



MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM: Jennifer Steingasser, ^{JS} Deputy Director

DATE: January 22, 2009

SUBJECT: **Public Hearing Report** for Ft Lincoln Gateway Village – ZC #06-08B
Modification and Time Extension Requests

I. RECOMMENDATION

The Office of Planning (OP) recommends approval of the modification and time extension requests. The requested modification and development phasing would be consistent with the intent of the previous approvals, 06-08 and 06-08A, and not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

II. BACKGROUND

On April 9, 2007, the Zoning Commission approved case #06-08, Ft Lincoln Gateway Village. That order became effective on November 23, 2007. A minor modification, 06-08A, was approved on November 19, 2007. That modification adjusted the footprints of the rowhouse units, increased the height of the units, provided flexibility for homebuyer options, and dispersed different rowhouse widths within each stick of rowhouses. No changes to the amenities were proposed. For a complete description of previous approvals please refer to the Zoning Commission orders contained in the applicant's written submission.

On October 15, 2009, the property owner submitted a timeline extension and request for a minor modification, case #06-08B. The Commission considered the requests at its November 9, 2009 public meeting and set the application down for a public hearing.

III. APPLICATION-IN-BRIEF

The modification would largely reverse the previous modification by returning unit dimensions to those originally approved in #06-08 and segregating the rowhouses so a consistent width would comprise each stick. The applicant also wishes to have the option to construct 22' rowhouses in lieu of the originally approved 24' rowhouses. The modification proposes to reduce the number of 2-over-2 units, and therefore the total number of units, as shown in the following table:

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia

Unit Type	Original Approval (#06-08)	Present Proposal (#06-08B)
16' Rowhouse	75	91
20' Rowhouse	80	103
24' or 22' Rowhouse	28	28
2-over-2 unit	174	112
Total	357	334

Finally, the time extension requests a phasing approach to development of the property, such that building permits for the eastern, central and western portions of the property must be applied for within one year, three years and five years of the date of approval, respectively. No changes to the amenity package are proposed with the current application.

IV. ANALYSIS

OP does not object to the reduction in the number of 2-over-2 units. Although the total number of units would decrease, the number of family-sized rowhouses would increase. The replacement rowhouses would, like the other units in the development, have rear alley access to off-street parking. OP also does not object to the unification of unit size within rowhouse sticks. The overall community will still contain a diversity of unit types. The flexibility to construct 22' rowhouses in lieu of 24' rowhouses is not inconsistent with the intent of the original PUD. The 22' rowhouse would still be the largest product type and would increase the diversity of buyers within the development.

The applicant's phasing request is based on their assessment of the market's ability to absorb the number of rowhouses contained in the project. OP does not object to phasing on those grounds and notes that a project of this size would likely take a number of years to complete in any event. OP discussed with the applicant the reasons for the east-to-west phasing of the project. Because of the grade of the property from west down to east, all of the sewer and storm sewer infrastructure must connect at the eastern end of the property. Constructing the western rowhouses first would require installing infrastructure for the entire development and grading the entire property. By phasing from east to west the grading and sewer installation could happen gradually, along with construction of the homes themselves.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENTS

The subject site is located in ANC 5A. As of this writing the Office of Planning has not received comments about the case from the ANC or other community members.