D

Board of Zoning Adjustment
District of Columbia
CASE NO. 17197
EXHIBIT NO. 23A2

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

★ ★ ★

Application No. 16914 of PN Hoffman, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3104.1, for a special exception from the roof structure provisions of section 411 (770.6(b)) and 411.5, and 1906, and pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3103.2, a variance from the residential recreation space requirements under section 773, and a variance from the maximum permitted height of a roof structure under section 1902, for the construction of an apartment house with first floor retail uses in the Arts/C-3-A District at premises 1444 Church Street, N.W. and 1445 P Streets, N.W. (Square 209, Lots 901 & 903).

Note: As a preliminary matter, the Board of Zoning Adjustment, upon recommendation from the Office of Planning and with the concurrence of the Applicant, amended the application to request a special exception from the maximum permitted height of roof structures in the Uptown Arts-Mixed Use Overlay District as specified in 11 DCMR § 1906.

HEARING DATE: September 17, 2002
DECISION DATE: September 17, 2002 (Bench Decision)

SELF-CERTIFIED

The zoning relief requested in this case was self certified, pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3113.2.

SUMMARY ORDER

The Board provided proper and timely notice of public hearing on this application, by publication in the D.C. Register, and by mail to Applicant, Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 2F, and to owners of all property within 200 feet of the property that is the subject of this application. The application was referred to the Office of Planning (OP) for review and report. The OP report supported the application. The application was also referred to the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) for review and report. DDOT did not submit a report.

The subject property is located within the jurisdiction of ANC 2F. ANC 2F, which is automatically a party to the application, filed a written statement in support of the application dated May 14, 2002.

As directed by 11 DCMR § 3119.2, the Board required the Applicant to satisfy the burden of proving the elements that are necessary to establish the case for a special exception

pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 411 (770.6(b)), 411.5, and 1906, and variance from the strict application of the requirements of 11 DCMR §§ 773 and 1902. No person or entity appeared at the public hearing in opposition to the application. Accordingly, a decision by the Board to grant this application would not be adverse to any party.

The Board closed the record at the hearing. Based upon the record before the Board, and having given great weight to ANC's statement and the Office of Planning's report filed in this case, the Board concludes that the Applicant has met the burden of proof pursuant to 11 DCMR §§ 3104.1, 411 (770.6(b)), 411.5, and 1906, that the requested relief can be granted as in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations and Map and will not tend to affect adversely the use of neighboring property in accordance with the Zoning Regulations and Map. The Board also concludes that specific requirements set forth in 11 DCMR §§ 1906.1(a) through 1906.1(e) have been met. The Board also concludes that the Applicant has met its burden of proof pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3103.2 under § 773, and 1902, that there exists an exceptional or extraordinary situation or condition related to the property that creates a practical difficulty for the owner in complying with the Zoning Regulations, and that the requested relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the application is **GRANTED**, subject to the following conditions:

1. A legally binding document ensuring access in perpetuity to underground parking via the building at Lot 94, Square 209 (1425 P Street, N.W.) shall be recorded on the title; and

2. A legally binding document ensuring access in perpetuity to the common roof area on Lot 902, Square 209 (1445 P Street, N.W.) by all residents of the building known as 1445 P Street, N.W., and 1444 Church Street, N.W. shall be recorded on the title; and

3. A copy of the title shall be filed with the Zoning Administrator.

Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3101.6, the Board has determined to waive the requirement of 11 DCMR § 3125.3 that the order of the Board be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The waiver will not prejudice the rights of any party, and is appropriate in this case.

Pursuant to 11 DCMR § 3101.6, the Board has determined to waive the requirement of 11 DCMR § 3125.3 that the order of the Board be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The waiver will not prejudice the rights of any party, and is appropriate in this case.

VOTE: 4-0-1 (Geoffrey H. Griffis, Anne M. Renshaw, David A. Zaidain, and James H. Hannaham to approve; Curtis L. Etherly, Jr., not present not voting)

BY ORDER OF THE D.C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
Each concurring member has approved the issuance of this Order.

ATTESTED BY: _____
JERRILY R. KRESS, FAIA
Director, Office of Zoning

FINAL DATE OF ORDER: OCT 15 2002

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3125.6, THIS ORDER WILL BECOME FINAL UPON ITS FILING IN THE RECORD AND SERVICE UPON THE PARTIES. UNDER 11 DCMR § 3125.9, THIS ORDER WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE TEN DAYS AFTER IT BECOMES FINAL.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3130, THIS ORDER SHALL NOT BE VALID FOR MORE THAN TWO YEARS AFTER IT BECOMES EFFECTIVE UNLESS, WITHIN SUCH TWO-YEAR PERIOD, THE APPLICANT FILES PLANS FOR THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS FOR THE PURPOSES OF SECURING A BUILDING PERMIT.

PURSUANT TO 11 DCMR § 3205, FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THE CONDITIONS IN THIS ORDER, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, SHALL BE GROUNDS FOR THE REVOCATION OF ANY BUILDING PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY ISSUED PURSUANT TO THIS ORDER.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE D.C. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 1977, AS AMENDED, D.C. OFFICIAL CODE SECTION 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, FAMILIAR 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. rsn

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

★ ★ ★

BZA APPLICATION NO. 16914

As Director of the Office of Zoning, I hereby certify and attest that on OCT 15 2002 a copy of the order entered on that date in this matter was mailed first class, postage prepaid or delivered via inter-agency mail, to each party and public agency who appeared and participated in the public hearing concerning the matter, and who is listed below:

Norman M. Glasgow, Jr., Esq.
Holland & Knight, LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20006

Leslie Miles, Chairperson
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2F
P.O. Box 9348
Washington, D.C. 20005

Jim Brandon, Commissioner 2F02
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2F
P.O. Box 9348
Washington, D.C. 20005

Jack Evans, City Councilmember
Ward Two
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 106
Washington, D.C. 20004

Robert Kelly, Zoning Administrator
Building and Land Regulation Administration
Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs
941 N. Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Ellen McCarthy, Deputy Director
Office of Planning
801 North Capitol Street, N.E.
4th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20002

Alan Bergstein, Esq.
Office of Corporation Counsel
441 4th Street, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001

rsn

ATTESTED BY:

JERRILY R. KRESS, FAIA
Director, Office of Zoning

E

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Property Address:	**1600 14th Street, NW**	X	Agenda
Landmark/District:	**14th Street Historic District**		Consent Calendar
		X	Concept Review
Meeting Date:	~~April 22, 2004~~ (May 27, 2004)		Alteration
H.P.A. Number:	**04-050**	X	New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	**Steve Callcott**		Demolition
			Subdivision

The applicant, architect Bill Bonstra for developer Fred Bahrami, returns with revised measurements and drawings for a seven-story apartment building at 14th and Q Streets. As the Board will remember, the conceptual design was approved as compatible with the character of the historic district at the February HPRB meeting, however, there was concern raised about discrepancies in the heights of the surrounding buildings as depicted in the drawings. At the April meeting, the Board asked that the drawings be prepared showing measurements referenced to a common datum point to more accurately show the relationship of the proposed building to its surroundings. The revisions result in no perceptible change in the relationship between the proposed and existing buildings.

As the fundamental characteristics that the Board found to be compatible when it approved the conceptual design in February remain unchanged in the revised drawings, the staff recommends that the Board reaffirm their conceptual approval of the project and direct the applicant to continue working with the staff on the design's development.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Property Address:	**1600 14th Street, NW**	X	Agenda
Landmark/District:	**14th Street Historic District**		Consent Calendar
		X	Concept Review
Meeting Date:	**April 22, 2004**		Alteration
H.P.A. Number:	**04-050**	X	New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	**Steve Callcott**		Demolition
			Subdivision

The applicant, architect Bill Bonstra for developer Fred Bahrami, returns to the Board regarding a conceptual design for new construction. At the February meeting, the Board approved a revised concept for a seven-story apartment building, finding that the new design was significantly improved in relating to the character of surrounding buildings and the historic district. However, after questions were raised by several residents on Q Street about potential discrepancies in the recorded heights of some of the surrounding buildings, particularly the Berret School occupying the opposite corner, the Board asked that the team conduct a professional survey of the Berret School to definitively record its height, and that the project return to the Board if the measurements deviated more than 12 inches from the representation in the submission.

The resulting survey indicates that the top of the cornice on the Berret School is located 54'1" above the sidewalk (as opposed to 57'4" as shown in the original submission – 3'3" lower) and that the top of the pediment is 67'3" from the sidewalk (as opposed to 74'0" as shown in the original submission – 6'9" lower). The discrepancies are explained in a letter from the architect, who obtained the dimensions of the school from the CAD drawings prepared for that building's restoration several years ago by another firm. Attempts were made to verify these measurements through on-site evaluation of the building, which were obviously not entirely accurate.

Revised drawings have been submitted, together with the previous drawings, showing the building in relation to the corrected height of the school. While regrettable that the initial drawings were inaccurate, the discrepancies do not result in the proposed building being any less compatible with the character of the historic district. The primary cornice line of the new building at the top of the fifth floor would still align (with a differential of less than 6 inches) with the cornice line of the school; the roof of the school and the upper floors of the apartment building similarly step back from this aligned 55' cornice line. The new building still achieves compatibility with the historic district because its overall massing, height, façade organization, rhythms, proportions and the manner in which it is articulated and detailed cumulatively work to create harmonious, compatible relationships with the wide variety of buildings surrounding this site, and which the Board recognized as successful in their previous review. None of those characteristics are perceptibly altered by the revised heights of the Berret School.

The staff recommends that the Review Board reaffirm their conceptual approval of the project and direct the applicant to continue working with the staff on the development of the plans.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Property Address:	**1600 14th Street, NW**	X	Agenda
Landmark/District:	**14th Street Historic District**		Consent Calendar
		X	Concept Review
Meeting Date:	**February 26, 2004**		Alteration
H.P.A. Number:	**04-050**	X	New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	**Steve Callcott**		Demolition
			Subdivision

The applicant, architect Bill Bonstra for developer Fred Bahrami, returns to the Board seeking on-going conceptual review for construction of a seven-story apartment building on a vacant parcel at the northwest corner of 14th and Q Streets. When previously presented in December, the Board expressed concern about the building's height, the overall proportions and treatment of the 14th Street elevation, and its general failure to relate to the surrounding buildings and historic district. The Board did not vote on a particular motion, but it was suggested that the applicants look at removing a floor, lowering the height, and/or increasing the setbacks for the top floor(s), reorganizing the 14th Street elevation (possibly using three rather than two projecting bays), and studying the surrounding context more closely in order to improve the design's relationship with the historic district.

The applicants submitted a revised proposal and were placed on the agenda for the January meeting but withdrew after the submission was mailed out to the Board after determining that additional time and effort were needed in working with the community to address outstanding concerns. The applicants retained preservation consultant Emily Eig, the author of the Greater 14th Street Historic District application, to assist them in evaluating the design of the building within the context of the historic district. Over the past month, the design has been further revised in an effort to improve its compatibility with the historic district.

The height of the building has been lowered by somewhat less than a full floor – a reduction of about six feet has been achieved by reducing the height of each floor and by minimizing the parapet walls. The top floor has been pulled back on the north side, resulting in an equal setback on all sides as would be typical of a penthouse. The 14th Street elevation has been reorganized around three projecting bays that rise to the fourth floor, with the bays rising only to the fourth floor. The southern-most bay projects around the corner onto the Q Street side, but on the upper floors the masonry portion of the building has been pulled back from the projection line. Taking its cue from traditional apartment building design in the neighborhood, the surface detailing of the 14th Street elevation has been organized in a tripartite fashion, with a strongly delineated base, a midsection capped by a cornice, and the top floor treated as a simplified attic story. The amount of glazing has been reduced to a ratio more characteristic of buildings in the

historic district, and the proportions of the fenestration made more vertical. On the Q Street side, in addition to the reduction in height, the changes include substitution of rough-cut stone for copper in the reveal between the 14th and Q Street masses, a more traditional entrance with a canopy, and simplified pergolas on the sixth floor. On both elevations, the vertical emphasis and orientation of the building has been strengthened in an effort to better relate to the vertical emphasis dominant throughout the historic buildings in the district.

The revised proposal represents a substantive response to the concerns raised by the Board and is significantly improved in establishing a more compatible relationship with buildings in the historic district. On 14th Street, the lower, narrower projecting bays establish a rhythm and proportions for the elevation that are more characteristic of the historic district. The tripartite organization of the facades, the lower height for the projecting bays, and a decorative use of brick and stone banding all help relate the building to the smaller size and scale of the Victorian buildings to the north and west, and were inspired by the use of similar design devices found in taller historic buildings in the neighborhood. The use of the lower bay at the corner also works to create a more deferential relationship with the Berret School, and would improve how the building would be perceived from Q Street. On the Q Street elevation, the revised entrance, vertical proportions and stronger cornice line all help bring the building into a more harmonious relationship with the character of this street.

The staff has only minor suggestions that should be considered as the design is further developed. On the 14th Street elevation, the extent of masonry used on the first floor might be too great for commercial storefronts, which could be easily solved by slightly widening the door openings; the masonry on the first floor should also be pulled down to below the second floor window sills. Conversely, on the Q Street side, the first floor of the projecting bay reads as more commercial than residential in character; an earlier iteration of this bay as an oriel may have been a more satisfactory treatment. The staff will continue to work with the applicants on these and other issues as the design continues to evolve.

<u>The staff recommends that the Review Board approve the revised conceptual design – height, massing, and organization of the elevations – as not incompatible with the character of the historic district, and direct the applicant to continue working with the staff on the development of the plans.</u>

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Property Address:	**1600 14th Street, NW**	**X**	Agenda
Landmark/District:	**14th Street Historic District**		Consent Calendar
		X	Concept Review
Meeting Date:	**January 22, 2004**		Alteration
H.P.A. Number:	**04-050**	**X**	New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	**Steve Callcott**		Demolition
			Subdivision

The applicant, architect Bill Bonstra for developer Fred Bahrami, returns to the Board seeking on-going conceptual design review for construction of a seven-story apartment building on a vacant parcel at the northwest corner of 14th and Q Streets. When previously presented in December, the Board expressed concern about the building's height, the overall proportions and treatment of the 14th Street elevation, and its general failure to relate to the surrounding buildings and historic district. The Board did not make or vote on a particular motion, but it was suggested that the applicants look at removing a floor, lowering the height, and/or increasing the setbacks for the top floor(s), reorganizing the 14th Street elevation (possibly using three rather than two projecting bays), and studying the surrounding context more closely in order to improve the design's relationship with the historic district.

In the revised design, the height of the building has been lowered by somewhat less than a floor – a reduction of about 6 feet has been achieved by reducing the height on each floor and by reducing the height of the parapet walls. The top floor has been pulled back on the north side, resulting in an equal setback on all sides as would be typical of a penthouse level. The 14th Street elevation has been reorganized around three projecting bays that rise to the fourth floor. The southern-most bay projects around the corner onto the Q Street side, but on the upper floors the masonry portion of the building has been pulled back from the projection line. Taking its cue from traditional apartment building design in the neighborhood, the surface detailing of the 14th Street elevation has been organized in a tripartite fashion, with a strongly delineated base, a midsection with horizontal brick banding, and the top floor treated as a simplified attic story. The amount of glazing has been reduced to a ratio more characteristic of buildings in the historic district, and the proportions of the windows made more vertical. On the Q Street side, in addition to the reduction in height, the changes include substitution of rough-cut stone for copper in the reveal between the 14th and Q Street masses, greater fenestration on the first floor, and reworking of the sixth floor pergolas. On both elevations, the vertical emphasis and orientation of the building has been strengthened in an effort to better relate to the vertical emphasis dominant throughout the historic buildings in the district.

The proposal represents a substantive response to the concerns raised by the Board and is significantly improved in establishing a more compatible relationship with buildings in

the historic district. Particularly on 14th Street, where the most changes have been made, the lower, narrower projecting bays establish a rhythm and proportions for the elevation that are more characteristic of the historic district. Using a lower height for the bays and a decorative use of brick and stone banding to relate to the smaller size and scale of the two- and three-story buildings to the north are techniques inspired by historic buildings in the neighborhood, where they are successful in bridging between different sized buildings. The use of the lower bay at the corner also works to create a more deferential relationship with the Berret School, and would improve how the building would be perceived from Q Street.

While the applicants are certainly aware that the concept design needs to be further developed, the revised height, massing, use of projections, rhythm, proportions, vertical emphasis, façade organization and materials' use are all much more successful in establishing a harmonious relationship with the surrounding buildings and the historic district, and the proposal should be allowed to proceed to the next level of design.

The staff recommends that the Review Board approve the revised conceptual design – height, massing, and general organization of the elevations – as not incompatible with the character of the historic district and direct the applicants to progress to the next stage in the project's design development before returning to the HPRB for additional review.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Property Address:	**1600 14th Street, NW**	X	Agenda
Landmark/District:	**14th Street Historic District**		Consent Calendar
		X	Concept Review
Meeting Date:	**December 18, 2003**		Alteration
H.P.A. Number:	**04-050**	X	New Construction
Staff Reviewer:	**Steve Callcott**		Demolition
			Subdivision

The applicant, architect Bill Bonstra for developer Fred Bahrami, seeks conceptual design review for construction of a seven-story apartment building on a vacant parcel at the northwest corner of 14th and Q Streets. The site, which measures approximately 79' wide (along 14th Street) by 120' deep (along Q), is comprised of three lots that contained 19th century commercial buildings until the mid-1990s when those structures were ordered demolished by the Board of Condemnation; it is currently used as a parking lot by the John Wesley AME Zion Church located across 14th at Corcoran Street. The property abuts two and three-story commercial buildings to the north on 14th Street; to the rear is a 20' wide north-south alley and a row of three-story 1880s duplex rowhouses. The 1889 Berret School, converted to condominiums in the 1990s, is located across Q Street on the adjacent corner. The site is zoned C-3-A within the Uptown Arts Overlay District, allowing a maximum height of 75 feet.

The proposal calls for the building's mass to be broken down into a six story block that fronts 14th Street, a five-story block that fronts on Q Street, and a two-story penthouse block that is set back from the street fronting and alley elevations, achieving the full allowable height of 75 feet on the set back portions. The 14th Street block would be articulated with two projecting storefront windows on the first floor and enclosed bays and small open balconies above. The end of this block, facing Q Street, would be treated as a sort of tower or third projection that is oriented to the south. The Q Street block would be separated from the front block by a thin reveal containing recessed balconies, and punctuated with a single projecting oriel at its western end also with small balconies. In contrast to the highly glazed storefront base of the 14th Street block, the base of the Q Street block would be treated as a more solid surface, with copper sheathing and coursed brickwork punctuated with small windows flanking the centered lobby entrance. The coursed brick base would extend to the alley, becoming a garden wall that encloses a rear yard areaway. The penthouse block would be set back approximately 10 feet to allow terraces with pergolas.

The project has been presented at several community meetings, generating significant interest from the neighborhood. The dialogue has resulted in a variety of changes and improvements to the design, however, the most significant and fundamental concern by some is that the project's overall height and mass may be too great for the site, and will

diminish the smaller scaled character of the 1400 block of Q Street. Before the project can move to the next stage in its design development, all parties are interested in determining whether the Board believes the overall height and mass is appropriate, or "not incompatible" with the character of this location in the historic district.

As has been expressed on other cases in the 14th Street corridor, the HPO does not believe that 75 feet for a new construction project is inherently incompatible with the character of 14th Street – a 110 foot wide commercial street with a variety of building types and heights – or, in this instance, even necessarily incompatible with the row house character of Q Street. The general approach of breaking the building down into smaller blocks, establishing a lower cornice line of 55 feet on Q Street and 65 feet on 14th Street, setting the top floors back 10 feet from the street fronting elevations, and modulating the mass with projecting bays are all good steps in breaking down the mass and lowering the apparent height of the building. While certainly taller than the adjacent rowhouses and commercial buildings, the setbacks on the upper floors and the 36' separation from the rowhouses on Q Street would mitigate any looming or discordant quality it might have over adjacent buildings. The new building would be roughly the same height as the adjacent Berret School and the taller auto showroom buildings on 14th Street, none of which could be considered too tall or looming over their adjacent neighbors.

Nevertheless, despite these manipulations in height and mass, the design is not entirely successful. As is more typically the problem with new buildings that might be perceived as "too big" or "too tall," this design suffers from how the height and mass are articulated through its façade organization, rhythm, proportions and scale. Particularly on the 14th Street elevation (and including the tower element on the Q Street side), the scale and rhythm of the bays, the proportions of the glazing, and the strong horizontal emphasis result in incompatibility with the historic district. More progress has been made on the Q Street elevation, with the stronger vertical emphasis of the windows, however, as on 14th Street, the width and strong horizontal emphasis of the bay projection and tower element is clunky and gives the building a bulky appearance.

The rhythm of 14th Street is largely defined by the 20'-25' width of its buildings, whose facades have a strong vertical emphasis, and which are generally taller than they are wide. The proposed design has a much larger scaled rhythm to its façade organization, within an elevation that is wider than it is tall, and which has a strong horizontal emphasis. The pairing of the open balconies with the projecting glass bays and visually merging them with a metal panel that serves as the base of each is one element responsible for this strong horizontality, which at the same time introduces a proportion of glass that is more commercial than residential in appearance.

In order to improve the 14th Street elevation's rhythm, proportions and weak vertical emphasis, the staff would encourage study of a design that organizes the 14th Street elevation around three slightly narrower projecting bays without balconies. The projecting bay on the west edge of the Q Street elevation could be similarly restudied with regard to its proportions; this elevation may also benefit from increasing the number

of projections. The corner tower element should be restudied and either treated as a true projection – such as a bay or oriel extending out from a building which remains grounded at the building line – or simply brought back to the building line and redesigned without a projection. While larger amount of glass than is found on the district's historic buildings may be acceptable, introducing a somewhat smaller, more residential scale to those large expanses of glazing should be studied.

The staff recommends that the Review Board approve the general height and mass, but direct the applicant to continue working on the design as outlined above. The project should return to the Board for further review when ready.

F

Exhibit F – Views of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2-F

As the ANC 2-F holds its July meeting on Wednesday, July 9, the Applicant is not able to include any record of the position they will adopt as the Applicant's filing must occur no later than Tuesday, July 8. The ANC will communicate its views directly to the BZA.

G

Exhibit G – Outline of Testimony of Fred Bahrami, Developer

1. Development History in the District of Columbia
2. Selection of Site
3. Project Goals and Objectives
4. Project Attributes (Apartments, Mix Thereof, Commercial Areas)
5. Design and Design Approval Process
6. Professional Development Team (Bonstra, Eig, Patton/Williams)
7. Consultations with Community Organizations and Residents
8. Requested Zoning Relief (Residential Recreation Space, Percentage of Ground Floor for Retail/Service/Arts-Related Uses)
9. Conclusion

H

Exhibit H – Outline of Testimony of Project Architect Bill Bonstra

1. Introduction and Personal Qualifications and Similar Projects in District of Columbia
2. Site and Location Description (Zoning and Historic District)
3. Project Description
4. Design Goals and Constraints Pertinent to Relief Sought (Variance and Special Exceptions)
5. Conclusion

I

Exhibit I – Availability of Emily Eig to Answer Questions from the Board

Ms. Eig was a key consultant in the design process leading up to the conceptual approval by the Historic Preservation Review Board. While Applicant did not ask her to prepare any statement for the BZA, she is attending the hearing and is available to answer questions the Board may have.

J

Exhibit J – Outline of Testimony of Expert Land Use Planner, Lindsley Williams

1. Introduction and Qualifications
2. Project Setting and Features; Character of the Area
3. Analysis of Impact of Relief Sought by Applicant's Project (Residential Recreation Space, Area for Uses "Favored" by the Arts Overlay's rules, Site and Project Limitations that Support the Relief Being Sought)
4. Conclusion

2074526_v1