--Map designates the Saint Paul's College as institutional, which reflects what is already there.

The property south of the campus

2.

and east across 4th Street are designated for 1 2. moderate density residential land uses. 3 characterized by row house neighborhoods, as well as low rise garden apartment complexes. 4 The existing R-5-A and proposed R-5 both designated medium 6 5-B 7 residential districts. The proposal would further several 8 9 things and policies in the 2006 Comprehensive Plan which are summarized fully in the Office 10 11 of Planning report. And they would support a number of Smart Growth principles as well. 12 The Wells and Associates traffic 13 study concludes the impacts of 14 15 traffic resulting from this project on the intersections around the site 16 studied is expected to have little impact effect and 17 could be offset by minor timing adjustments at 18 19 a few signal light intersections. 20 Based on this information, Office of Planning determined the proposed PUD 21

is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive

Plan and supports plan goals and policies and recommends approval subject to conditions and clarifications that we include in our report.

That concludes my brief summary of the Office of Planning report and we are available to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank

CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson. And as you -- one of my questions was, looking at you report and as we just received the additional information about the amenities package tonight, I think, that satisfies the requirements of what I saw in the report.

I have not had a chance to look at it, but I think it does.

MR. JACKSON: Well, again, we just need to clarify certain things. For instance, the initial value of the Smart Card, are we saying that when they receive the Smart Card, there will be \$20 on it? That would mean that they would start off with \$20 as opposed to having the value of \$20 and they have to buy

2.

1	the card. But this clearly says that when
2	they have when you give them the Smart
3	Card, that it will be worth \$20. Just come
4	clarification.
5	MR. YOUNGENTOB: That is correct.
6	MR. JACKSON: Okay. And that the
7	explanation about training the person
8	interested in affordable units, is the focus
9	would be on Ward 5 residents and as such, this
10	would be their primary focus?
11	MR. LESTER: Well, as we
12	understand it, you know, it can't be limited
13	to Ward 5 residents.
14	MR. JACKSON: Right.
15	MR. LESTER: Of course, we would
16	be working with the ANC Commissioner getting
17	out the information through him and other
18	outlets, but through him, so he and his
19	constituents will have what we will locate
20	our meetings in the community. They will have
21	a great chance to participate. But again, we

can't exclude other residents of the District.

1	MR. JACKSON: Right, right. Okay.
2	Then with regard to improvements to Shaed
3	Elementary School, we had indicated that we
4	think it's important that the applicant assure
5	that the school is not one of those being
6	closed and that has been verified. But also
7	that this proposal is worked through the to
8	the level of school administration where we're
9	sure that it would be implemented or has met
10	all approvals.
11	At this point, although the list
12	of items is clarified, do you have any type of
13	documentation from the school system that says
14	that's acceptable or doable?
15	MR. LESTER: I can provide that.
16	In fact, we are working through the Mayor's
17	office. Rebecca Katz is the is our contact
18	there.
19	MR. JACKSON: Okay.
20	MR. LESTER: And we have begun the
21	work, in fact.
22	MR. JACKSON: Okay. The issue is

just to close the deal to the point where we have a document in the record that actually says we have agreement. We can move forward. You have already done that with the Parks and Recreation, so I congratulate you on. And of course, that can -- that document will be part of the -- will be on file before you get the building permits, which is also good.

In terms of administration of the college fund, are the mechanics of this actually worked out?

They are not fully MR. LESTER: worked out. And what I have said, I think in my response that Phil submitted, is that there wouldn't be a contribution until they were what we have said is we would participate in establishing the fund and working with the Council Member the Commissioner and to determine the criteria for giving it and the that would make up the selection folks committee, presumably, they would be faculty, staff of the area high schools, as well as a

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

representative from the Council Member and the 1 Commissioner. 2. 3 MR. JACKSON: I quess my question would be whether or not those details would be 4 in place by the time final action or --5 Well, let me do 6 CHAIRMAN HOOD: 7 this, so we won't have to go down piece by It needs to be fine tuned. It needs 8 piece. 9 to be ready for us for proposed action. know, as we ask specificity, how it's going to 10 11 be administered and some of the questions in 12 which Office of Planning, and we got this tonight, so I thought that it was -- it took 13 care of itself, but obviously not. 14 So what we need to do is fine tune 15 16 it. And I'm sure, Mr. Feola, as you alluded to earlier, you know what we're asking for and 17 what we're looking for. If not, you can work 18 19 with the Office of Planning and the ANC 20 Commissioner. Okay? All right. Any 21 questions? Are you finished, Mr. Jackson? 22 MR. JACKSON: Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Lawson, you
2	okay.
3	MR. JACKSON: Well, the only I
4	thought that it might be worthwhile if I
5	clarified what we were actually looking for in
6	terms of the affordable housing issue.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, let's, yes.
8	Thank you.
9	MR. JACKSON: In the future.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let's do that,
11	yes.
12	MR. JACKSON: Really when we we
13	applaud the applicant's changes to the plan in
14	that they dropped a couple of the models that
15	were originally proposed, which were closing
16	off the open spaces in the project, thereby
17	providing more open space.
18	But as we look through and looked
19	at the models that remained, we see that they
20	are three sizes. There is an A Model, a B
21	Model and a C Model. And they actually range
22	from 2,000 square feet to about 2,700 square

feet.

And what we would like to see would be the widest range of affordable housing opportunities on the site consistent with the goals of the affordable housing program and assisting with the proposals for this development in terms of types of units.

We are talking about the 14 foot units which are Model A, but then we also have 16 and 18 units, 18 foot wide units and really most of the units on this property are going to be of the Model B and C, which are the wider units.

In fact, only 25 percent of the units on-site would be the A Model, which would be 14 feet wide. So another way of they work -- the applicant computing their units based on the number of bedrooms and we think an alternative solution could be to compute it based on the types of units that are available.

So if we look at that, the portion

of current -- of units that currently exist,
25 percent are Model A, about 30 percent are
Model B and 37 percent are Model C. So that
would mean that possibly six of the units
could be Model A or the 14 feet, 6 of the
affordable units would be Model A 14 feet
wide, 9 of the units would be Model B, which
would be 16 feet wide, and then 9 would be
Model C, which is 18 feet wide. That's a
total of 24 units.

And then if you divide them up in terms of affordability range, you still are only talking about 3 and 3, 4 or 5 at -- 3 and 3 at the A level and then B an C being either 4 or 5 each. So again, this is just another way of looking at the affordability, looking at the -- and trying to provide the widest range of affordable options on the property as opposed to the widest -- as opposed to sticking just to the number of bedrooms.

MR. LAWSON: And just to add to what Mr. Jackson said, I'm Joel Lawson with

Office of Planning. The reason we suggested this is that typically in the past the Zoning Commission has accepted affordable units as an amenity item which you certainly have and we certainly support the applicant in their proffer of this amenity item, the Commission has looked for the affordable units to truly reflect the range of units that are available in the building or the development.

And that's why we suggested that, in this case, the Commission may want to look at the proffers as is brought forward and maybe whether it should include some of the larger size units as well, so that the amenity item is -- kind of reaches its maximum value by reflecting the mix of units that are in the development.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think as we opened up, we talked about the mix of units to begin with as we started, the different sizes.

You stated typically what we do and we will

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

take that under advisement. I think the 1 2 applicant has heard it loud and clear. 3 not going to necessarily direct, because I haven't talked to my colleagues or asked or 4 really strongly encouraged, because a lot of 5 that will come up for deliberation. 6 7 We can deliberate on that, at that time, and then we can -- before final action, 8 9 you know, on down road, but that's just a risk we take, unless you want to look at that, at 10 11 this point, Mr. Feola. 12 MR. FEOLA: Well --13 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Well, let me just say this. I did ask a question, 14 15 Office of Planning. What did you -- I mean, I did ask the question about the rational for 16 the 14 foot. Do you recall their response? 17 18 MR. JACKSON: They said that they 19 were -- I believe they have experience with 20 that unit and it sells is, essentially, what 21 they said.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:

22

Right.

MR. LAWSON: Yeah, and I think 1 2 what you were asking more was why all the 3 units were 14 feet. And we certainly don't disagree that a 14 foot wide unit is a 4 5 perfectly livable unit. The District has them all over the place in Dupont Circle, in 6 7 Capitol Hill and many neighborhoods have 14 foot wide 8 units and they entirely are 9 liveable. I think the response was that the 10 11 affordable units would have the same number of bedrooms as other units. Obviously, they 12 would be of smaller square footage, but that 13 they would have the same number of bedrooms. 14 15 We feel that it would be a stronger amenity item if the affordable units also reflected 16 the range of the size of the units themselves 17 and not just bedroom count. 18 19 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Sorry, 20 Mr. Chair, I just wanted to put, you know --21 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Mr. Feola 22 is going to save us all some time. Mr. Feola?

1	MR. FEOLA: What I was going to
2	ask, Mr. Chair, we're obviously going to hold
3	the record open for a number of items, if you
4	could hold the record open for clearly we
5	or I had a misunderstanding of my
6	communications with the Office of Planning,
7	because they explained it exactly right or now
8	that I understand what they were looking for.
9	And if we could take the time for
10	the post-hearing filings to include an
11	opportunity to respond to that?
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13	MR. FEOLA: And work with
14	Commissioner Grant as well
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
16	MR. FEOLA: to fine tune this
17	particular aspect, I would like to, I'm asking
18	the Commission for that permission.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure, sure. Yeah,
20	we want to do that. We want to make life easy
21	for all of us that propose time. Okay. Any
22	other questions of Office of Planning? Does

1	the applicant have any questions of the Office
2	of Planning?
3	MR. FEOLA: No, sir.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
5	Grant, do you have any questions of the Office
6	of Planning? Cross examination?
7	MR. GRANT: No, sir.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
9	With that, report of let me ask the Office
10	of Planning. We didn't have a DDOT report,
11	did we?
12	MR. JACKSON: No. Not that we
12 13	MR. JACKSON: No. Not that we saw.
13	saw.
13 14	saw. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did we? Okay.
13 14 15	saw. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did we? Okay. Well, I didn't see it. I may have missed it.
13 14 15 16	saw. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did we? Okay. Well, I didn't see it. I may have missed it. MR. JACKSON: The only report that
13 14 15 16 17	saw. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did we? Okay. Well, I didn't see it. I may have missed it. MR. JACKSON: The only report that we saw from another agency was from the
13 14 15 16 17 18	Saw. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did we? Okay. Well, I didn't see it. I may have missed it. MR. JACKSON: The only report that we saw from another agency was from the Department of Housing and Community
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did we? Okay. Well, I didn't see it. I may have missed it. MR. JACKSON: The only report that we saw from another agency was from the Department of Housing and Community Development.

1 MR. JACKSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Jackson. We did get a

Department of Housing and Community

Development, DHCD, that was the only other report that I saw. Now, we'll go to the report of ANC-5C. We have a letter stating for Commissioner Grant the Single Member District Commissioner for this area who will be providing his testimony. We have his testimony in front of us and, Commissioner Grant?

MR. GRANT: Good evening once again. I would first like to thank the Zoning Commission for allowing this public process to take place. I would like to also thank many of my neighbors who have come out: Deborah Smith, who is the former ANC Commissioner in our community for 10 years; Mr. Shabazz, who is the owner and founder of The Help Foundation, which is located on 4th -- 3rd, I'm sorry; Ula and Lozina Jackson, who live right

next to the proposed development; Linda Yahr, who submitted a letter and I guess that will go on the record; Carol Parks, our Commissioner Tim Day, who is at 5C10. And unfortunately, Danian Agostinelli could not be here tonight, but he has been very active in the process with the community.

First, I would like to talk about EYA. They have done a great job of coming Also a great job with addressing out. modifications to the plan. One of the main issues that citizens who live near the community, Ι mean, near the proposed development, their concern about was houses facing -- the back of the houses facing their community. And so that was one of the first modifications that took place.

Also, the park buffer between the houses on 5th and 6th and the proposed development was also another change that was made and I think the citizens will enjoy that. In particular, I would like to thank Jack

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Lester, who has come out for the last 12 months. He stayed beyond meeting time and engaged with citizens and so I'm definitely grateful for that.

great projects across the city and beyond the city limits. And I really take to their infill development where they actually take a look at the existing design and then try to build homes that can fit right in with that. And I think the Bryan Square project is the best example of that so far.

As an ANC Commissioner, it's my job to voice the concerns that the community has. And so we have had several meetings and the meetings' schedule was posted by EYA on their PowerPoint. And I think early on in the process, it took us a while to really get our arms around the development and what was actually taking place.

There were many citizens who would come and then we would have new citizens and

2.

then we have to re-explain what was taking place. And so we got to a point where we discussed the basic project and then we discussed the traffic study and the streetscape and how those things would affect the community.

And so it took us a while to really get to some of the issues that were burning with the citizens. I would like to point out three of those issues. I think we have talked about them so far in this hearing. The first being parking. Many of the citizens are concerned with quality of life.

This area that we are talking about, there is a lot of proposed development, but even with that development, I'm not sure that the proposed development beyond St. Paul's will give this community an opportunity to actually go without having an average of two cars.

Many of our citizens in our community have two cars. If you look at our

2.

houses, there is at least one space in front of this house, in front of these houses and then there is a garage in the back. And so many of our citizens use two cars. And so the idea of having one car garages in some of these units, it doesn't sit well with our community.

And so what we are looking to do is to actually have two cars for each garage, so that the existing community is not affected and that term "self-sustain" is what we really, really want to go to.

In terms of traffic, we're not just concerned about the traffic of the vehicles of the citizens who will be living in this project. We're also concerned about the construction traffic. I know it's a conversation that Jack and I have had. And we are actually looking to sit down with ABDO, who will be developing a few blocks up as well.

So we're trying to get this thing

to a point where all the construction traffic is coordinated. In terms of vehicular traffic for the development, one of the discussions was about the Bishops' land and the possibility of having an ingress/egress at that 4th Street exit. I mean, at that 4

At this point, we haven't received a formal letter from the Bishops stating their stance on this option. And so the citizens would not like to go forward until they actually hear from the Bishops whether or not they would be open do doing this. Of course, we have all made assumptions that maybe they wouldn't, but I don't think we should go off of assumptions.

So Mr. Lester and I have actually worked to try to set up a conference call initially with the Bishops and then have the Bishops respond to the community.

In terms of the traffic study, many of the citizens in the community

2.

understand that the impact at those main intersections won't be major, but those cars still have to get to those intersections. And so there is more of an impact at the immediate streets, 5th, 6th, going to Franklin and then Jackson and Hamlin going to 7th.

And they are very concerned, especially with the 7th Street side with the construction traffic and the possibility of the damages to homes, which I believe can all be restrained within the regulations for construction traffic. But it's still something that we haven't completely gotten our arms around as far as getting a solution for that.

In terms of amenities, one of the things that I think the reoccurring theme here for this whole project is that we have to really zoom in on the citizens who will be impacted the most. We're talking about this PUD application. And the PUD application is a question of what is the benefit of this

2.

exception for the people who will be impacted by this? What is the benefit for the community?

And so I think a lot of the studies that we have done have done a good job of talking about the greater good of the ward, but the citizens, especially in recent months, have come back and stated that we need to really zoom in on those immediate blocks.

And so think the amenities Т package was put together based on responses at several meetings. Meaning that, you know, for example, if you look at page 3 testimony, home ownership training. You know there may have been a citizen that came to meeting two and said hey, how can I get a house or how can I get ready for this or we may have had a citizen who comes to a meeting and talks about the fact that their child goes to Shaed and they would like to see improvements.

And so we have had this discussion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with citizens, whether it be during meeting, after the meeting, before, email, calls and so forth. My concern is that I believe that we still need to have one meeting, a workshop of sorts to address amenities, so that we can truly define it within the community and have ideas come together to kind of make this thing work in terms of what really helps the immediate community.

I guess in conclusion, I would like to iterate -- reiterate that in principle, you know, in general, I support the project. But I think there are a lot of loose ends that have to be tied up together.

At our last ANC meeting, I expressed many of the things that I have expressed here and I made a motion to ANC-5C that we not lend support or express opposition at this moment. I believe that the amenities package is a major portion of what will have to get in line in order for us to lend

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

support.

Also, the parking issue and the traffic would also have to be two issues that would have to come together between the community and the developer to make sure that this happens. And I would like to say, you know, on behalf of my community, we thank you guys for having this hearing.

For me, it has been very tough, because I got so jacked when I first met him, that field I played football on, I played baseball on, I thank St. Paul for allowing me to do that for many years. And so when this project came along, it was something that I really took to heart.

And so I hope that this Commission understands that it takes a very long while to get this thing together, because we have to deal with it for a lifetime.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's a very,
very good point. Okay. Thank you,
Commissioner Grant. Let me ask my colleagues,

1	do you have any questions of Commissioner
2	Grant?
3	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No, other
4	than that, you know, Commissioner Grant is
5	very, very impressive and the people who he is
6	working for are in good shape.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, yeah,
8	our hat is off to you, Commissioner Grant, for
9	what you have done with your community as well
LO	as with the ANC. Is this your first time?
11	MR. GRANT: Yes, it is. And about
12	five months in this happened, so from the
13	beginning, I have a very
L4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Jumping right in?
15	MR. GRANT: Yeah, jumping right
16	in.
L7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Good, good. Okay.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I'm happy
L9	to know that Ward 5 has like what two cars per
20	household? I didn't know that Ward 5 is
21	contributing to all the vehicular traffic of
22	the District.

1	MR. GRANT: Yeah.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I know he
3	confirmed it for me, so it's not from you.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Anyway, we're not
5	going to get into wards. Sometimes we have
6	ward battles. Sometimes we have city battles
7	up here, you know.
8	MR. GRANT: I think we are the
9	most active Ward 5.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Anyway,
11	let's move on. Any questions from the
12	applicant?
13	MR. FEOLA: I just have a couple.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm sorry, cross
15	examination?
16	MR. FEOLA: Well, one is
17	clarification. I guess the first,
18	Commissioner Grant, has the ANC passed a
19	resolution on these issues?
20	MR. GRANT: The ANC has passed a
21	resolution of recognition of the fact that EYA

1	lent support or expressed opposition, at this
2	moment.
3	MR. FEOLA: So the point you made
4	in your very eloquent statement tonight, do
5	not have the ANC's weight of a resolution. Is
6	that correct?
7	MR. GRANT: Well, I believe that
8	it would be the weight, because we have shown
9	that we have actually acknowledged
10	MR. FEOLA: Did they take a vote
11	on the points in your statement?
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Let me back up.
13	Let me back up. I didn't do something that I
14	should have done earlier. Colleagues, we have
15	a request to accept the late filing of ANC
16	from Chairperson Bonds and maybe this I
17	don't know if you have seen Chairperson
18	Bond's
19	MR. FEOLA: I have not.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So that's
21	my fault. I should have done that earlier.

1	volunteers. You know, I'm going to say the
2	same thing. Regardless of what ward, they all
3	are volunteers. They don't get paid and this
4	letter did not meet our time frame and they
5	have asked us to waive our rules to accept
6	this report dated July 15, 2008.
7	Any objections?
8	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No, no
9	objections.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we will
11	accept it. And, Mr. Feola, does Mr do we
12	have a copy for Mr. Feola? Do you have a
13	copy?
14	MR. GRANT: I can provide one as
15	early as tomorrow morning.
16	MR. FEOLA: It may answer my
17	question though, I guess.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think it will
19	answer your question.
20	MR. GRANT: You know, I may have
21	one here, as a matter of fact.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't want to

1	read the whole letter, but I think it will
2	answer your question.
3	MR. GRANT: This is the actual
4	resolution. I didn't turn the actual
5	resolution in to you guys, because we have the
6	signature from the Chair, but not the
7	recording secretary.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah, yeah.
9	Typically, I mean, because he brought the
10	question up, I think, Mr. Feola, if you could
11	just go ahead and ask your question and we
12	will take Commissioner Grant's testimony, so
13	we can move forward.
14	MR. LESTER: May I say something?
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is it germane to
16	what we're talking about?
17	MR. LESTER: Yeah.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.
19	MR. LESTER: And I appreciate all
20	the words that Silas said and he and I have
21	been working a lot of late nights and a lot
22	of, you know, weekend phone calls over the

past 13 months and we have made a lot of progress. And I think as Silas said that the community is supportive.

And these issues, these questions have come up on the parking. And I don't want to spend too much time. And we're trying to strike a balance between being sensitive to the larger D.C. concerns of more traffic on the roads and addressing the concerns of the community. And we hope to try to do that by providing this option for people to get the second car.

You know, with regard to the connection of 4th Street, I did commit to Silas the other day and we tried to call the Bishops' office to ask that. And I'm probably wrong to assume that they would make a connection, but I think it's more than that.

You know, the connection -- well, it's complicated. I mean, certainly we would not support closing Hamlin, Jackson, $5^{\rm th}$ and $6^{\rm th}$ in lieu of a connection to $4^{\rm th}$. And but as

I said, the connection to 4th really does have a de minimis impact and DDOT would possibly likely not support that as they haven't supported it in the other locations.

I think the major challenge that is just really come up really within the last week and a half is on the community benefits. And Silas, I know, would confirm this that we agreed early on we want to do community benefits in an organized logical way that it would be he and I and the Council Member in taking into consideration the community's input.

And I hear what Silas is saying that, you know, the community didn't really get their, you know, maybe hands around that specific issue until later in the process. Although, throughout the process, we had been collecting these ideas. The Triangle Park was very early on. There was support for that at -- people at the early meeting, of course, affordable housing.

2.

As I have said in my testimony earlier, none of these ideas were generated by anyone at EYA. These came from either Silas directly or through the community process.

And I feel like in the last, you know, week or so where we had had initial agreement, I think now there is this definition with of what is community benefit and what isn't.

And you know, my sense, and of course this is yours to ultimately decide with input from the Office of Planning, is that it is a broader community as opposed to, you know, the neighbor whose windows might rattle with the construction truck and, you know, replacing that, you know, person's windows, but rather creating a public benefit, a park nearby.

And so I think that's where, you know, now where we are struggling where I think Silas is thinking of it in a very, very narrow way. And certainly say if I'm wrong, and I'm thinking it in narrow, meaning Ward

1	5C09 to the extent we can, but not, you know,
2	Mrs. Smith's, you know, new windows or Mr.
3	Jones', you know, insulated attic.
4	And I think that's part of where
5	we are struggling. Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I thank you for
7	that. And I let you continue, but normally on
8	cross examination, Mr. Feola, you know we
9	don't usually do that.
10	MR. FEOLA: I know.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So I want you to
12	put that one in the hat.
13	MR. FEOLA: Okay. Is that
14	supposed to be a question to me or
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: This is time for
16	you to
17	MR. FEOLA: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You want to
19	continue to ask the question that you were
20	asking earlier?
21	MR. FEOLA: No. The resolution
22	that I have now seen answers the question.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right.
2	MR. FEOLA: The ANC took a
3	resolution to take no position on this case,
4	at this point in time
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: In time.
6	MR. FEOLA: for open issues.
7	And I didn't have that, the benefit of that,
8	that's all.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I think the
10	general consensus, we're going to they have
11	also asked us to leave the record open and we
12	have some dates in which we're going to be
13	dealing with towards the end. So if that was
14	another one of your questions, we're going to
15	allude to that towards the end of this
16	hearing.
17	MR. FEOLA: Okay. Then that's the
18	only question I had.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: The other
21	thing, I thought that Commissioner Grant
22	talked a little bit about construction

1	management. So I mean, I don't know if that
2	has been part of the discussion or
3	MR. LESTER: Well, two things. We
4	did submit a Construction Management Plan to
5	the Office of Planning and you all should have
6	that. And
7	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I'm just
8	going on what
9	MR. LESTER: Yes.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:
11	Commissioner yeah.
12	MR. LESTER: Commissioner Grant
13	did ask
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I'm just
15	talking about open points.
16	MR. LESTER: Okay.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I mean,
18	I'm just going on what his testimony was, I
19	mean.
20	MR. LESTER: He did ask me, as you
21	have testified, to meet with the folks at ABDO
22	as they contemplate the Catholic, you know,

1	South Campus, the Catholic U.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh,
3	that's what they are doing. Okay.
4	MR. LESTER: And we, of course,
5	committed to meet with them and Commission Day
6	and to coordinate. I think one thing that is
7	that I have stressed throughout the process
8	is that, and Bob mentioned it earlier, we are
9	an integrated company, so it's our it will
10	be our land development folks out there. It's
11	not going to be some other general contractor
12	who you know, if something if a truck
13	brings mud onto the road, it's me or an EYA
14	person that is out there every day.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
16	We're going to move right along. Anything
17	else? All right. Thank you for your
18	testimony.
19	MR. LESTER: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do we have
21	any let me ask this first. Do we have
22	anyone in the audience who is in opposition of

this application? Okay. All right. And the 1 2. reason I asked is because you may not -- you 3 must not have signed in, but anyway, we will get there. 4 Let me go by who I have here for 5 organizations and persons in support. 6 7 Mr. Shabazz, The Help Foundation, I think. have -- well, maybe you did sign in, you just 8 9 didn't check whether you were a proponent or an opponent. But let me go to who is checked 10 11 for being a proponent. you didn't want to 12 speak? Okay. Thomas Rosey, Thomas Rosey? 13 Okav. has left. Okay. Ms. Chambers has already 14 15 spoke for Council Member Thomas. I think it's Joe Martin or -- self-owned, speaking on 16 behalf of himself as an owner. Mr. Martin or 17 Ms. Martin? I"m sorry, I just can't make out 18 19 the first name. Okay. 20 Clara or Clare Etchariva? Either my eyes are tired or I just can't see, one or 21

the other, from the Religious of Mary.

I think -- Immaculate, okay. All right. Let me just do this. Anyone who is here in support, organizations or persons in support, just come on up. Former Commissioner Smith, good evening.

MS. SMITH: Good evening.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: You may begin.

MS. SMITH: Thank you. For the record, first, I would like to say that my Commissioner, who has represented me and my community real well today, I was really astonished, I didn't know that he had prepared what he said, but I just wanted to just have that noted on the record.

Also, I wanted to make a couple of comments that -- before I read my testimony regarding some of the things that I have heard up here, so that it will be a part of the record. I wanted to make sure that EYA and as they move forward to understand the discussion should have been in conjunction with your ANC Commissioner when you deal with the U.S.

2.

1 Conference of Bishops or anyone in the 2. community. 3 The U.S. Census information is outdated by eight years. The proposed influx 4 of new residents would increase by at least 5 450 adults, not including children. 6 7 Paul's College must retain their individuality with this project. 8 9 As I, Deborah L. Smith, appear here before the Zoning Commission's Chair and 10 11 Members, I thank you for this opportunity to provide my input on the proposed Planned Unit 12 Development known as Case No. 07-27 EYA St. 13 Paul's College. 14 As a resident who is less than 100 15 16 feet away from this development, a lifelong resident of this affected community by this 17 development and a prior five term Advisory 18 19 Neighborhood Commissioner in which this 20 development is being proposed, ANC-5C09, I am 21 providing the following testimony:

St. Paul's College has been and

still remains a great institution of solid religious foundation and favorable character interwoven into the Edgewood community. They have always assisted in the needs of the immediate surrounding community, even though they have been hit with thefts and economic struggles of their own.

I could not find any reason why this development should not happen at some point in time. However, given the atmosphere of the community surrounding this project with the fact that a meeting has not yet happened to get community's input on the amenities package, even though the Ward Council Member has inserted his own pet projects, the incentive package that the developers want to offer in its current status is flawed.

The traffic options are still a sticking point to the majority of residents who have participated and understand the depth of the project and what is actually happening to their quaint community. With the current

2.

proposal that area residents will have to deal with additional increase and traffic onto 7th Street by way of Jackson Street, N.E., which would be the egress/ingress point of this development.

With the addition of proposed developments to occur in the next several years surrounding this PUD, we are within a 1 to 2 mile radius, the proposed traffic outlay needs to be re-evaluated to accommodate the influx of new and existing vehicular traffic regardless of how stagnate, since it will dramatically affect the quality of life for the residents in that immediate area.

Community benefits have not been given the just due of process as relates to the immediate community's needs. Even though some benefits are being proposed, for the most part, there are projects that support the portfolio of our Council Member and not the community.

The current package is not --

2.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Smith, what
2	I'm going to do
3	MS. SMITH: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm doing this
5	because it's Ward 5. Colleagues, you know, I
6	would do this for any ward, but let's give her
7	two more minutes.
8	MS. SMITH: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Smith, if you
LO	could finish it up?
11	MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you. Um,
12	the current package does not address nor
L3	provides the immediate community organizations
L4	that will be directly affected by this project
15	any support, even though there is a certainty
16	that this newly proposed housing development
L7	with its new residents and guests will, at
18	some point in time, have a need to use or have
19	access to these community entities.
20	Dan's Place, Beacon House, The
21	Football Team, Help and The Edgewood Civic
22	Association are all nonprofits in our

immediate community that have not been identified in the amenities package, including the newly rebuilt Edgewood Recreation Center.

It comes as no surprise that our economic -- that our economy has taken a down turn which, in fact, effects the functionality of our nonprofits who serve our neediest residents, children and seniors. There is no reason why each one of these organizations should not receive at least \$75,000 each to assist with their operational costs.

This will allow each one of these organizations an opportunity to get additional funding through match dollared grants increasing their ability to serve our community needs.

In addition, the current amenities package calls for improvements to be made to Shaed Elementary School. While this is important, the City Council is addressing this issue with their current approval of \$121 million for improvements to all schools, so

2.

this part of the package has been addressed. 1 The Triangle Park which has been 2 3 listed falls under the Department of Parks and Recreation. The current plan makes 4 5 astonishing improvements that are warranted, but needs to be tweaked. While this is D.C. 6 7 Government property, the D.C. Park and Recreation needs to be a partner 8 in this 9 initiative, since this plan only calls for one year of maintenance after the improvements 10 11 have been made. There is a direct need to increase 12 13 maintenance of this park, once the improvements are made. Since all too often 14 15 projects like this start out beautiful, but 16 end up in disaster, because there is no continuality to maintain the area. 17 18 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Can we get your 19 closing? 20 MS. SMITH: Okay. In conclusion, it is imperative that this Board understands 21 22 the importance of the community, that it is

being -- that is being affected by this 1 2 project. And requests that they be given the 3 chance to weigh in. small 4 Also, as а note, 5 community has been -- made comments about the well, 6 that - the flyers 7 circulated to area residents. The flyer does not depict enough information that will inform 8 9 the community of the impact it will have on the surrounding area, so adjustments need to 10 11 be made accordingly. This concludes my Thank you. And I appreciate it, 12 testimony. 13 Ward 5, thank you. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. 14 Ms. Smith, 15 let me just ask one question. You say about 16 the flyers were circulated to area residents. The flyer does not depict enough information. 17 18 What do you mean? What are you saying? 19 MS. SMITH: Well, the flyers were 20 They were provided, I take it, by EYA. great. But the gist of the information did not give 21

the area residents enough jolt to say do you

1	know or do you realize. Because as we know,
2	as residents in D.C., unless you give them
3	something that says, you know, that it is at
4	your front door, do they normally come out.
5	So it was just a basic flyer
6	saying you're having a community meeting more
7	so than do you realize that a new proposed
8	development of 200 and some odd people are
9	coming, 450 residents, how this impacts the
10	traffic, your quality of life level, blah,
11	blah, blah.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So it
13	didn't say that there is a new development?
14	It just said it was a community meeting. Let
15	me ask you, a lot of people who within 200
16	feet received a notice, right?
17	MS. SMITH: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So that's not even
19	a question.
20	MS. SMITH: Exactly.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
22	MS. SMITH: No problem. Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Colleagues,
2	do we have any other questions of Ms. Smith?
3	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: No
4	questions.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I thank you
6	for your testimony.
7	MS. SMITH: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Is there anyone
9	else who would like to testify in support?
10	Any organizations or persons? Okay. Next,
11	organizations or persons in opposition? I'm
12	not sure. Ms. Merit? Let me just do this.
13	Anyone who is in opposition.
14	MS. YAHR: I'm in support.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You think you are
16	in support?
17	MS. YAHR: Well, if that was in
18	support.
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All those who want
20	to testify and don't know whether they are in
21	support or opposition, please, come forward.
22	Let's do it that way. Anyone else who just

1	wants to testify, please, come forward.
2	Opposition, support or not sure, please, come
3	forward. Okay. So you would be our last
4	person to testify tonight. Anyone else, just
5	come forward.
6	MS. YAHR: Oh, okay.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
8	MS. YAHR: I'm sorry to seem
9	disty.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's okay.
11	That's all right. Give us your name and give
12	your name first.
13	MS. YAHR: My name is Linda Yahr.
14	I own and live own a home and live at 1017
15	Lawrence Street, N.E. I'm actually an ANC-
16	5C10, but my home is very close to 7 th Street,
17	which will have a significant impact on
18	traffic from this development.
19	The reason why I have switched
20	over to putting myself in support is that I do
21	want to say that I think that the development
22	on-site as planned is very well done and I

think will be a great asset to the community.

I can't say that I'm against the development itself. What I would like to comment on, and now I'm going to go into my real testimony, is, the reason why I wanted to testify here, to comment upon the PUD request by EYA for the development on the property of St. Paul's College.

However, my concerns about that development are related to concerns about the multiple projects planned for this area of Ward 5 and adjoining developments. Although there are significant problems with traffic and parking, I would rather leave those comments about those issues to others.

Among other issues, EYA is seeking status as a Planned Unit Development in order to secure certain concessions to zoning. Developers are expected to return value to the community in exchange for these concessions characterizes amenities.

In their last presentation to the

2.

community, EYA described the benefit to them of the PUD as a 20 percent increase in allowed density. This would result in, approximately, a \$25 million increase in the value of their property.

is offering list EYA of amenities that I believe to be insignificant in proportion to the benefit that they will receive. They, themselves, if you take away the affordable housing, the citizens who were at least who are participating in that meeting, the last community meeting as well as other people I have talked to don't consider affordable housing to be an appropriate amenity for us to be considering.

When you take away the affordable housing part, they, themselves, value the offered amenities of \$800,000. I would estimate its value closer to \$500,000. Even at the higher figure, the benefit to the community of these amenities proposed is too little compared to the value to the landowner

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and the developer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I believe a minimum of 10 percent of the increase in value of the property as a result of the PUD should be returned to the community.

Edgewood, Brookland the and surrounding the areas are target of proposed development by their significant largest and most powerful landowners. developments will significantly change the character of the community. Some of these changes are welcome. Most residents would neighbors like more and а more viable commercial district.

some of these changes are feared and are the result of poor and/or uncoordinated planning. For many years, we have enjoyed the benefits of much green space, both active and passive. Green space does not only provide aesthetic and recreational benefits. Its greatest importance is the maintaining of healthy air quality, as well as

habitat for beneficial wildlife. 1 Perhaps the residents have become 2. complacent. Oh, is that my three minutes? 3 live in Ward 5, do I still get a pass on this? 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: You know, one of 5 these nights I'm going to get in trouble. 6 7 What I will do, I'm going to be fair, because we only have three people and I hope my 8 9 colleagues will indulge. I'm going to give you two additional minutes. 10 11 MS. YAHR: Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not because you live in Ward 5, but because there's only three 13 people that is testifying. 14 15 MS. YAHR: I have great respect for all the wards of the District. 16 Let me residents 17 see, perhaps the have 18 complacent, because most of this green space 19 was in private hands. Now those private hands 20 want to turn their property into profit. And we will lose the beauty of our neighborhoods 21

and the quality of our environment.

I propose that the Zoning Commission, the Office of Planning and the citizens of Ward 5 consider the following proposal: That the community receive an amenity of significant value in exchange for the great number of PUD requests that will come before this body; and that all the applicants for PUDs, which would include at least EYA, St. Paul's, ABDO, Catholic University, Jamal, WMATA and would obligated, collectively, to support a major improvement. The community should be consulted as to the nature of this amenity. But I have a proposal. To replace the significant amount of green space we will lose, I propose the establishment of a park and wildlife sanctuary

This land includes lowlands, wetlands and highlands and could be improved

University of America owns on Harewood Road

on the large acreage that the Catholic

across from the Shrine.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to provide recreational opportunities such as 1 2 picnic grounds as well as environmental 3 preservation and education through installation of boardwalks over the wetlands. 4 5 Making this preserve -- making this into preserved space in perpetuity would 6 7 do much to assure the continuance of the benefits of green space. This project would 8 9 be funded through partial application of the amenity funds of all the developments in the 10 11 The calculus calculation of this obligation should be based upon the increase 12 in the value to the developer, as a result of 13 the PUD. 14 Those who make a profit on their 15 16 presence in our community need to start paying their fair share. Let me get one more thing 17 18 out. 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Your closing 20 thought. We expect and demand 21 MS. YAHR: 22 Smart Growth in all of these projects.

1	proposal does not relieve property owners and
2	developers from that obligation. We will not
3	trade away our requirement that all the
4	developers use their land wisely, that all the
5	developed parcels are aesthetic and
6	environmentally sound.
7	We will continue to be an active
8	citizenry. This proposal is only one way we
9	demand that the landowners and developers act
10	as good citizens.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
12	very much.
13	MS. YAHR: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: If you can just
15	hold your seat, we may have some questions.
16	MS. YAHR: Thank you for the
17	opportunity.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure. Thank you.
19	Young lady, if you can turn your microphone on
20	and introduce yourself.
21	MS. PARKS: My name is Carol
22	Parks. I'm at 6 th and Franklin, which my

street will be impacted because my street will

then go into the property and become 6

th

Street. I'm not opposed to the development,

but I'm opposed to the way it has been

proposed as regards to parking.

As from those diagrams, you can

As from those diagrams, you can see that every street is just one street. 5th Street is one street, 6 th Street. We don't have parking now. Some of the people from 5th Street are now parking on 6th Street. We are taking parking from people on Girard Street, which has not been mentioned in the project.

And we questioned, I think his name is, Jack intensely at our last meeting with the neighbors and what we found out is there is a garage and if you have a one car garage and you have two cars, you can't even park outside. Like if one car goes in, that-the second car can't even park behind the first car. It's an alley here.

So that second car has to park some place. They have no on-street parking

within that development. So if a person buys a one car garage, which they might, because it may be more affordable, and they have two cars or three cars, they have no provision for those other cars. And those people will have to find parking within the community. And this is why we are concerned.

Our community is not such that we want to go down 7th Street. 7th Street has people standing all around the stores. We don't even frequent. Guys standing around. If we go the other way, we have Edgewood. Edgewood has a lot of concerns and it's a lot of singles. It's a lot of older people in the neighborhood. And we don't want to not be able to go to Bible Study at night and come back and can't find a space and have to go three or four blocks concerning all of the elements that we have just down the street.

So instead of all that green and the gardens and all of that, I think they should find a place for their people to park.

1	Everybody with a one car garage is not going
2	to have one car. And Metro for us is not that
3	accessible.
4	From my house on 6 th Street, I
5	would have to walk 10 long blocks to get to
6	Metro. When I take Metro, I drive my car and
7	I park on the street. For other people that
8	live down around 7 th Street, you see them at
9	the bus stops. They are not walking to Metro.
10	It is 10 long blocks.
11	So I'm not opposed, but I need for
12	them to find a place, let us know where their
13	people are going to park, because they have no
14	parking within their confines. So that is my
15	opposition.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you
17	very much. So noted. Colleagues, any
18	questions? I'm sorry, young lady, we may have
19	questions for you, if you can come back.
20	MS. YAHR: Oh, I'm sorry.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I forgot your
22	name, forgive me.

1	MS. YAHR: Linda Yahr.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Do you have
3	any do we have any questions of this panel?
4	Okay. Does the applicant have any questions,
5	any cross?
6	MR. FEOLA: No, sir.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Does the
8	ANC have any cross examination?
9	MR. GRANT: No, no.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
11	We want to thank you all for your testimony.
12	And we have heard your concerns. Thank you
13	very much.
14	MS. YAHR: Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. That was
16	our last panel. No one else wanted to testify
17	either in opposition or support or unsure.
18	What we're going to do in this fashion, Mr.
19	Feola, we're going to try to come up with some
20	dates. Ms. Hanousek? And I want to thank Ms.
21	Hanousek. Ms. Hanousek, you have done a
22	marvelous job tonight. I know this is your

1	first time being solo without Ms. Schellin,
2	but you've done a fabulous job of making sure
3	that all of us stay on track and especially
4	me, so thank you very much.
5	MR. FEOLA: Mr. Chairman?
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes?
7	MR. FEOLA: We have a little bit
8	of rebuttal.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Rebuttal. You
10	know what, I thought about that after
11	before I got started.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: And the
13	operative word is little hopefully. It's
13 14	operative word is little hopefully. It's late.
14	late.
14 15	late. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't think we
14 15 16	late. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't think we would have so much with all this support. A
14 15 16 17	late. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't think we would have so much with all this support. A few issues. Okay. Let's
14 15 16 17	late. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't think we would have so much with all this support. A few issues. Okay. Let's MR. FEOLA: I just have one
14 15 16 17 18	late. CHAIRMAN HOOD: I didn't think we would have so much with all this support. A few issues. Okay. Let's MR. FEOLA: I just have one question.

for Mr. Lester and 30 seconds worth of concluding remarks.

Mr. Lester, you heard a lot of comment about the community amenities and where they came from and I think former Commissioner, ANC Commissioner Smith alluded to the Council Member's pet projects. You might want to comment on that.

MR. LESTER: Yes, if I may. Thank you. I want to be clear that none of these amenities came from either EYA or anyone at EYA nor did any of them come from Council Member Thomas or his staff. They were party to it, as I said, as I committed to the Council Member when I met him 16 months ago to discuss this that I would keep him in the loop, that Silas and I with the community would bring them to him.

None of these are his pet projects. He didn't contribute any of them.

And in fact, his staff tried to help us refine some of the questions that were raised about

money going for the small business grants or for the college fund.

And the flyers, may I clarify on that? The -- Silas had requested that we prepare the flyers at our cost, deliver them to his house for each of the 11 or 12 public meetings that we had or, excuse me, just the community meetings. So that was maybe seven or eight.

You know, I reviewed the information on it. There was always a picture of the project. It was, you know, typically an attractive picture. That one was often on it. It always had the time, the date, the location and there was always 500 or 600 of them printed.

The last of the Triangle Park, we did work closely with the Department of Parks and Rec. I can tell you they are enthusiastic about the improvements and they are the ones that requested us -- requested of us that we provide a year of maintenance and we agreed to

2.

1 \parallel do that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. FEOLA: Did you want to mention the 80 on-street spaces?

Well, there are MR. LESTER: already on-street spaces. You are probably aware of that. I know it was testified that it wasn't. And the last -- I quess the last I did make a note, Shaed Elementary. Shaed Elementary was -- again, that was a request, my recollection, it was directly from Commissioner Grant. It was important. important to the community and we jumped in enthusiastically to the point where, you know, we are out there making it happen today.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I will tell you -let me just say this. We don't do
demonstrations on it. There was a time to
testify. What I would encourage everyone to
do is to work with your ANC Commissioner. We
called for opposition. We called for support.
I'm not sure if you disagree with what he
said, but I will tell you that the record is

1	going to be open some time for some more
2	submittals.
3	So that's just to acknowledge what
4	was going on. Okay. All right.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Mr.
6	Chair?
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Sure.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Are you
9	done with your rebuttal?
10	MR. FEOLA: Yes.
11	MR. LESTER: Yes.
12	MR. FEOLA: Thank you.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I just
14	you know, if you don't mind just indulging me
15	just a minute. From what I have heard
16	tonight, it seems to me that people are pretty
17	much supportive of this project. There's just
18	some fine tuning that needs to happen. So,
19	you know, I don't think you need to take on a
20	defensive posture here.
21	MR. LESTER: Okay.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I don't
ļ	

think that's necessary. I just think you need to pull your sleeves up and just make certain that people are clear about exactly what you are doing and you might need to -- maybe not always speak in developer tone, but just, you know, as a resident and so forth to make certain that people are clear about, you know, exactly what you are doing, because a lot of what was stated here was really things that you already talked about, you know, such as the parking and things of that sort.

So it seems there is a communication issue that you are going to have to deal with. So it sounds like a pretty good project, but you need to make certain that the community is clear about, you know, exactly what they are getting and so forth. You know, so that's where I see it.

And so I don't get a sense that you're that far apart. That's just my impression. So I just didn't want the developer to walk out thinking that, you know,

this is not a great project. But also, it 1 sounds to me with the community, there is a 2. 3 number of things that you need to do and just roll your sleeves up and get to work and so by 4 the time we get to proposed action, we can, 5 you know, hopefully move this thing along. 6 7 MR. FEOLA: I appreciate it. a couple of concluding comments. 8 One is to 9 the defense of my client, I think part of the frustration is that we thought a deal had been 10 struck before this -- the 13th meeting. 11 it didn't fall apart, I think, legitimately as 12 some people have said. It finally came to 13 14 light. And that happens. 15 And I do this for a living. 16 know it happens. And so we have to deal with But I think what you are hearing 17 might be a little bit of we worked on this for 18 19 16 months and the last three weeks issues 20 arose. VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: 21 I mean, I 22 also want to say this Commission has and I

have been one of the Commissioners that -- you know, and I don't like over parking of developments. Particularly if you are close to, you know, a Metro now.

Someone testified that you are really not that close to the Metro, but clearly, you know, the District has certain policy initiatives that it's trying to push and sometimes the developer is trying to achieve that, strike the balance. I think Mr. Youngentob mentioned that.

But you know, again, I just think it's important that the communication is real clear and that even if people is nodding their head, they still might not fully understand everything that you are saying and you need to just make certain that you are clear, because, you know, they have come out and spent many hours tonight, you know, waiting to testify, so they feel very strongly about these issues. And you know, we just want to make certain that, you know, their voices are heard.

2.

1	MR. FEOLA: And I think as I said
2	in my concluding remarks, I think this is like
3	a very almost a classic struggle between
4	how to do a development in an existing
5	community. I would hope the Commission as it
6	contemplates this going forward to recognize
7	despite what Ms. Yahr said about this great
8	open space, this is private property.
9	The Paulists owns this 10 acres of
10	land that we are proposing to develop and it
11	has development rights. I did a quick back of
12	the envelope calculation here and we could
13	have 400,000 square it's R-5-A, without
14	zoning change. We could have 400,000 square
15	feet of apartments. That's 400 apartment
16	units. Just
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: We don't
18	need to go there.
19	MR. FEOLA: No.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: We just
21	MR. FEOLA: I think, you know, we
22	all take a look at I went to school up

there. I lived in Brookland. I know the area and we all love those spaces, but we have to recognize that they are private property and we try to balance it as the developer of that property with a lot of open space, Smart Growth techniques, trying to get this balance of cards exactly right.

And so I think we have done a lot of that. The applicant has done a lot of that to get here. We have called it a lot of city policies. The first application that we proposed had well over two plus cars per unit.

VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: But, Mr. Feola, clearly you know that this is not the first PUD application we have seen here. of mean, we have seen lot these applications. We have a good sense in terms of the types of things that we see in the PUD applications. We have also seen, you know, where there is disagreement from the community and so forth and most times we get these things reconciled.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	But I just want to make certain
2	that everybody recognizes that, you know, it
3	seems that you are not that far apart.
4	MR. FEOLA: And we will.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah.
6	MR. FEOLA: We think we have got a
7	quality housing development that is extremely
8	environmentally sensitive.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
10	MR. FEOLA: It meets all the city
11	goals and policies.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: We got
13	it.
14	MR. FEOLA: And we have to dot
15	some Is.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
17	MR. FEOLA: And I think we
18	thank you for your time to get there and we
19	will get there.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: I'm
21	sorry, Mr. Chair.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's all right.

1	That's all right.
2	MR. FEOLA: Is it interesting
3	concluding
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm turning
5	everybody's mike off. Have you finished
6	your
7	MR. FEOLA: I have, yes.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Here is
9	where I am. And I want to comment on
LO	something that was said by one of the folks
11	who were in opposition or thinking about being
12	in opposition or whatever it was. But one of
13	the things in another part of the city when
L4	you talk about a number of PUDs, we cannot,
15	basically, hold this application to a joint
16	thing, a joint effort.
L7	I will tell you that over in
18	southwest, they did start doing that with all
19	the development, but it is contingent upon all
20	the parties agreeing and trying to work out
21	this massive grant of amenities, because,

basically, as was already said, in the

discussion that you heard between Mr. Feola 1 and the Vice Chairperson, is we have to look 2. 3 at each PUD application in front of us and we, basically, balance that with what is requested 4 relief -- relief requested versus what is 5 being proffered. 6 7 hitting But Ι think you were something, but it's up to the community, 8 9 especially in Ward 5 or any ward, to do as they did in Ward, what was that 6, 6 when they 10 11 start trying to formulate all the construction with amenities that are sustainable. 12 Yes, I like to see amenities that, 13 as the Commissioner said, last the life of the 14 15 project. And that's what we need to start 16 gearing ourselves towards. But this application here with affordable housing and 17 other amenities that's there, we need to 18 balance that with what the relief is that's 19 20 being requested. And as the Vice Chair said, you're 21

You're not far off.

not far off.

22

I'm hoping

that it comes back, it will make our life a 1 lot easier. If not, we will make the 2. 3 decision. Let's see what kind of 4 Okay. One thing we will not do, we will 5 grant the ANC time. I do not like doing 6 7 anything in July and August. If you want to get something over on folks in this city, and 8 9 I say this all the time, you do it in July and But we will not even be meeting in 10 August. 11 August, so Ms. Hanousek, can we have some 12 dates? Well, let's do this first. 13 see what is needed, what we have asked for. 14 15 I know Commissioner May had a few things, that was so long I forgot I'm sure. Can we work 16 Ms. Hanousek, have you -- did you 17 that out? keep a record of what we needed? 18 19 MS. HANOUSEK: I think so. 20 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Can you call off a list and we can coordinate with 21 22 your list?

MR. FEOLA: If you like, and given 1 2 the late day, we can do this or do you want to 3 have it on the record? I think we need to CHAIRMAN HOOD: 4 do it for the record. 5 6 MR. FEOLA: Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN HOOD: We can do it right quick. 8 9 MR. FEOLA: Okay. MS. HANOUSEK: The details of the 10 11 amenities completely ironed out. The -revisiting the affordable housing size of 12 Providing a site plan that shows more 13 of the context, so we can better see the 14 15 relationship between the private streets and 16 the neighboring streets. Providing some three dimensional views of the development, so that 17 we can see it in relation to the rest of the 18 19 grounds and the context of the neighborhood. the 20 And related to that was 21 volumetric study within the campus, especially 22 the 36 foot courtyards showing something in

1	scale, showing something where you could, you
2	know, depict people. Providing photos of the
3	surrounding neighborhood houses, so that we
4	can better understand the context.
5	Provide larger scale, more
6	detailed renderings and color of the row
7	houses. Where there will be downspouts,
8	showing them on the elevations. And that's
9	all I have.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: How did we do, Mr.
11	Feola?
12	MR. FEOLA: I had one more, I
13	think, that Commission May wanted, what I'll
14	call hard line elevations, that included with
15	or without downspouts. I think he wanted more
16	specificity on the
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: She said
18	that.
19	MR. FEOLA: Oh, she did say it?
20	I'm sorry. Okay. I'm sorry, I didn't hear
21	her say that.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. We need to

1	make sure everybody is on the mike though.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes.
3	Some of my requests and Commissioner May's
4	requests were pretty similar, so again, those
5	perspectives. Again, a perspective that
6	shows, you know, the tow bow, that shows, you
7	know, exactly what one would experience in
8	terms of walking onto this new development.
9	MR. FEOLA: Vignette street views,
10	perspectives from the outside.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:
12	Absolutely.
13	MR. FEOLA: Volumetric studies
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right.
15	MR. FEOLA: within the campus
16	courtyards.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yeah.
18	MR. FEOLA: A variety of roof
19	light at the courtyard.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Right,
21	right. And then again, if I could see a
22	perspective of one of the residences, existing
	I .

residence and what they are looking at from 1 their front porch or whatever as they look 2. 3 into the development. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okav. Let's come 4 up with some dates and we will wind it down. 5 6 MS. HANOUSEK: Okay. CHAIRMAN HOOD: 7 Ms. Hanousek? If the applicant 8 MS. HANOUSEK: can get the materials to us by August 15 th, 9 that should be plenty of time, right? 10 11 then the ANC will get its response to us by September 26th to give them time after their 12 meeting. And then we will set up a Special 13 Public Meeting for, at 6:00, September 29th. 14 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And the reason, the rational for those dates, first of all, we 16 don't meet in August and the ANC, I think, 17 takes a break. And if we had done it any 18 19 closer, the ANC would only have three days to 20 get a response in to us. So we had to look to 21 those dates and especially being a response to

the volunteers who work very hard in the city.

22

1	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay. I
2	just this is something between the Chair
3	and I and the Special Public Meeting. So why
4	do we have to do a Special Public Meeting?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We were trying to
6	accommodate our schedules, because our next
7	meeting will push you into October.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh, we
9	don't have a September meeting?
10	MR. FEOLA: It's after the ANC.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We have a
12	September, but we won't meet it, because the
13	ANC because of the ANC's schedule.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh, okay.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Some of
16	MS. HANOUSEK: And, Commissioner
17	Jeffries, we already have a hearing that
18	night, so
19	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Yes, but
20	if normally in those situations oh, we
21	already have a hearing on Monday night? Okay.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So it's just not

1	we should just be a Special Public Meeting and
2	we have a hearing afterwards. So can we have
3	30 minutes?
4	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Sure.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
6	Do we have anything else tonight?
7	MR. FEOLA: One clarification.
8	I'm assuming this goes without saying. If
9	in addition to the August 15 th filing for the
10	required for the request, I assume if there
11	is a coming together of the amenities package
12	with the community, if that changes what is
13	already in, we would I have an opportunity
14	to file that? Because right now, it's like we
15	are done on August 15 th and we wait for the
16	ANC to respond. I'm assuming that we
17	working with the
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think, yeah, we
19	need to be amenable to that, yeah.
20	MR. FEOLA: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. Feola, we are
22	amenable to that.

1	MR. FEOLA: Okay.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yeah.
3	MR. FEOLA: I just wanted I
4	thought you would be.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. We want to
6	be fair. Okay. Anything else?
7	All right. I want to thank
8	everyone for their participation.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES:
10	Commissioner Grant, are you fine with what we
11	just talked about?
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh.
13	MR. GRANT: Yes, I am.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Oh, do
15	you have a question?
16	MR. GRANT: Just to be clear, are
17	you stating that on August 15 th that we would
18	have to have this package in place?
19	CHAIRMAN HOOD: No.
20	MR. GRANT: Okay. Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: What's his date?
22	What is the ANC's date? It's after their
	I

1	meeting. It's after your meeting.
2	MS. HANOUSEK: September 26 th .
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
4	MS. HANOUSEK: Is when we have to
5	have your response.
6	MR. GRANT: Sure, sure.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: September 26 th .
8	MR. GRANT: Okay.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I hope you all
10	work together.
11	MR. GRANT: Oh, yeah, yeah.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Come back in and
13	make the Special Public Meeting a lot quicker
14	than the 30 minutes that I said.
15	MR. GRANT: Okay.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So let's work on
17	that. If not, we're going to hash it out. I
18	would rather for the neighborhood and the
19	applicant to hash it.
20	MR. GRANT: No, definitely we'll
21	hash this thing out. Just as a point of
22	clarification, for me as an ANC Commissioner,

regardless of what point it takes place, if I 1 see fit that the citizens have a concern, then 2 3 I have to voice that. And, you know, if that comes in 4 the form of apology to you, I about -- the 5 fact that it came about in this month, then 6 7 I'll do that. But at the same time, you know, I have to -- if they -- as an area or as a 8 9 neighborhood come about -- come to a point where, okay, this is our concerns, at that 10 11 moment, it could have been last night. a Commissioner for 24/7, I have to always have 12 my ears open to their concerns. 13 So I do apologize if that has made 14 15 this difficult, but --CHAIRMAN HOOD: Oh, no, we do this 16 all the time. It didn't make it difficult for 17 18 us, no. 19 VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: But 20 understand, I think the Chair mentioned this, eventually, if you don't get this settled, we 21 22 will settle it up here.

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We will settle it.
2	MR. GRANT: Oh, I understand, yes.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
5	MR. GRANT: I'm saying
6	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: We're not
7	interested in just going on and on.
8	MR. GRANT: Yes, yeah, yeah.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
10	Okay.
11	MR. GRANT: And I have made that
12	clear, too, to Jack, in particular, that it's
13	not about making this go on and on. That's
14	not the type of Commissioner that I want to
15	be. I want to get resolutions, but I also am
16	aware of time and those sort of issues though.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN JEFFRIES: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. All right.
19	Well, good. I think we are all on the same
20	page. And as we said, we just encourage you
21	all to work together. You might not get 100
22	percent resolution and then we will have to

1	put all the pieces in and help bring some
2	closure.
3	But I want to thank everyone for
4	their participation tonight. And all those
5	who participated and those who came down to
6	observe. Hopefully it was very informative
7	and great presentation by all.
8	With that, Ms. Hanousek, is
9	everything in order?
LO	MS. HANOUSEK: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. With
12	that, this hearing is adjourned.
13	(Whereupon, the Public Hearing was
14	concluded at 10:16 p.m.)
15	
L6	
L7	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
l	I .