

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF PLANNING



RECEIVED
D.C. OFFICE OF ZONING
2006 DEC 11 PM 2:59

Office of the Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM:  Ellen McCarthy, Director

SUBJECT: Supplemental Report – Zoning Commission Case No.06- 14
Consolidated Planned Unit Development
Square 3584, Lots 23, 811-813 New York and Florida Avenues, NW
“Washington Gateway”

DATE: December 11, 2006

I. APPLICATION STATUS

The applicant submitted a supplemental filing on December 4, 2006 to respond to concerns raised by the Zoning Commission at the public hearing on November 30, 2006.

Issue 1: Percentage of Affordable Housing

The Zoning Commission encouraged the applicant to increase the percentage of affordable housing from 6% of the project's total residential gross square footage (gsf) to 8% of the residential gsf. The Commission indicated its openness to increases in the project's height and density in order to achieve the affordable housing goal, primarily because of the project's proximity to a new Metrorail station.

The applicant's revised proposal reserves 8% of its residential gsf for housing affordable to families earning up to 80% of the Area Median Income. This adds 4,594 gsf (approximately 4 to 5 units) to the affordable housing total previously shown in the applicant's November 9, 2006 filing. The applicant has achieved this in two ways:

- A. Asking the Commission to increase the amount of permitted office space by 22,429 gsf, by the addition of one eleven-foot two-inch high 12th floor to the southern portion of the office building.*

The design of the building would remain essentially the same, by extruding the previous design upward by one floor. The project's footprint and lot occupancy would remain the same. The requested FAR increases from 6.9 to 7.06 – well within the 8.0 maximum FAR permitted a C-3-C PUD.

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia

CASE NO. 06-14

EXHIBIT NO. 40

- B. Asking the Commission to increase the range of the permitted number of residential units the applicant could provide within the same amount of square footage it had previously shown for residential use.*

The applicant formerly indicated that 230 to 250 residential units would be provided in 229,690 gsf. The applicant now wishes to accommodate 230¹ to 270 units within the same 229,690 gsf. Assuming the maximum number of requested units for each iteration, OP notes that this decreases the average residential unit's gross square footage from approximately 919 gsf to 850 gsf. The applicant has not yet formalized its unit type mix, but it would likely be primarily studios and one bedrooms with, perhaps, some two-bedroom units.

Issue 2: Relief Request for Roof Setback

Responding to a concern expressed by OP, the applicant has expanded its roof structure setback relief request to include the southeastern portion of the residential/hotel penthouse.

Issue 3: Column Design on Residential/Hotel Building

The Commission had questioned whether some columns were square and others round. Sheet 148 in the December 4, 2006 drawings clearly indicates that the columns are round, not square.

Issue 4: Project Amenities and Benefits

The Commission asked the applicant to provide a more detailed discussion of the adequacy of the amenities and benefits in relation to the zoning flexibility being requested. The applicant discusses this on pages 1 and 2 of its December 4, filing and presents more detail on the programs and equipment that would be funded through the proffered cash contributions.

Issue 5: Annual TDM Reporting

In a memo dated November 28, 2006, the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) had asked the applicant to provide an annual report on the effectiveness of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. At the November 30, 2006 hearing, both the Commission and the applicant expressed doubt about the usefulness of this without a baseline study, and the practicality of this given likely changes in ownership, condominiumization, etc. after the intended single-phase development is completed. The applicant does not include this condition in the Draft Proposed Conditions included with its December 4, 2006 filing.

Other Issues:

The Applicant addressed all other issues raised by the Commission, DDOT or OP in its filings of November 9, November 30, or December 4, 2006, or in its November 30, 2006 testimony.

¹ The applicant's December 4 filing indicates a range of 218-270. OP has spoken to the applicant and been informed that the lower end of this range is inaccurate; it should have remained at 230. The applicant has told OP that it intends to notify the Commission of this error.

II. REVISED DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

The proposed development is summarized in the following table. Where information has changed, the old figures are struck through and the new figures are in italics:

PROPOSED PROJECT OVERVIEW – Revised December 8, 2006

SITE AREA (square feet)	134,665
OFFICE GSF	601,896 <i>579,468</i>
RESIDENTIAL GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE	229,690
HOTEL GSF	120,443
RETAIL GSF	7,000
TOTAL GSF	951,120 <i>929,601</i>
RESIDENTIAL UNITS	230–250 <i>230²–270</i>
HOTEL ROOMS	140 - 195
TOTAL PARKING	598 spaces (approximately)
LOT COVERAGE	74,066 sf
% LOT OCCUPANCY	55%
FAR	6.9 <i>7.06</i>

All other development data remains the same as summarized in Table 3 on page 3 of OP's November 20, 2006 Final Report on this case. The amount of required parking and the parking ratio will depend on the final number of the units. Even with 270 units, the applicant will be providing significantly more parking than is required by the Regulations.

III. OP RECOMMENDATION

OP recommends the Commission approve the application, as revised to December 4, 2006, with clarification that the applicant will construct no fewer than 230 residential units.

EMcC/slc

² *Ibid.*