

Following our call with the Office of Planning on 12/3, we would like to enter the following information into the record.

- Correction of IZ Unit location (not in cellar)
- Designation of a second voluntary IZ unit in building 1 (existing building).
- Additional information regarding the practical difficulty of meeting the regulations.

The following items have been uploaded or corrected:

- Z001 IZ Unit Identification
- Updated Architectural Plans including Zoning Charts and IZ Unit
- This response and clarification letter for the record

Second Inclusionary Zoning Unit

Based on the Office of Planning's advisement, we have added a second unit for voluntary Inclusionary Zoning to this project. This will negate the ambiguity of whether the Inclusionary Zoning is to be applied per theoretical lot or for the project as a whole in order to avoid the variances related to FAR and special exception related to lot occupancy.

Practical Difficulty and Clarification Regarding Theoretical Lot Line

Regarding the placement of the theoretical lot line, we believe the amended location presents the fewest requests for relief. The proposed two rear yard variance requests (one for each lot) replace six separate requests for variances or special exceptions, which would otherwise address FAR, lot occupancy, and yard requirements.

In response to the Office of Planning's inquiry about reducing the building size to meet the required yard, we confirm that this option was considered during the design phase.

The building footprint was initially maximized to ensure the highest and best use of the lot for District residents. However, the design was adjusted to reduce FAR and lot occupancy wherever possible. Any further reduction in the building size—even by a few square feet—would require removing at least one bedroom per floor. To meet development standards fully, over 300 square feet per level would need to be eliminated, resulting in a significant loss of functional space and rental income, as noted in Exhibit 58.

Additionally, reducing the building size to conform to all setback requirements would preclude the project from utilizing the full 40% lot occupancy prescribed by RA-1 zoning. Given the physical dimensions and characteristics of the existing structure and lot, this is the only feasible design. To be prohibited from utilizing the full lot occupancy allowed by zoning regulations would place an undue burden on the applicant. A more detailed discussion of this issue is provided in Exhibit 74, "Applicant's Response to Board of Zoning."

The proposed building placement does encroach on the rear yard and requires approval for two buildings on the lot. However, this approach ensures the highest and best use of the property while minimizing requests for relief and preserving the project's viability.