



Pillsbury
Winthrop
Shaw
Pittman LLP

2300 N Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1122

Tel 202.663.8000
Fax 202.663.8007
www.pillsburylaw.com

February 8, 2008

Paul Tummonds
Phone: 202.663.8873
paul.tummonds@pillsburylaw.com

By Mail

Sharon Schellin
Secretary to the D.C. Zoning Commission
441 4th Street, NW
Suite 210-S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Zoning Commission Case No. 05-35; Horning Brothers and Stanton Square, LLC (the "Applicant") – Recorded PUD Covenant

Dear Ms. Schellin:

Enclosed please find a certified copy of the PUD Covenant for the above-mentioned case that was recorded in the DC Land Records on February 7, 2008, as Instrument No. 2008014447. Please feel free to contact me if you have any comments regarding the attached Covenant.

Sincerely,

Paul Tummonds

Enclosure

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 05-35

EXHIBIT NO. 49

cc: Matt Le Grant, Zoning Administrator
Jeff Milota/Robert Love (By e-mail, w/o encl.)

2008 FEB 12 AM 11:40

D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING

RECEIVED

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.05-35
EXHIBIT NO.49



LT2-0-0-41

PUD COVENANT

THIS COVENANT, made as of this 7th day of December, 2007, by and between STANTON SQUARE, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "Developer") and the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, a municipal corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "District").

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, Developer is the owner of Lots 60, 61, 78, 832, 835, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 873, 878, and 879 in Square 5877 (such property hereinafter referred to as the "Subject Site"), as described in the attached Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, Developer intends to develop the Subject Site for use as a Planned Unit Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Project") under Chapter 24 of the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia in accordance with Zoning Commission Order No. 05-35 effective November 23, 2007, in Zoning Commission Case No. 05-35; and

WHEREAS, said Chapter 24 and Zoning Commission Case No. 05-35 further require that Developer enter into this Covenant with the District of Columbia assuring Developer's (and its respective successors in title) development and operation of the Project as approved by the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as the "Zoning Commission") in Order No. 05-35 and all modifications, alterations or amendments thereto.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing recitals, which are a material part hereof, it is agreed among the parties hereto as follows:

1. Recitals. The above recitals are incorporated herein.
2. Approved Plans. The terms and conditions of the Zoning Commission's approval of the Planned Unit Development under Order No. 05-35 effective November 23, 2007, in Zoning Commission Case No. 05-35 (as the same may be amended and/or modified from time to

DOB-5612

After Recording Return To:
Tri-State Commercial Closings, Inc.
1150 18th Street, N.W. Suite 575
Washington, DC 20036

11
CMF

time, the "Order"), are incorporated herein by reference and made a part hereof as Exhibit B and shall be considered a part of this Covenant. The Subject Site will be developed and used in accordance with the plans approved by said Order and in accordance with conditions and restrictions contained in said Order, subject to such changes thereto as the Zoning Commission and/or the Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia may authorize. Developer covenants that it will use the Subject Site only in accordance with the terms of the Order, as the same may be further amended and/or modified from time to time, subject to the terms and conditions contained herein and the provisions of Chapter 24 of the Zoning Regulations.

3. Additional Time to Construct Planned Unit Development. If Developer should fail to file for a building permit and to commence construction of the approved Planned Unit Development within the time specified in Sections 2408.8 and 2408.9 of the Zoning Regulations and the Order, the Zoning Commission may duly consider an application for an extension of time for good cause shown.

4. Default. In the event that Developer fails to file for a building permit and to commence construction of the approved Planned Unit Development within the time specified in Sections 2408.8 and 2408.9 of the Zoning Regulations and the Order or within any extension of time granted by the Zoning Commission for good cause shown, the benefits granted by the Order shall terminate pursuant to Section 2408.14 of the Zoning Regulations.

5. Future Conveyance. Developer covenants that if any conveyance of all or any part of the Subject Site takes place before completion of the Planned Unit Development in accordance with the approvals of the Zoning Commission as aforesaid, such conveyance shall contain a specific covenant binding the grantee, its successors and assigns to develop and use the Subject Site in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Covenant.

6. Successors and Assigns. The covenants and restrictions contained herein shall be deemed real covenants running with the land, and shall bind the parties hereto, their successors and assigns and shall inure to the benefit of the parties hereto, their successors and assigns. Such covenants are not binding upon any party who no longer has a property interest in the Subject Site. The District shall have the right to enforce all covenants, conditions and restrictions contained herein.

7. Recordation. Developer shall record this Covenant, as fully executed by the parties hereto, among the Land Records of the District of Columbia, and shall file a certified copy of this Covenant with the Zoning Administrator and the Zoning Commission.

8. Counterparts. This Covenant may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument.

9. Rescission/Alteration of Chapter 24 Covenant. The covenants hereby created may not be extinguished without the prior written consent of the District. In the event any amendment, modification, rescission or alteration of the Order is adopted or authorized by the Zoning Commission, or in the event of a lapse of said Order by its terms, the District shall, upon the request of Developer, execute an instrument, in recordable form, evidencing such action or lapse, which instrument shall amend, modify, rescind, nullify or alter this Covenant, as the case may be.


IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Stanton Square, LLC has, as of the day and year first above written, caused this Covenant to be signed with its corporate name by David Roodberg, Vice President of Sunrise Development Corporation, managing member of Horning Associates Limited Partnership, the sole member of Stanton Square, LLC, and does hereby appoint the said David Roodberg to be its attorney-in-fact, and in its name to acknowledge and deliver this Covenant according to law.

STANTON SQUARE, LLC

By: Horning Associates Limited Partnership, Sole Member

By: Sunrise Development Corporation,
Managing Member

By: David Roodberg
Vice President



JANE M. RAFTERY
Notary Public, State of Maryland
County of Montgomery
My Commission Expires March 27, 2010

I, Jane Parfrey, a Notary Public in and for the jurisdiction aforesaid, do hereby certify that David Roodberg, Vice President of Sunrise Development Corporation, managing member of Horning Associates Limited Partnership, the sole member of Stanton Square, LLC, party to the foregoing Covenant, personally appeared before me and, being personally well known to me acknowledged said Covenant to be the act and deed of said organization and that he delivered the same as such.

GIVEN under my hand and seal this 7th day of December, 2007.

~~Notary Public~~

My commission expires: March 27, 2010.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Mayor of the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, having first considered and approved the foregoing Covenant, has directed the execution thereof in the name of said DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, by the Secretary, D.C., who has hereunto set her hand and affixed the seal of the District of Columbia hereto under authority of the Act of Congress entitled "An Act to Relieve the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of Certain Ministerial Duties," approved February 11, 1932.

WITNESS:

Tabatha Braxton
Secretary, D.C.
(Corporate Seal)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
a Municipal Corporation

By: Stephanie D. Scott

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ss:

I, Tabatha Braxton, a Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that Stephanie Scott who is personally well known to me as the person named as Secretary of the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA in the foregoing PUD Covenant hereunto annexed, personally appeared before me in said District and, as Secretary of the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA aforesaid, and by virtue of the authority in her vested, acknowledged the same to be the act and deed of the Mayor of the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

GIVEN under my hand and seal this 11 day of January 2008.
Tabatha Braxton
Notary Public, D.C.

My commission expires: _____

TABATHA BRAXTON
Notary Public District of Columbia
My Commission Expires May 14, 2012

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY:

Alan Beyster

Chief, Land Use Section
D.C. Office of the Attorney General

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:

Matthew Z. Gruet 1-2-08

Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia

EXHIBIT A

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECT SITE

EXHIBIT A

All those certain lots or parcels of land situate and lying in the District of Columbia, and more particularly described as follows:

Lot numbered Sixty (60) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877) in the subdivision made by George G. Colen, as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber 84 at folio 13.

AND

Lot Sixty-one (61) in Square Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877) in the subdivision made by George G. Colen, as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber 84 at folio 13.

AND

Part of Lot numbered Fifteen (15) in Section 2, "Barry Farm", described as follows: BEGINNING at a stone at the southwest boundary of said lot and running with the dividing line between Lots numbered Fifteen (15) and Sixteen (16) South 51 degrees 44 minutes East, 280.35 feet to a stone on the West side of 15th Street, as extended; thence with the West side of said street, North 63.67 feet to a stone; thence North 51 degrees 44 minutes West, 228.01 feet to the West line of said Lot 15; thence with said line, South 52 degrees 47 minutes West, 51.64 feet to the beginning; except the portion thereof condemned and taken by proceedings in District Court Cause No. 1548 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, as shown on plat recorded in the said Surveyor's Office in Liber 86 at folio 4.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Thirty-two (832) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Part of Lot numbered Sixteen (16) in Section numbered Two (2) in the subdivision called "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court No. 2 at folio 1, described as follows: BEGINNING at the intersection of the northerly line of said lot with the westerly line of Elvans Road as condemned and taken by proceedings in District Court Cause No. 1548 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; thence with the line of said Elvans Road, southerly on the arc of a circle deflecting to the right the radius of which is 385 feet an arc distance of 84.33 feet to the southerly line of said lot; thence with said southerly line, northwesterly 308.96 feet, more or less, to the westerly line of said lot; thence with said westerly line of northeasterly 86.04 feet, more or less, to the northerly line of said lot; thence with said northerly line, southeasterly 272.51 feet more or less, to the place of beginning.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Thirty-five (835) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

All of Lot numbered Twenty-three (23) in Section 2 of the subdivision called "Barry Farm", as

per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2, at folio 1; EXCEPT such part thereof as was condemned and taken for Stanton Road by proceedings in District Court Cause No. 1548, in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and shown on plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber 86, at folio 4.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Fifty-three (853) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

All of Lot numbered Twenty-two (22) in Section numbered Two (2) of the Subdivision called "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1; except such part thereof as was condemned and taken for Stanton Road by proceedings in District Court Cause No. 1548 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and shown on plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber 86 at folio 4.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Fifty-four (854) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Part of Lot numbered Twenty-one (21) in Section numbered Two (2) "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1, described as follows: BEGINNING for the same at the intersection of the southeasterly line of said lot with the northeasterly line of Stanton Road as condemned and taken by proceedings in District Court Cause No. 1548 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and shown on plat recorded in said Surveyor's Office in Liber 86 at folio 4 and running along the line of said road northwesterly 44.08 feet; thence northeasterly and parallel with the southeasterly line of said lot, to the rear line of said lot; thence with said rear line, southeasterly to the most easterly corner of said lot; thence southwesterly along the southeasterly line of said lot, to the place of beginning.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Fifty-five (855) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Part of Lot numbered Twenty-one (21), Section 2, Barry Farm, as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1. BEGINNING at the northwesterly corner of said lot, and running thence southeasterly along the northerly line of said lot to the northwesterly corner of the part of said lot conveyed to Alice Hall by Deed recorded in Liber 2240 at folio 489 of the Land Records of the District of Columbia; thence southwesterly along northwesterly line of the part of said lot so conveyed to the northeasterly line of Stanton Road as said Road was condemned and taken by proceedings in District Court Cause #1548 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia; thence northwesterly with said line of said Road to northwesterly line of said lot; thence northeasterly with said northwesterly line of said lot to the place of beginning.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Fifty-six (856) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Lot numbered Twenty (20) in Section numbered Two (2), "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1; excepting that part of said lot condemned and taken for Stanton Road by proceedings in the District Court Cause No. 1548 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and shown on plat recorded in said Surveyor's Office in Liber 86 at folio 4.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Fifty-seven (857) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Part of Lot numbered Nineteen (19) in Section numbered Two (2), "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1, described as follows: BEGINNING for the same at the intersection of the southeasterly line of said Lot 19 with the northeasterly line of Stanton Road, as widened by proceedings in District Court Cause No. 1548 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, as shown on plat recorded in said Surveyor's Office in Liber 86 at folio 4, and running thence northwesterly along said line of Stanton Road, 57.67 feet, more or less, to the southeasterly line of the land conveyed to Matilda A. Fendall by deed, dated July 29, 1892, recorded in Liber 1715 at folio 176, among the Land Records of the District of Columbia; thence Northeasterly along said Fendall's southeasterly line, 104.39 feet, more or less, to the northeasterly line of the land so conveyed to Fendall; thence northwesterly along said Fendall's northeasterly line, 61.49 feet, more or less, to the northwesterly line of said Lot 19; thence northeasterly along said line of said lot to the most northerly corner of said Lot 19; thence southeasterly along the northeasterly line of said lot, 122.76 feet, more or less, to the southeasterly line of said Lot 19; thence southwesterly along said line of said lot to the place of beginning.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred fifty-eight (858) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Parts of Lots numbered Twenty-four (24), Twenty-five (25) and Twenty-six (26) in Section numbered Two (2) of the Trustees subdivision of "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1 - described as follows: BEGINNING at a point in the northerly line of Elvans Road as widened by proceedings in District Court Cause No. 1548 in the Supreme Court for the District of Columbia, and shown on plat recorded in said Surveyor's Office in Liber 86 at folio 4, said point is North 78 degrees 43' 30" East 301.28 feet from its intersection with the northeasterly line of Stanton Road, 50-feet wide as widened by District Court Case No. 1548 as aforesaid; thence North 36 degrees 26' 00" West 154.38 feet to a point on the northerly line of said Lot 24; thence along said northerly line of Lot 24, North 53 degrees 34' 00" East 254.31 feet to a point on the easterly line of said Lot 24; thence with the easterly lines of said Lots 24, 25 and 26, South 51 degrees 42' East 186.86 feet to a point in the northerly line of Elvans Road; thence along the line of said road on the arc of a circle deflecting to the right, the radius of which is 385 feet an arc distance of 292.13 feet to a point of tangent; thence South 78 degrees 43' 30" West 20.86 feet to the place of beginning.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Seventy-three (873) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Part of Lot numbered Eighteen (18) in Section numbered Two (2) of the Trustees subdivision of "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1; described in accordance with a plat of computation recorded in said Surveyors Office in Survey Book 185 at page 95 as follows: BEGINNING at the intersection of the easterly line of Stanton Road with the southerly line of Pomeroy Road; thence running along the line of Pomeroy Road North 53 degrees 15' East 250.46 feet; thence South 51 degrees 42' East 120.33 feet; thence South 53 degrees 39' West 336.17 feet to the easterly line of Stanton Road; thence with the line of Stanton Road the following two courses and distances: (1) North 29 degrees 36' 20" West 19.28 feet to an angle; (2) North 7 degrees 52' 50" West 56.74 feet; thence leaving the line of Stanton Road and running North 82 degrees 07' 10" East 48.58 feet; thence North 67 degrees 39' 25" East 70.70 feet; thence North 22 degrees 20' 35" West 50 feet; thence South 67 degrees 39' 25" West 58.43 feet; thence South 82 degrees 07' 10" West 47.97 feet to the place of beginning.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Seventy-eight (878) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

AND

Lot 78 in Square 5877 in the subdivision made by Victoria M. Lewis and Robert L. Lewis as per plat recorded in Subdivision Book 156 at page 183 among the records of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia.

AND

Part of Lot 18 in Section 2 in the subdivision of "Barry Farm", as per plat recorded in the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia in Liber Levy Court 2 at folio 1 described in accordance with a plat of computation recorded in said Surveyor's Office Survey Book 183 at page 95, as follows:

BEGINNING at the intersection of the easterly line of Stanton Road with the southerly line of Pomeroy Road; thence North 82 degrees 07 minutes 10 seconds East 47.97 feet; thence North 67 degrees 39 minutes 25 seconds East 58.43 feet; thence South 22 degrees 20 minutes 35 seconds East 50 feet; thence South 67 degrees 39 minutes 25 seconds West 70.70 feet; thence South 82 degrees 07 minutes 10 seconds West 48.58 feet to the easterly line of Stanton Road; thence along the line of Stanton Road North 7 degrees 52 minutes 50 seconds West 51.49 feet to the place of beginning.

NOTE: Said property being now known for purposes of assessment and taxation as Lot numbered Eight Hundred Seventy-nine (879) in Square numbered Fifty-eight Hundred Seventy-seven (5877).

EXHIBIT B

ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 05-35

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Office of Zoning



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ss:

I attest and certify that I am the Director of the District of Columbia Office of Zoning, and that attached hereto, and bearing my initials in red ink in the lower right corner of each page, is a true copy of the following records that are in my custody and possession in my official capacity.

Twenty-Eight page Z.C. Order No. 05-35 of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia dated November 23, 2007.


JERRY R. KRESS, FAIA
Director
Office of Zoning

Signed and sworn to before me this 29th day of November, 2007.


Betty J. Williams
NOTARY PUBLIC, D.C.

My Commission expires February 14, 2011

441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 200/210-S, Washington, D.C. 20001

Telephone: (202) 727-6311

Facsimile: (202) 727-6072

E-Mail: dcoz@dc.gov

Web Site: www.dcoz.dc.gov

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zoning Commission



ZONING COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Z.C. ORDER NO. 05-35
Z.C. Case No. 05-35
Consolidated Planned Unit Development and Related Map Amendment -
Stanton Square, LLC
September 10, 2007

Pursuant to notice, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (the "Commission") held a public hearing on May 24, 2007, to consider an application from Stanton Square, LLC, for the consolidated review and approval of a planned unit development ("PUD") for the property known as Lots 60, 61, 78, 832, 835, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 873, 878, and 879 of Square 5877, and approval of PUD-related amendment to the Zoning Map of the District of Columbia pursuant to Chapters 1, 24, and 30 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (DCMR) Title 11 (Zoning). The public hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR § 3022.

At its public meeting on July 9, 2007, the Commission took proposed action by a vote of 5-0-0 to approve the application and plans that were submitted into the record.

The proposed action of the Commission was referred to the National Capital Planning Commission ("NCPC") pursuant to § 492 of the Home Rule Act. The NCPC Executive Director, through a Delegated Action dated July 26, 2007, found that the proposed PUD, "would not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, nor would it have an adverse impact on any federal interests."

The Commission took final action to approve the application on September 10, 2007, by a vote of 5-0-0.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On November 11, 2005, Horning Brothers ("Developer") filed an application for the consolidated review and one-step approval of a PUD and a related amendment to the Zoning Map.
2. Stanton Square, LLC ("Applicant") is the current owner of the site. Horning Brothers and Stanton Square, LLC have entered into a contract whereby Horning Brothers will

act as fee developer for the site upon approval of this project by the Commission. (Exhibit 17, p. 1.)

3. The property that is the subject of this application is bounded by Stanton Road, Elvans Road, and Pomeroy Road, S.E. The property is made up of Lots 60, 61, 78, 832, 835, 853-858, 873, 878, and 879 in Square 5877 (the "Subject Property" or "Property"). The Property is located in the Fort Stanton neighborhood in Ward 8. The Property consists of approximately 8.1 acres or 353,256 square feet. The Property is located in the R-3 Zone District. (Exhibit 17, p. 1.) The Applicant seeks to rezone the Subject Property to the R-5-A Zone District.
4. The Developer seeks to construct 187 single-family townhouses, with 63 townhouses reserved for households making up to 60% or 80% of the Area Median Income ("AMI") for the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area. (Exhibit 17, p. 2.)
5. At its January 9, 2006, public meeting, the Commission took no action regarding setting down the initial project. The Commission requested that the Applicant look to increase the amount of green space on the project, reduce the amount of paved area, and re-examine the proposed treatment of the steeply sloped area of the Subject Property. In response to those comments, the Applicant submitted an updated plan to the Commission on February 1, 2007.
6. The Commission set down the PUD for public hearing on February 12, 2007, requesting that the Applicant address the following issues: 1) increase the amount of green space in the project; 2) provide additional information regarding retaining water on the site (specifically involving low-impact development strategies); 3) reduce the asphalt coverage of the site; 4) provide information on the expected pricing of the market-rate units; and 5) provide details regarding the exterior treatment of the townhouse units. (Exhibit 17, p. 1.)
7. The Commission held a public hearing, which was conducted on the above-mentioned application in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR § 3022 on May 24, 2007. There were no requests for party status at the public hearing.
8. At the May 24, 2007 public hearing, Paul Tummonds of Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman, LLP presented the case on behalf of the Applicant. The Commission accepted James McDonald of the Lessard Group Architects as an expert in architecture; Mary Ramsey of Edwards & Kelcey as an expert in civil engineering; and Joe Plumpe of Studio 39 as an expert in landscape architecture. (Tr. May 24, 2007, p. 9.)

PUD SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

9. The Subject Property includes approximately 8.1 acres, or 353,256 square feet, and is located between the Hillsdale and Fort Stanton neighborhoods approximately one-half mile north of Suitland Parkway. The Subject Property is irregularly shaped and is bounded by Stanton Road to the west; Evans Road to the south and east; the Wilkinson Elementary School directly to the north; and Pomeroy Road to the northwest. (Exhibit 17, p. 3.)
10. The Subject Property is currently undeveloped, has steep topography, and slopes generally to the west, with a sharp 30-foot drop effectively dividing the site into an upper and a lower portion. Where the Subject Property borders Wilkinson Elementary School, there is a large concrete retaining wall. (Exhibit 17, p. 3.)

DESCRIPTION OF THE PUD PROJECT

11. In its pre-hearing statement dated March 14, 2007, the Applicant presented revised plans and materials reflecting the comments and requests of the Commission. The Applicant noted that the success of the project (to be known as Stanton Square) remains the mix of 187 affordable and market rate townhouses in a cohesive development that includes a mix of unit types interspersed throughout the Subject Property, while creating an appropriate amount of green space for residents and their guests. In response to the comments of the Commissioners on February 12, 2007, the Applicant undertook a holistic approach to creating a project that has an increased amount of green space, a reduced amount of paved area, and includes significant low-impact development strategies that will significantly reduce the overall environmental impact of this project. (Exhibit 17, p. 1.)
12. The PUD project creates a new 187-unit townhouse community that embraces and welcomes community interaction. With a mix of affordable and market rate homes, the Applicant has strived to create a cohesive community feel. The townhouse architecture creates a mix of texture and scale giving the community an image of an established neighborhood. (Exhibit 17, p. 3.)
13. A mixture of architectural styles and elements will eliminate any overpowering presence to the buildings. Two-story units, repetitive bay elements, and paired styled units are specifically located to break up the scale of the streetscape and building façades. The fronts of the townhouses have a mix of Federal, Colonial, and Transitional Victorian architectural styles consistent with the architectural styles of the surrounding area and found throughout the District of Columbia. Detailed entries, front stoops, and porticos embellish the street façades in addition to the full two- and three-story projecting bay windows and the detail-oriented window and door surrounds. (Exhibit 17, p. 4.)

14. The façade of the individual townhouse units will include a mix of brick, siding, and trim to create a sense that the project was created over time. The Applicant anticipates that 84 units (45%) will have all-brick fronts, 88 units (47%) will have brick along the water table, and 15 units (8%) will not include brick. The affordable units will also have brick and masonry elements included in their façade. The roofs will be either architectural asphalt shingles or metal. (Exhibit 17, p. 4.)
15. The site plan provides a traditional street grid pattern, with a two-way "Main Street" on the lower portion of the site. The proposed internal street grid and the townhouses are sited to work with the existing grade by creating "English basements"¹ (buried front levels) instead of retaining walls. The use of English basements also creates a reduced scale of the townhouses along the street. The street grid introduced to the site creates a pedestrian-friendly community as well as opens up green spaces for public access. (Exhibit 17, p. 4.)
16. Internally the streets focus on, and direct attention to, the public green spaces or pocket parks. Each street provides view corridors along tree lined streets toward open spaces and to the landscaped pedestrian link along the hill that separates the upper and lower portions of the site. The design and layout of the project emphasizes the green corridor at the front of each home by providing landscaping and tree planting areas in each lot within the community, as well as the landscaped front yards for the units facing the surrounding streets. (Exhibit 17, p. 5.)
17. The townhouse units will consist of models that are 14, 16, 18, and 20 feet wide. The majority of these units will be three stories tall with rear-loaded vehicular access provided from private alleys. In addition, in order to better relate to the existing topography of the site, 64 of the 187 units include English basements (partially buried ground floors). Twenty units have rear yards and front-loaded vehicular access, some units have side-loaded vehicular access, and some of the 14-foot-wide units are two stories in height. All of the townhouses, except for the two-story units, will have cantilevered decks located on the rear of the unit. These decks will be approximately 12 feet wide and 4.5 feet deep. These decks will allow the opportunity for private space outdoors, in addition to the front yards, which could include outdoor seating and dining. Most units will have family rooms and garages on the first floor and kitchens and living areas on the main floor; between 35% and 65% will have at least three bedrooms (depending on the options selected by the purchasers). (Exhibit 17, p. 6.)
18. The upper portion of the site will include a tot lot and a series of open spaces that can be used by residents of the project and their guests for outdoor recreation. The lower portion of the site includes an open plaza at the intersection of Stanton and Pomeroy

¹ These English basements will not be separate rentable units from the single-family townhouses.

Roads that provides similar outdoor recreation space. In addition, the lower portion of the site also includes a series of green, open spaces. A series of short, landscaped retaining walls are provided in this area to provide the necessary stability to protect the steep slope, while also preventing the creation of a single large retaining wall. (Exhibit 17, p. 6.)

19. The internal street system includes both one-way and two-way streets. This combination allows the Applicant to reduce the amount of paved roadway area on the Subject Property, while creating a safe and pleasant co-existence between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. In total, approximately 32 on-street parking spaces will be provided for use by residents of the PUD project and their guests in the new internal street system. Additionally, a series of 16-foot-wide alleys will connect the residents' garages to the streets. (Exhibit 17, p. 7, Exhibit 30.)
20. The Applicant initially proposed to create public streets and alleys for this project. In order to create such public streets and alleys, the Applicant requested that the District Department of Transportation ("DDOT") provide flexibility from the strict requirements of the DDOT Design and Engineering Manual (the "Manual"). The majority of the flexibility requested was related to the right-of-way width required by the Manual. At the public hearing, and in its post-hearing submission, the Applicant testified and provided written statements that it was going to make the street and alley system private and, therefore, no relief from the Manual was necessary. The Applicant notes that truck tracking diagrams submitted to DDOT demonstrate that cars, trash trucks, and emergency vehicles will be able to access all the streets and alleys within the site. The Applicant will make an initial capital contribution to the reserve fund of the Stanton Square Homeowner's Association that can be used for repairs and maintenance of the private streets and alleys. (Exhibits 31, 35.)
21. The total gross floor area included in the PUD is 317,438 square feet which creates a total density of 0.90 floor area ratio ("FAR"), below the 1.0 FAR guideline for a PUD in the R-5-A District. The total lot occupancy is approximately 31%, with green space of 114,078 square feet, and paved area of 90,070 square feet. (Exhibit 30.) The townhouses will have heights of 28 feet, 6 inches, measured to the ceiling of the top story, less than the 40-foot height permitted in the R-5-A District as a matter-of-right, and a total height of 40 feet, 3 inches. The R-5-A District requires one parking space for every dwelling unit. This PUD project will contain 267-287 parking spaces. (Exhibit 17, pp. 7, 8.)
22. The PUD project complies with the underlying zone district requirements; however, pursuant to 11 DCMR Chapter 24, it requires relief from the front, rear, and side yard requirements (§§ 2516.5(b), 404, and 405) and to allow more than one principal structure on a single lot (§ 2516.1). In addition, the Zoning Regulations require a minimum distance of 28 feet between driveways (11 DCMR § 2117.8(d)). For the

proposed front-loaded garage townhouse units, the project provides a distance of six feet to eight feet between the driveways that act as "safety zones". Satisfaction of the strict requirements of § 2117.8(d) is not possible because the front-loaded garage townhouse units are only 16 to 20 feet wide. These areas of flexibility requested of the R-5-A District will have no impact on the surrounding properties. (Exhibit 17, p. 8, Exhibit 35.)

SATISFACTION OF PUD EVALUATION STANDARDS

23. Through written submissions and testimony to the Commission, the Applicant and its representatives noted that the application will provide high quality residential development on the Subject Property with significant public benefits to the neighborhood and the District as a whole.
24. Urban Design and Architecture: The proposed townhouses are designed to complement and elevate the level of architectural quality and design in this area of the District. The impact of 187 new townhouses at this location will set a design standard for this area, giving the Stanton Road thoroughfare an architectural significance that it has lacked in the past. Furthermore, the townhouses are built to the street, with yards at the front and the majority of the units having automobile entry and parking from rear alleys. The introduction of townhouses of varying size and height, as well as the 20 front-loaded townhouses with rear yards, also helps add to the architectural richness of the project. (Exhibit 17, p. 13.)
25. There will be no gates or barriers preventing members of the public from gaining access to the site. The Applicant anticipates that the pocket parks at Stanton and Pomery Roads, and along Evans Road will be utilized extensively by residents of the project and the surrounding community. The design connects the homes to the public streets, incorporates the entire development into the existing neighborhood, and enhances the walkability of the streets; it does not create a self-contained suburban-style village. (Exhibit 17, pp. 13, 14.)
26. Site Planning: The Applicant noted that throughout the design review process it has sought to address the requests of the Commission and the Office of Planning to maximize green space and reduce paved area on this site. The proposed density of the project is entirely appropriate for the Subject Property. Green space occupies 32% of the Subject Property. The revised site plan continues to make efficient use of a site that poses many topographical challenges. While a steep 30-foot slope requires that the project be divided into two parts, the site plan seamlessly ties these two parts together, so that the project functions as a whole, through the creation of a walking path and stair system. (Exhibit 17, p. 14.)

27. The layouts of townhouses, especially the units with English basements, allows for more natural street and site grading within the project to account for the 10 to 12 foot elevation change that occurs on the lower portion of the site. The introduction of a more traditional street grid system and the various open and green spaces provide an inviting and open environment for residents of the project, their guests, and members of the surrounding community. Biorentention areas, rain gardens, and Filterra units have been incorporated into the site plan to create a true low impact development ("LID") strategy for this project. Pocket parks and mews have been developed to create linked pedestrian spaces. The central focus of the project becomes the open green space which separates the upper and lower portions of the Subject Property. The steep grade differential between the two parts of the project has evolved into cascading landscaped garden retaining walls. The internal private road system has been created to provide view corridors towards this open space, as well as the individual unit architecture. (Exhibit 17, pp. 14, 15.)
28. Effective and Safe Vehicular and Pedestrian Access: The proposed one-way and two-way street systems will discourage excessive speeds and cut-through traffic. Safe and inviting sidewalks will be created along the surrounding public streets and throughout the site to encourage pedestrian activity and also mitigate and pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. The proposed development provides residents with 267-287 parking spaces, depending on the number of units that will have tandem parking spaces. Guest parking is provided in approximately 32 designated parallel parking spaces located along the interior roadway system, enhancing vehicular access to and from residents' homes. (Exhibit 17, p. 15.) There are currently no parking restrictions along the Stanton Road frontage of the site, with the exception of a Metrobus stop adjacent to the intersection with Elvans Road. Approximately 42± parking spaces are available along the Stanton Road frontage of the site for residents and guests. The Elvans Road frontage is currently restricted by the two-hour Residential Parking Permit Program between the weekday hours of 7:00 AM – 8:30 PM. Approximately 70± parking spaces are available along the Elvans Road frontage of the site for residents and guests. (Exhibit 35.)
29. The Applicant's traffic and parking expert provided written documentation that the study area roadway network currently operates at an acceptable level of service during the morning and afternoon peak periods and will continue to do so after build-out of the project without the need for off-site roadway improvements. The proposed project will generate an average of 92 peak hour vehicle trips. These trips are anticipated to be well distributed and will result in minimal impacts on the study area intersections. The traffic and parking expert also concluded that the parking supplied in the project would adequately comply with District regulations. In conclusion, the traffic and parking expert noted that the project can be

accommodated without any appreciable adverse traffic impacts on the local area. (Exhibit 24, Exhibit E, p. 19.)

30. Housing: The proposed PUD project will add 187 new for-sale residential townhouses to the Hillsdale and Fort Stanton neighborhoods. The project will include 63 townhouses as workforce affordable housing units. Twenty townhouses will be reserved for households making up to 60% of AMI and 43 townhouses will be reserved for households making up to 80% of AMI. The affordable models will consist of the 14 and 16 foot models, which include two bedrooms and two bedrooms with a den. The affordable townhouses will not constitute a majority of units in any particular area of the development. Based upon the results of a market study, the Applicant anticipates that the market rate for these units will range from \$280,000 - \$340,000 depending on the unit size. A three-person household with an income of 80% of AMI will be able to pay approximately \$234,000 for a new home. Assuming an average market rate price of \$290,000, the three-person household at 80% of AMI will be achieving a discount of \$56,000 from the market rate price. (Exhibit 17, p. 16.)
31. First Source Employment Program: The Developer will enter into an agreement to participate in the Department of Employment Services ("DOES") First Source Employment Program to promote and encourage the hiring of District of Columbia residents during the development and construction process. (Exhibit 17, pp. 16, 17, Exhibit H.)
32. Local, Small, and Disadvantaged Businesses: The Developer will enter into a Memorandum of Agreement ("MOU") with the Department of Small and Local Business Development ("DSLBD") in an effort to utilize local, small, or disadvantaged business enterprises certified by the D.C. Local Business Opportunity Commission in the development of this project. (Exhibit 17, p. 17, Exhibit H.)
33. Environmental Benefits: The LID strategy addresses both water quality control and water quantity control. A series of bioretention areas/rain gardens and Filterra units have been introduced into the project. The multiple bioretention/rain garden areas are strategically situated where site grading and sufficient drainage and planting space permit such uses. These areas create a reduction in peak flow rate of stormwater and also help treat the stormwater prior to it leaving the Subject Property. The bioretention/rain garden areas and their associated structures will be located in common areas and will be maintained by the homeowners association. The maintenance responsibility for these facilities is not expected to be overly cumbersome or expensive. The project also includes four Filterra units, which significantly reduce pollutants through filtration and absorption of storm water in a specially engineered media within the underground concrete box. These systems

together reduce the burden on the storm water infrastructure of the site as well as of the District, in addition to improving water quality. (Exhibit 17, pp. 11, 12.)

34. Uses of Special Value to the Neighborhood: The Applicant is providing the following public benefits and amenities:

- Workforce Affordable Housing – Sixty-three of the 187 townhouses will be reserved as workforce affordable housing units. Twenty of these affordable units will be made available to households making up to 60% of AMI, and 43 of these units will be made available to households making up to 80% of AMI. (Exhibit 30.)
- Public Space Improvements in the Community – The Applicant will make a financial contribution of \$30,000 that will be used for the purchase and placement of 30 commercial trash receptacles (36 gallon size with steel slats), 30 decorative pole banners, and 30 decorative single pole brackets for placement in the surrounding neighborhoods. The Applicant and representatives of Advisory Neighborhood Commission (“ANC”) 8A, the ANC district within which the project is located, will coordinate with representatives of DDOT to determine location requirements and the ability of the District to remove the trash placed in the receptacles. (Exhibit 30.)
- Fort Stanton Recreation Center – The Applicant will make a financial contribution of \$30,000 to the Fort Stanton Civic Association that will be used for the purchase of computers (including service and technical support service contracts) for the Fort Stanton Recreation Center. (Exhibit 30.)
- Signage in the Fort Stanton and Hillsdale Neighborhoods – The Applicant will contribute \$15,000 for the creation and installation of three signs welcoming visitors to the Fort Stanton and Hillsdale neighborhoods. Based on discussions with members of ANC 8A and the community, these signs are intended to be located at: Suitland Parkway and Stanton Road; Fort Place and Bruce Place (near the Smithsonian’s Anacostia Community Museum); and Martin Luther King Boulevard and Howard Road. (Exhibit 30.)
- Low Impact Development/“Green” Design Strategies – The Applicant has maintained a significant amount of green space (32%) on the Property and has limited the amount of paved area (25%) on the Property. The site plan includes a tot lot and parks for residents of the project and the surrounding community. (Exhibit 30.)

- Homebuyers' Program – The Applicant has entered into an agreement with MANNA, Inc. to create a dedicated chapter of MANNA's Homebuyer Club for the Stanton Square project to help members of the surrounding community be financially prepared for homeownership. (Exhibit 35, Tr. May 24, 2007, pp. 31, 32.)
- Capital Contribution to Homeowner's Association Reserves Fund – The Applicant will contribute \$46,750 (\$250 per townhouse) to the Stanton Square Homeowner's Association Capital Reserves fund. (Exhibit 30, Tr. May 24, 2007, p. 12.)

35. Comprehensive Plan: The project is fully consistent with and fosters the goals and policies stated in the elements of the D.C. Comprehensive Plan (the "Plan"). The District of Columbia Generalized Land Use Map recommends moderate-density residential land use for the Subject Property. The moderate-density category includes row houses and garden-style apartments as its predominant uses. Thus, the proposed rezoning of the Subject Property to the R-5-A District is consistent with the Generalized Land Use Map designation for the Property.

36. The project serves the goals of several of the citywide elements of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Consistency with the Framework Element – The Plan stresses the importance of preserving and including community input in the planning and development process. The Applicant met with representatives of ANC 8A, the Anacostia Coordinating Council, the East of the River Community Development Corporation, and other neighborhood organizations. In these meetings, the Applicant was told that the community wants to see a solely townhouse project on the Subject Property. ANC 8A adopted a resolution in support of the project. (Exhibit 17, pp. 19, 20.)
- Consistency with the Land Use Element – The Plan cites the importance of infill development on vacant lots. The project will make good and valuable use of a well-located parcel of land now merely overgrown with vegetation and a crime nuisance to members of the community. The project has been designed to be completely complementary to the surrounding neighborhood. The townhouses are built up to the street; this frontage, when combined with the front yards, front stoops, and projecting bays adorning each townhouse and sidewalk system, creates an attractive and intrinsically walkable community. The project also provides a more usable, secure green space plan. (Exhibit 17, p. 20.)

The Plan also seeks to achieve “land use compatibility” – specifically, the enhancement and stabilization of the District’s neighborhoods by the protection of residential neighborhoods from non-residential and disruptive uses. The Applicant stated that development in the Hillsdale/Fort Stanton area of 187 new townhouses will help achieve that goal. The Subject Property is located in a primarily residential neighborhood. A new development of townhouses in this neighborhood will not be disruptive, and in fact provides a new type of residential opportunity for existing residents of the neighborhood. No displacement of residents will occur as a result of this application. The Applicant noted that these townhouses will provide residents with an interim housing opportunity from a rental apartment to a single-family home, or alternatively provide an attractive housing opportunity for someone who is looking to minimize the amount of work that is necessary to maintain a single-family home. (Exhibit 17, pp. 20, 21.)

- Consistency with the Transportation Element – The sidewalks of the proposed development will be connected to the existing sidewalk system on Elvans, Stanton, and Pineroy Roads. The sidewalks on these streets will be safer and more user-friendly with the removal of overgrown vegetation as well as the integration of a complete pedestrian sidewalk system for the surrounding neighborhood. The building out of the townhouses to the sidewalk also enhances the appearance and walkability of the pedestrian streetscape. (Exhibit 17, p. 21.)
- Consistency with the Housing Element – The Plan notes that, “[e]xpanding the housing supply is a key part of the District’s vision to create successful neighborhoods,” and especially seeks to achieve this via the private sector. The project will expand the housing supply by a considerable 187 high-quality units, and is being undertaken by a private-sector entity (the Applicant). Furthermore, the Plan emphasizes that, “[r]egardless of its affordability level, new or renovated housing should be indistinguishable from market rate housing in its exterior appearance.” The Applicant has followed this guidance carefully, and the affordable units in the project will be visually indistinguishable from the neighboring market-rate units. The high-quality affordable community will serve as an anchor that strengthens and enhances the surrounding residential neighborhood. (Exhibit 17, pp. 22, 23.)
- Consistency with the Environmental Protection Element – The Plan seeks to encourage the planting of street trees and the, “use of landscaping to beautify the city, enhance streets and public spaces, reduce stormwater runoff, and create a stronger sense of character and identity.” The project features 32% of the site area as green space, with just 25% of the site area covered by

pavement. In addition, an extensive landscape plan provides for abundant trees, and comprehensive and creative stormwater treatment. The LID strategy included in this project will both reduce stormwater runoff and help treat stormwater prior to it leaving the Subject Property. (Exhibit 17, p. 23.)

- Consistency with the Urban Design Element – The proposed development will reflect the beneficial architectural qualities of the surrounding residential neighborhoods. In site planning and architectural detailing, the project will emphasize and help strengthen a neighborhood identity for this area. The project proposes an appropriate number and density of residential units, while allowing for sufficient private and public open space for the residents. (Exhibit 17, p. 24.)
- Compliance with Area Element - The Plan also contains 10 area elements with the Subject Property located in the Far Southeast/Southwest Area Element. The project is consistent with this element of the Plan. The proposed project furthers several of the objectives and policies of this element:
 - Nature of Housing Provided – The Far Southeast/Southwest Area Element lists, “improved housing choices” as one of the four principal priorities for the area. The creation of 187 new townhouses will substantially improve the housing choices in an area of the city largely dominated by deteriorating garden apartments available only for rent. The Plan also notes that, “Far Southeast/Southwest needs more housing suitable for families and young homeowners...Additional low to moderate density housing should be encouraged...In some areas, rezoning may be needed to promote the desired housing types,” which include, “row house[s].” The project provides such housing, and the rezoning requested by the Applicant to provide it is consistent with that recognized as, “needed” by the Comprehensive Plan. (Exhibit 17, pp. 24, 25.)
 - Location of Housing Provided - The Plan seeks to, “[c]oncentrate future housing development and employment growth in the Far Southeast/Southwest around the Congress Heights and Anacostia Metro Stations...provide improved transit and automobile access to these areas and improve their visual and urban design qualities.” The project will be developed close to both the Congress Heights and Anacostia Metro Stations and improve transit ridership on Metrorail and Metrobus in the immediate vicinity.

Second, the Plan sets out to, “[e]ncourage compatible infill development on vacant and underutilized land within the Hillsdale and

Fort Stanton neighborhoods, with an emphasis on low to moderate density housing designed for families. Special care should be taken to respect the area's topography..." The project constitutes an infill development in the Fort Stanton neighborhood, will provide moderate-density housing for families, and is sensitively designed to incorporate the existing topography of Subject Property into the site plan. (Exhibit 17, p. 25.)

37. In response to issues raised by the Commission members at the May 24, 2007 public hearing, the Applicant filed a post-hearing submission which included the following information:

- A letter from MANNA, Inc. regarding the creation of a homebuyer's club for the Stanton Square project.
- Responses to the issues raised in the May 23, 2007 DDOT report; and
- Summary of architectural controls which includes a description of the duties of the Architectural Review Board for the Stanton Square Homeowners Association that will be created for this Project.

(Exhibit 35).

GOVERNMENT REPORTS

38. In its May 11, 2007 report, the Office of Planning ("OP") recommended approval of the project, subject to any conditions that may be specified by DDOT. OP determined that the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the following Major Themes of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Stabilizing and Improving District Neighborhoods;
- Promoting Enhanced Public Safety; and
- Providing for Diversity and Overall Social Responsibilities.

OP also concluded that the proposal was consistent with the following policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Expanding Housing Supply;
- Balanced Growth;
- Housing Quality; and
- Mixed Income Housing.

OP noted that the Subject Property is located in the moderate-density residential land use category on the Generalized Land Use Map. OP supported the PUD-related rezoning request to the R-5-A Zone District to accommodate the moderate-density residential uses proposed for the Subject Property. OP noted that the rezoning accommodates a more compact building design as an alternative to the more consumptive development pattern of the lower density residential land use. (Exhibit 26.)

39. OP concluded that the project satisfied the PUD evaluation standards. OP noted that, in addition to the one-third of the units that will be reserved for low- to middle-income families, the market rate units will help ensure a diversity of income to the neighborhood. OP noted the site design of the project focuses the homes towards the adjacent street frontages, which increases the residential character of the Stanton Road and provides public safety benefits. The provision of sidewalk areas that connect to the street system help create a pedestrian environment that is a key to smart growth according to OP. In addition, OP noted the development would allow the vacant parcel to be integrated into a long-standing community, already served by infrastructure and the public transportation system. (Exhibit 26.)
40. In its May 23, 2007 report, DDOT concurred with the observations and conclusions of the Applicant's parking and traffic expert that the traffic expected to be generated from the project can be adequately accommodated by the existing road network and all key intersections in the project area currently operate at an acceptable level of service during both the AM and PM peak hours. (Exhibit 27.)
41. DDOT noted that it does not have the authority to approve public roadway designs that are inconsistent with existing D.C. Code requirements. DDOT recommended that the Applicant modify its plans to be consistent with existing D.C. Code requirements for public roadway designs, or in the alternative, the Applicant should construct the roadways as private streets. DDOT's report included the following recommendations:
 - Design and construct the proposed alleys to DDOT design standards and dedicate them for public use after DDOT has obtained the authority to approve right-of-ways less than 55 feet wide.
 - Modify the design of the new roadway across from Gainesville Street, S.E. by changing it to a one-way traffic pattern and connecting it with Elvans Road, S.E.
 - Connect the proposed alley S.E. that ends between Unit No. 1 and Unit No. 31, to the proposed north-south alley ending at Unit No. 32.

- Perform a signal warrants analysis at the intersections of Elvans Road and Gainesville Street, S.E. and Elvans Road and Stanton Road, S.E.
- Coordinate with appropriate DDOT staff in designing public space improvements, street markings and regulatory signage.
- Redesign of L-shaped alley that services Units 169-177 and 178-182. (Exhibit 27.)

42. The Applicant responded to DDOT's May 23, 2007 report in its post-hearing submission. The Applicant's response included the following information:

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Design and construct the proposed alleys to DDOT design standards and dedicate them for public use after DDOT has obtained the authority to approve right-of-ways less than 55 feet wide.*

The Applicant will follow the alternative approach noted on the first page of the DDOT report and construct all of the streets and alleys as private streets and alleys. (Exhibit 35, Tr. May 24, 2007 public hearing, p. 11.)

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Modify the design of the new roadway across from Gainesville Street, S.E. by changing it to a one-way traffic pattern and connecting it with Elvans Road, S.E.*

The project architect and the Applicant's traffic engineer reviewed this alternative during the site planning phase of the project. The conclusion of these professionals is that DDOT's proposal would not be appropriate and would in fact be detrimental for the following reasons:

- a) The current design allows all traffic from the upper portion of the site to enter and exit at an all-way stop-controlled intersection. Accident data provided by DDOT shows the existing Elvans Road at Gainesville Street intersection to be safe.
- b) DDOT's suggested new roadway connection to Elvans Road would be along a section of a combined horizontal and vertical curve, with restricted sight distances. The crest of the hill is approximately mid-way between the suggested exit onto Elvans Road and the Gainesville Street intersection. DDOT's proposal would have all traffic for the upper portion of the site exiting at the extended roadway; where it would not be feasible to provide an all-way stop-controlled intersection, as exists at the currently designed entrance at Gainesville Street, S.E.

- c) Considering the design criteria of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials ("AASHTO") Geometric Design Manual, the stopping sight distance and driveway corner sight distances approaching the suggested new exit onto Elvans Road would both be inadequate.

(Exhibit 35.)

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Modify the proposed two-way roadway in the middle of the Stanton Road portion of the project to one-way heading out to Stanton Road, S.E.*

This alternative was considered during the site design phase, and discussed with DDOT's Traffic Services Administration staff. The proposal is not considered feasible or desirable for the following reasons:

- a) The middle access point along Stanton Road is separated from Pomeroy Road and Elvans Road by distances of 420 feet and 435 feet, respectively. This separation and the accompanying visibility/sight lines and stopping distance availability makes this the location most appropriate for significant access activity into and out of the site.
- b) This proposal would make the northernmost access (closest to Pomeroy Road) the only point through which vehicles could enter the site. This arrangement would be impractical, and create potential hazards along Stanton Road.
- c) This proposal would result in significant "redundancy of travel" within the site (i.e., residents would need to drive considerable extra distances to access a large number of the units.) This situation would violate "driver expectation" and encourage violations of the proposed one-way traffic circulation pattern.

(Exhibit 35.)

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Connect the proposed alley S.E. that ends between Unit No. 1 and Unit No. 31, to the proposed north-south alley ending at Unit No. 32.*

The Applicant reviewed DDOT's recommendation to connect these two alley systems and determined that the potential loss of green space and a residential unit is a significant detriment to the project. As noted above, the Applicant has created, and provided to DDOT, truck tracking diagrams that provide evidence that the proposed alley systems will be able to adequately serve cars, trash trucks and emergency vehicles that may need to access the alley systems. Therefore, the Applicant does not agree to DDOT's recommendation to connect these alley systems. (Exhibit 35.)

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Perform a signal warrants analysis at the intersections of Evans Road and Gainesville Street, S.E. and Evans Road and Stanton Road, S.E.*

The Applicant's traffic engineering firm prepared the requested signal warrants analyses and has determined that these intersections do not satisfy any of the warrants for the construction of a signalized intersection at these locations. Moreover, in 2004, DDOT conducted a circulation and traffic calming study for the entire Cluster 37 area (the area in which the property is located) and did not identify the need for signalization at any of the local intersections. (Exhibit 35.)

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Coordinate with appropriate DDOT staff in designing public space improvements, street markings, and regulatory signage.*

The Applicant agreed to undertake this coordination with DDOT staff. (Exhibit 35.)

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Widen Sidewalks – The DDOT report recommended that the Applicant widen the proposed internal sidewalks from four feet to six feet in width and reduce the size of the proposed planting strips from six feet to four feet.*

The Applicant did not agree with this recommendation and desired to maintain the four-foot sidewalks and six-foot planting strips proposed in this project. The four-foot sidewalks provide adequate space for pedestrian circulation throughout the site and the six-foot planting strips are important in maximizing green space on the property. (Exhibit 35, Tr. May 24, 2007, pp. 17, 18.)

DDOT RECOMMENDATION: *Redesign of L-shaped alley that services Units 169-177 and 178-182 - The DDOT report recommends that the Applicant redesign the L-shaped alley behind Units 169-177 and 178-182 on the upper portion of the property in order to provide a turn-around for vehicles where the alley currently dead-ends.*

The Applicant has conducted truck tracking diagrams that prove cars, trash trucks, and emergency vehicles can adequately access all of the alley systems. In addition, the creation of a paved turn-around area at this location will diminish the amount of green space and increase the amount of paved area on the site. The Applicant declined to incorporate this recommendation into the design of the project. (Exhibit 35.)

ANC REPORT

43. ANC 8A supported the PUD project and the proposed Zoning Map Amendment by letter dated May 3, 2007 and the testimony of Lendia Johnson, ANC Commissioner of 8A07, at the public hearing. The ANC's letter in support of the project noted the benefits that the 187 townhouses will bring to the community as a result of the fronting of the townhouses on surrounding streets, the mix of affordable and market-rate townhouses, and the project's environmentally sensitive design. The ANC also noted that the proposed number and type of residential units is appropriate for the Property and the surrounding neighborhood, and the ANC supported the proposed Zoning Map amendment. The ANC commended the Applicant for working with representatives of the community and the ANC to obtain feedback on the project. The ANC also concluded that the community benefits and amenities package of the PUD was created with significant comment and input from members of the ANC, local neighborhood organizations, and members of the community. The ANC determined that the community benefits and amenities provided in this project will provide benefits throughout the Hillsdale and Fort Stanton neighborhoods. (Exhibit 25.)

PARTIES AND PERSONS IN SUPPORT

44. Addie Cooke, a resident of 2407 18th Street, S.E. and the President of the Fort Stanton Civic Association, testified in support of the project. Ms. Cooke noted the dialogue and working relationship that occurred with the Applicant and its representatives for over two years. Ms. Cooke noted the importance of the Fort Stanton Recreation Center to the community and the benefit that the proposed computers and service contracts would have for both young and old residents of the surrounding neighborhood. (Tr. May 24, 2007, pp. 55-59.)

45. Jamil Shoatz, a resident of Gainesville Street, directly across Elvans Road from the Subject Property testified in support of the project. (Tr. May 24, 2007, p. 60.)

PARTIES AND PERSONS IN OPPOSITION

46. Hannah Hawkins, a resident of Ward 8 approximately two blocks from the Property, testified in opposition to the project. Ms. Hawkins questioned whether adequate notice of the project was provided to the community. Ms. Hawkins also testified in opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Property and noted her desire for retaining single family home zoning on the Property. (Tr. May 24, 2007, pp. 61-65.)

MATERIALS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO PROPOSED ACTION

47. Subsequent to the Commission taking proposed action to approve this PUD and Zoning Map Amendment application, DDOT filed a memo with the Zoning Commission on July 23, 2007 regarding the Applicant's Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis (Exhibit 40.) In that memo, DDOT agreed with the findings of the Applicant's traffic and parking consultant that the intersections of Gainesville Street, S.E. and Elvans Road, S.E., and Elvans Road, S.E. and Stanton Road, S.E. are not warranted for traffic signals. However, DDOT recommended that safety improvements be made at both intersections and that the Applicant be required to install new crosswalks and advanced pedestrian flashing beacons with appropriate signage to assist pedestrians crossing Elvans Road, S.E.
48. By letter dated August 30, 2007, in accordance with 11 DCMR § 3024.5, the Applicant made a motion to reopen the record in the above-mentioned case to accept the Applicant's response to DDOT's July 23, 2007 memo, which was filed after the record in this case had been closed.
49. In response to DDOT's July 23, 2007, memo, the Applicant arranged a meeting with DDOT representatives to address DDOT's further recommendations. On August 3, 2007, the Applicant filed materials with DDOT that included a memo from O. R. George & Associates that provided its analysis that flashing/warning pedestrian lights are not warranted along Elvans Road according to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices ("MUTCD") criteria. However, the Applicant did agree to re-paint the crosswalks, in accordance with DDOT standards, at the intersections of Stanton and Elvans Roads, S.E.; Elvans Road and Gainesville Street, S.E.; and Pomeroy and Stanton Roads, S.E.
50. DDOT filed an additional memo with the Commission dated August 29, 2007. In this memo, DDOT notes that it concurs with O.R. George & Associates' analysis that the two intersections do not meet the signal warrant analysis and flashing lights are not required. This memo noted that the Applicant and DDOT agreed that the Applicant will re-paint the crosswalks, in accordance with DDOT standards, at the intersections of Stanton and Elvans Roads, S.E.; Elvans Road and Gainesville Street, S.E.; and Pomeroy and Stanton Roads, S.E. The Applicant will construct sidewalks, to DDOT standards, in the public space surrounding the Property, and the Applicant will coordinate with DDOT to create a continuous and safe sidewalk system along Elvans Road, S.E.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Pursuant to the Zoning Regulations, the PUD process is designed to encourage high-quality developments that provide public benefits. (11 DCMR § 2400.1.) The overall

goal of the PUD process is to permit flexibility of development and other incentives, provided that the PUD project, "offers a commendable number or quality of public benefits, and that it protects and advances the public health, safety, welfare, and convenience." (11 DCMR § 2400.2.)

2. Under the PUD process, the Commission has the authority to consider this application as a consolidated PUD. The Commission may impose development conditions, guidelines, and standards which may exceed or be less than the matter-of-right standards. In this application, the Commission finds that the requested relief from the front, rear, and side yard requirements, the relief to allow more than one principal structure on a single lot, and the relief to allow driveways that are closer together than the Zoning Regulations allow, can be granted with no detriment to surrounding properties and without detriment to the zone plan or map.
3. The development of this PUD project carries out the purposes of Chapter 24 of the Zoning Regulations to encourage well planned developments which will offer a variety of building types with more attractive and efficient overall planning and design not achievable under matter-of-right development.
4. The Commission agrees with the written submissions and testimony of the Applicant's representatives that the project will provide superior features that benefit the surrounding neighborhood to a significantly greater extent than a matter-of-right project on the Subject Property would provide. The Commission finds that the mix of residential unit sizes and varying heights, the introduction of the buried English basement units to utilize the Subject Property's topography, the orientation of the townhouses to the adjacent public and private streets, the introduction of pocket parks and a tot lot, and the use of the terraced retaining walls to address the significant slope between the upper and lower portion of the Subject Property are significant project amenities and exemplify superior features of urban design, architecture, and site planning.
5. The Commission determines that the provision of 63 workforce affordable units, including 20 units reserved for families making up to 60% of AMI, is a significant project amenity. The Commission notes that the homebuyer's club that the Applicant has proposed with a well-respected non-profit housing provider is also a significant project amenity that will help make homeownership a possibility for District residents. The Commission finds that the Applicant's initial capital contribution to the reserve fund for the Stanton Square Homeowners Association is appropriate given the Applicant's decision to make the streets and alleys private. The Commission also concludes that the proposed community amenities package will provide appropriate benefits to members of the surrounding area and the District as a whole.

6. The Commission finds that the proposed low impact development strategy proposed by the Applicant is an environmentally sensitive approach to development on the Property and is a public benefit and project amenity. The Commission further finds that the Applicant has addressed the goals of maximizing green space and limiting the amount of paved area on the Property.
7. The Commission agrees with the written submissions of the Applicant, as well as the recommendations of OP that approval of the proposed project and the proposed amendment to the Zoning Map is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission finds that the PUD project and related Zoning Map Amendment is consistent with and fosters the goals of several citywide elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including: the Framework Element; Land Use Element; Transportation Element; Housing Element; Environmental Protection Element; and Urban Design Element. The Commission also finds that the project and Zoning Map Amendment furthers numerous objectives and policies of the Far Southeast/Southwest Element, including the nature and location of housing provided.
8. The Commission agrees with the conclusions of the Applicant's traffic and parking expert that the proposed project will not create any adverse traffic or parking impacts on the surrounding community. The Commission believes that the proposed private streets and alleys will provide a safe and functional vehicular circulation system that can adequately handle turning movements for cars, trucks, emergency vehicles and trash trucks. The Commission agrees with the arguments and materials provided by the Applicant and the Applicant's traffic and parking expert that it is not necessary or appropriate for the project to be revised to address the alternatives noted in the May 23, 2007 DDOT report. The Commission agrees with the Applicant's desire to minimize the amount of paved area on the Subject Property and finds the Applicant's arguments persuasive that revising the circulation patterns on the Property and connecting alley systems are not appropriate. In regard to DDOT's alternative of adding an additional exit from the Property to Elvans Road, the Commission finds the Applicant's arguments persuasive that the location of such an exit does not provide sufficient sight distances. The Commission also agrees with the conclusion of the Applicant's traffic expert that the intersections of Elvans Road and Gainesville Street and Elvans Road and Stanton Road do not satisfy the warrants for the construction of signalized intersections at these locations.
9. In regard to the materials that were submitted by DDOT and the Applicant after the Commission took proposed action in support of the PUD Project, the Commission agrees with the Applicant's traffic expert, and DDOT's April 29, 2007 memorandum, that flashing/warning pedestrian lights are not warranted along Elvans Road according to the MUTCD criteria. However, the Commission does note that the Applicant has agreed to re-paint the crosswalks, in accordance with DDOT standards,

at the intersections of Stanton and Elvans Roads, S.E.; Elvans Road and Gainesville Street, S.E.; and Pomeroy and Stanton Roads, S.E.

10. In accordance with D.C. Official Code § 1-309.10(d), the Commission must give great weight to the issues and concerns of the affected ANC. The Commission has carefully considered the ANC's recommendation for approval of the project and amendment to the Zoning Map and concurs in its recommendation.
11. The Commission is required under § 5 of the Office of Zoning Independence Act of 1990, effective September 20, 1990 (D.C. Law 8-163, D.C. Official Code § 6-623.04) to give great weight to OP's recommendations, as reflected in paragraphs 38 and 38 above. For the reasons stated above, the Commission agrees with OP's recommendation for approval and concurs in its recommendation.
12. Approval of the application will promote the orderly development of the Property in conformity with the entirety of the District of Columbia zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map of the District of Columbia.
13. Notice of the public hearing was provided in accordance with the Zoning Regulations.
14. The proposed PUD meets the minimum area requirements of 11 DCMR § 2401.1.
15. The Applicant is subject to compliance with the Human Rights Act of 1977 (D.C. Law 2-38, as amended, D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.01 *et seq.*).

DECISION

In consideration of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia **ORDERS APPROVAL** of the application for consolidated review of a Planned Unit Development and related Amendment to the Zoning Map application for Lots 60, 61, 78, 832, 835, 853-858, 873, 878, and 879 of Square 5877. The approval of this PUD is subject to the following guidelines, conditions, and standards of this Order.*

1. The PUD project shall be developed in accordance with the plans and materials submitted by the Applicant marked as Exhibits 17, 17A, 24, and 30 of the record, as modified by the guidelines, conditions, and standards of this Order. These plans include the low-impact development features of the project, as well as the tot lot and parks for residents of the project and the surrounding community.

* References to the Applicant in these conditions shall not preclude the Applicant from entering into agreements with the Developer or others to carry out these responsibilities provided that the Applicant shall remain totally responsible for their completion.

2. The Applicant shall make the following financial contributions as part of the PUD project:

- Public Space Improvements in the Community – The Applicant shall purchase (at a cost of \$30,000) 30 commercial trash receptacles (36 gallon size with steel slats), 30 decorative pole banners, and 30 decorative single pole brackets for placement in the surrounding neighborhoods. The location of the trash receptacles in the surrounding community will be as indicated in Exhibit 44. As noted in Exhibit 44, the Department of Public Works will be responsible for removing trash from 16 of the trash receptacles. The Stanton Square Homeowners Association's Bylaws will include a provision that it will be responsible for removing trash from the remaining 14 trash receptacles.
- Fort Stanton Recreation Center – The Applicant shall make a financial contribution of \$30,000 to the Fort Stanton Civic Association that will be used for the purchase of computers (including service and technical support service contracts) for the Fort Stanton Recreation Center.
- Signage in the Fort Stanton and Hillsdale Neighborhoods – The Applicant shall create and install three signs (at a cost of \$15,000) welcoming visitors to the Fort Stanton and Hillsdale neighborhoods. Based on discussions with members of ANC 8A and the community, these signs are intended to be located at: Suitland Parkway and Stanton Road; Fort Place and Bruce Place (near the Smithsonian's Anacostia Community Museum); and Martin Luther King Boulevard and Howard Road.

These financial contributions shall be made prior to the issuance of a building permit for the construction of the PUD project.

3. At least 63 of the 187 townhouses will be reserved as workforce affordable housing units. Twenty of these affordable units will be made available to households making up to 60% of AMI, and 43 of these units will be made available to households making up to 80% of AMI. The affordable models will consist of the 14- and 16-foot wide models, which include two bedrooms and two bedrooms with a den. The affordable townhouses will not constitute a majority of units in any particular area of the development. The eligibility requirements and enforcement mechanisms of the affordable housing program shall be consistent with the materials included in Exhibit B of Exhibit 24. To the extent minor modifications are needed in the execution of this program to conform to District or Federal programs, the Applicant is afforded the necessary flexibility to make such changes.

4. The Applicant and the non-profit housing provider MANNA, Inc. shall create a dedicated chapter of MANNA's Homebuyer's Club for the Stanton Square project to help members of the surrounding community be financially prepared for homeownership. The Stanton Square MANNA Homebuyer's Club shall be created prior to the issuance of a building permit for the construction of the PUD project.
5. The Applicant shall make an initial capital contribution to the reserve fund for the Stanton Square Homeowners Association prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. This capital contribution shall be \$250 per residential unit, for a total contribution of \$46,750. The Stanton Square Homeowners Association's Bylaws shall include a provision that requires this capital contribution will be used solely for the maintenance and repair of the private street and alley system in the project.
6. The Stanton Square Homeowners Association's Bylaws shall be required to include an Architectural Review Board. The Architectural Review Board shall regulate the external design and appearance of the PUD project in a manner so as to preserve and maintain the harmonious relationships among the structures on the Property and the Property's natural vegetation and topography. The bylaws will include the requirement that no fences or other embellishments shall be located on private property between the entrance to the individual units and the adjacent public space. The bylaws will also include a requirement that any and all construction and development on the Property will occur in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Order.
7. The Applicant shall re-paint the crosswalks, in accordance with DDOT standards, at the intersections of Stanton and Elvans Roads, S.E.; Elvans Road and Gainesville Street, S.E.; and Pomeroy and Stanton Roads, S.E. The Applicant shall construct sidewalks, to DDOT standards, in the public space surrounding the Property, and the Applicant shall coordinate with DDOT to create a continuous and safe sidewalk system along Elvans Road, S.E. This will occur prior to the issuance of a building permit for the PUD project.
8. The Developer shall enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Small and Local Business Development in substantial conformance with the Memorandum of Understanding submitted as Exhibit H of Exhibit 17. A fully executed Memorandum of Understanding shall be filed with the Office of Zoning and the Office of the Zoning Administrator prior to issuance of a building permit for the PUD project.
9. The Developer shall enter into a First Source Employment Agreement with the Department of Employment Services in substantial conformance with the First Source Agreement submitted as Exhibit H of Exhibit 17. A fully executed First Source

Agreement shall be filed with the Office of Zoning and the Office of the Zoning Administrator prior to issuance of a building permit for the PUD project.

10. The Applicant shall have flexibility with the design of the PUD in the following areas:
 - To vary the location and design of all interior components, including partitions, structural slabs, doors, hallways, columns, stairways, bathrooms, provided that the variations do not change the exterior configuration of the structures;
 - To vary the final selection of the exterior materials within the color ranges and material types as proposed, based on availability at the time of construction, without reducing the quality of the materials; and
 - To make minor refinements to exterior details and dimensions, including belt courses, sills, bases, cornices, railings and trim, or any other changes to comply with Construction Codes or that are otherwise necessary to obtain a final building permit.
11. The consolidated PUD shall be valid for a period of two (2) years from the effective date of Zoning Commission Order No. 05-35. Within such time, an application must be filed for a building permit and construction of the project must start within three (3) years of the effective date of this Order, pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 2408.8 and 2408.9.
12. The Office of Zoning shall not release the record of this case to the Zoning Regulations Division of DCRA and no building permit shall be issued for the PUD project until the Applicant has recorded a covenant in the land records of the District of Columbia, between the Applicant and the District of Columbia, that is satisfactory to the Office of the Attorney General and the Zoning Division of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs ("DCRA"). Such covenant shall bind the Applicant and all successors in title to constrict and use the Property in accordance with this Order, or amendment thereof by the Commission. The Applicant shall file a certified copy of the covenant with the records of the Office of Zoning.
13. The change of zoning from the R-3 Zone District to the R-5-A Zone District for the Subject Property shall be effective upon the recordation of covenant discussed in Condition No. 11, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3028.9.
14. The Applicant is required to comply fully with the provisions of the Human Rights Act of 1977, D.C. Law 2-38, as amended, and this Order is conditioned upon full compliance with those provisions. In accordance with the D.C. Human Rights Act of

1977, as amended, D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.01 *et seq.*, ("Act") the District of Columbia does not discriminate on the basis of actual or perceived: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, personal appearance, sexual orientation, familial status, family responsibilities, matriculation, political affiliation, disability, source of income, or place of residence or business. Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination, which is also prohibited by the act. In addition, harassment based on any of the above protected categories is also prohibited by the Act. Discrimination in violation of the Act will not be tolerated. Violators will be subject to disciplinary action. The failure or refusal of the Applicant to comply shall furnish grounds for denial or, if issued, revocation of any building permits or certificates of occupancy issued pursuant to this Order.

For these reasons above, the Commission concludes that the applicant has met the burden, it is thereby **ORDERED** that the application is **GRANTED**.

On July 9, 2007, the Zoning Commission **APPROVED** the application by a vote of 5-0-0 (Carol J. Mitten, Anthony J. Hood, Gregory N. Jeffries, John G. Parsons, and Michael G. Turnbull to approve).

This Order was **ADOPTED** by the Zoning Commission at its public meeting on September 10, 2007 by a vote of 5-0-0 (Carol J. Mitten, Anthony J. Hood, Gregory N. Jeffries, John G. Parsons, and Michael G. Turnbull to adopt).

In accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR 3028, this Order shall become final and effective upon publication in the *D.C. Register* on NOV 23 2007.

Anthony J. Hood
ANTHONY J. HOOD
CHAIRMAN
OFFICE OF ZONING

J. R. Kress
JERRILY R. KRESS, AIA
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF ZONING

1-14
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT
OFFICE OF THE SURVEYOR

Washington, D.C., November 7, 2007

Plat for Building Parcel of SQUARE 657: LOTS 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677
S.E.L. 651, 652, 653, 654, 655

Scale: 1 inch = 80 feet Recorded in A & T Book Page 2452-G (Lots 671, 679);
Book 152 Page 182 Lot 70; on Mapbooks
(Lots 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 651, 655, 656);
A & T Book Page 2400-M (Lot 672);
Book 61 Page 13 (Lots 60, 61)

Recept'd by 61144
Furnished to PWSP

I hereby certify that the foregoing instruments acknowledge, has completely described, and are correctly plotted; that all recorded buildings or constructions, or parts thereof, including several portions, have been duly delineated and plotted, with plans accompanying the instrument, and that the dimensions plotted are correct. I further certify that the property described in the instrument above and described in the instrument(s) heretofore recorded by me during 2006 & in the present year above on this page, shall be free of any existing liens, charges, or encumbrances, except as otherwise specifically set forth in the instrument(s) above, and that the property is in no wise subject to any existing liens, charges, or encumbrances, and if it is, I further certify and swear that no action, party, and power created by the Zoning Regulations, will be exercised in accordance with the Zoning Regulations, and that this area has been surveyed, drawn, and plotted in accordance with the Surveyor's Code of Ethics, and that the surveyor has been licensed by the Surveyor's Board of Registration and Discipline, and that the surveyor has been licensed by the Surveyor's Board of Registration and Discipline and that no person and no entity is a less qualified than become otherwise engaged in surveying property in excess of 100% for other than surveying work, or work of 100% as only part for other things. (The policy of the Surveyor's Board is to issue a minimum surveyor's grade of 120, unless the public, public and no grade restricted surveying.)


Date: _____

(Signature of owner or his authorized agent)

John A. Smith
Surveyor, D.C.

By D.M. _____

NOTE: Data shown for Assessment and Taxation Lists or Parcels are in accordance with the rules of the Department of Finance and Revenue, Assessment Administration, and no act of accuracy is guaranteed otherwise.



GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Zoning Commission

★ ★ ★

[REDACTED]

Dec# 2008014447 Fees:\$583.00
02/07/2008 10:58AM Pages 41
Filed & Recorded in Official Records of
WASH DC RECORDER OF DEEDS LARRY TODD

Z.C. CASE NO.: 05-35

NOV 19 2007

As Secretary to the Commission, I hereby certify that on _____ copies of this Z.C. Order No. 05-35 were mailed first class, postage prepaid or sent by inter-office government mail to the following:

1. <i>D.C. Register</i>	6. Councilmember Marion Barry
2. Paul Tummonds Jr., Esq. Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037-1128	7. Office of Planning (Harriet Tregoning)
3. Anthony Muhammad, Chair ANC 8A 2100-D M.L.K. Avenue, S.E. Washington, DC 20032	8. Ken Laden, DDOT
4. Commissioner Lendia Sue Johnson ANC/SMD 8A07 1512 Howard Place S.E. Washington, DC 20020	9. Zoning Administrator (Bill Crews)
5. Gottlieb Simon ANC 1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004	10. Jill Stern General Counsel - DCRA 941 North Capitol Street, N.E. Suite 9400 Washington, D.C. 20002
	11. Office of the Attorney General (Alan Bergstein)

RECORDING	\$	293.00
SURCHARGE	\$	6.50
COPIES	\$	276.75
CERTIFICATION	\$	6.75

ATTESTED BY:


Sharon S. Schellin
Secretary to the Zoning Commission
Office of Zoning