

FORMER RANDALL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT AT 65 I STREET, SW

By Lowe Enterprises



**APPLICATION TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ZONING COMMISSION FOR
REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANCE TO AN
APPROVED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT**

SEPTEMBER 11, 2017

EXHIBITS

<u>Description</u>	<u>Exhibit</u>
Authorization Letters	A
Approved PUD Order (Z.C. Order No. 07-13D)	B
Extension Order (Z.C. Order No. 07-13F)	C
Notice of Intent to Surrounding Property Owners and Certificate of Notice	D
Property Owners' List	E
Compliance with Modification of Significance Requirements	F
List of Publicly Available Information	G
Surveyor's Plats	H
Application Form	I
Architectural Drawings and Elevations, and Photographs of the Property and Surrounding Area	J

I. Introduction

Lowe Enterprises (the “**Applicant**” or “**Lowe**”)¹ hereby submits this application (this “**Application**”) to the District of Columbia Zoning Commission (the “**Commission**”) for review and approval of a modification of significance of an approved consolidated planned unit development (“**PUD**”). The property that is the subject of this Application is located at 65 I Street, S.W. (Square 643-S, Lot 801) (the “**Property**”), and has a land area of approximately 115,724 square feet. The Property is located in the Southwest neighborhood and is bounded by I Street on the south, former First Street on the west, partially closed H Street on the north, and former Half Street on the east. The Property is presently improved with the former Randall Junior High School, a historic landmark listed in the D.C. Inventory of Historic Places.

Briefly, the Applicant seeks approval of modifications and refinements to the design of an approved PUD that will improve its functionality and facilitate construction and completion of the PUD. The PUD continues to consist of a similar mix of uses, including museum and related commercial uses within the historic Randall School and a new residential building behind the Randall School, organized around a central courtyard (“**Project**”). The Applicant proposes to revise and simplify the massing of the residential building to open up the courtyard into a more appealing and usable space. The residential addition continues to consist of a primarily glass and metal materials palette, but the design has been refined to improve its compatibility with the historic building and the overall character of the Southwest neighborhood. Finally, the Applicant seeks to enhance and improve the configuration of museum and related uses within the historic school building.

¹ TR SW LLC (“**TR SW**”) is the contract purchaser of the Property, which is currently owned by the Trustees of the Corcoran Gallery of Art. TR SW 2 LLC (“**TR SW 2**”), an affiliate of TR SW, was the applicant under the Approved PUD (as defined below). Lowe and TR SW entered into a Co-Development Agreement, pursuant to which Lowe became the lead developer and responsible for the development, financing and construction of the Property. A letter authorizing Lowe to proceed with this Application is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

II. Background

The Commission originally approved a planned unit development and map amendment for the Property in 2008 (“**Original PUD**”). The Original PUD, proposed by Monument Realty, authorized the construction of a mixed-use building on the Property that included educational and residential space, with 20% of such residential space being reserved for households earning no more than 80% of the area medium income (“**AMI**”), as required by legislation authorizing the disposition of the Property (collectively the “**Randall School Legislation**”). The Original PUD was extended three times during the recession and was effectively abandoned with the approval of the Approved PUD (as defined below).

Following Monument’s withdrawal from the project, TR SW acquired the development rights to the Property and engaged architects Bing Thom and Beyer Blinder Belle to revise the development plan for the Property. In 2014, the Commission approved a modification of the Original PUD (the “**Approved PUD**”). The basic formulation of the project—i.e., a residential addition to the historic Randall School, used primarily for arts and arts-related uses—did not change from the Original PUD. The Approved PUD included numerous public benefits, including the proposed museum, reuse of an existing historic landmark, housing, and affordable housing. A copy of the order approving the Approved PUD is attached as Exhibit B (the “**Approved PUD Order**”). Earlier this year, the Commission approved a two-year extension of the Approved PUD in order to provide the Applicant time to further refine the Project. A copy of the extension order is attached as Exhibit C.

III. Summary of PUD Modifications

As discussed in detail below, the Applicant seeks approval of a modification of significance to the Approved PUD. The modifications proposed by this Application (the “**Modified PUD**”) are centered on the goals of improving open space and preserving the historic building based on the Applicant’s detailed studies of the previously approved Project. The proposed modifications are entirely consistent with the overall massing, development envelope, policy objectives, character and appropriateness of the Approved PUD. Updated plans for the Project, including comparisons between the Approved PUD and the Modified PUD as well as zoning tabulations for the Modified PUD, are attached as Exhibit J (the “**Revised Plans**”).

A. Modifications to the Building Design

Comparisons between the Approved PUD and the Modified PUD are included as pages A1-A6 of the Revised Plans. The changes are summarized and described below.

1. Enhancement and Enlargement of the Central Courtyard

The Applicant has made two material changes to the original design of the Project that will create an open, light-filled courtyard between the residential building and the historic Randall School building. First, the original plans contemplated an addition to the back of the historic building that protruded into the courtyard. The Modified PUD removes this addition, which not only opens-up the courtyard and creates less density within the center of the Project, but also allows for further preservation of the historic building because it enables the back elevation of the historic center block to be restored to its original character. Second, the original plans featured upper-story wings on the residential building that extended over the historic building. The Modified PUD removes these wings to pull the residential building further away from the historic building. This change, similar to the removal of the addition to the historic building, allows for a light-filled

courtyard with less congestion between the residential building and the historic building. The enlarged courtyard is consistent with the “tower in the park” character that defines much of the architecture in the Southwest neighborhood. The courtyard will be open during the day and closed at night using gates.

2. Improved Building Access and Circulation

The primary museum entrance will now be located through the east wing of the historic building along I Street. This provides the museum with a more visible and functional entrance; it also allows the center block of the historic building to be restored back to its original configuration.

For the residential component, the primary residential entrance will be relocated from the corner of I Street and former Half Street to the center of the building at H Street. This provides the residential building with an easily-identifiable and efficient central entrance that can be accessed from the courtyard as well as H Street and is equally accessible to both the west and east residential towers.

With the above change to the residential building entrance, the parking entrance has been relocated to the northeast corner of the residential building. The parking garage will contain 301 parking spaces, which is within the range of 290-370 parking spaces authorized in the Approved PUD. The amount and location of loading facilities generally remains the same, although the residential loading facility has been relocated to an at-grade facility.

3. Refined Architectural Design of Residential Building

The residential building continues to consist of a 110 feet tall tower with approximately 489 units and related residential amenity spaces. However, the residential massing has been adjusted to improve its efficiency and emphasize the central courtyard. As described above, the cantilevered wings over the historic building have been eliminated and the primary entrance has

been relocated to a central location on H Street. Other adjustments to the massing further simplify and organize it around fewer vertical circulation and mechanical cores, which improves the efficiency of operation, reduces the need for multiple tall penthouse structures on each mini-tower, and creates a shared, expansive roof top amenity space. Additionally, an offset in the residential building's massing was introduced at the 7th floor to visually reduce the scale of the building along each elevation. This design element evolves the original concept to create several unique blocks within the overall structure, allows for the creation of true balconies and further breaks down the massing of the apartment building, bringing additional light and air to the courtyard.

The façade of the residential building will now be regularized to accentuate the form of the building. The residential building's fenestration uses large picture windows for views and smaller modules for operable windows, while maintaining a similar color palette from the prior design. The corners of the residential building are now squared-off, and the infrastructural supports will be cantilevers, as opposed to columns.

B. Adjustment to Proposed Uses within the Project

The uses of the Project under the Modified PUD (as defined below) are generally consistent with the uses outlined in the Approved PUD. However, the Applicant's continued studies of the Project indicate that certain minor adjustments to those uses will allow the Project to thrive.

1. Central and East Wings of the Historic School

The Project continues to contain approximately 32,000 square feet of museum space (the Approved PUD contained 32,707 square feet of museum and related space, and the Modified PUD will contain 31,839 square feet of museum and related space). With the relocation of the main entrance of the museum to the east wing, however, the Modified PUD proposes to adapt the use of the east wing (the former school auditorium) for museum use, with a large gallery space to hold

the larger pieces of art in the museum as well as ancillary retail (e.g., café, bookstore, gift shop) “event space,” rather than the separate restaurant that was called for in the Approved PUD.

2. West Wing of the Historic School

The west wing of the historic Randall School continues to contain a mix of commercial and non-profit arts-related uses; the Applicant proposes to include a mezzanine level that will increase the amount of such space in this component of the historic building. The Approved PUD defined these uses as a mix of retail, service and education uses; the Modified PUD articulates these uses based on the 2016 Zoning Regulations use categories as uses in the office, institutional, retail and arts/design/creation use categories. With the removal of the restaurant use in the east wing and the addition of the mezzanine level in the west wing, the net amount of space devoted to such commercial uses decreases from 23,303 square feet of GFA to 18,602 square feet of GFA.

3. Residential Building

The residential building will now include 489 units in the Modified PUD compared to 520 units in the Approved PUD. As previously approved, the Applicant continues to request flexibility to vary the unit count by +/- 10%. The Applicant anticipates a mix of studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. The bulk of the Project will be rental apartments, but the Applicant is studying the potential for for-sale condominium units in one of the wings of the residential building. As in the Approved PUD, the Applicant continues to request flexibility to modify the design of the ground floor of the residential building to include retail/service uses, to phase the residential component in two phases, and to allow for two-story residential units. The potential retail space and the contemplated phase line are shown on page A10 of the Revised Plans.

4. Summary of Adjustments to Uses

The below chart compares the uses under the Approved PUD with the uses contemplated by the Modified PUD.

	APPROVED PUD		MODIFIED PUD	
Central / East Wings of Historic Building	Museum / Restaurant	32,707 SF (Museum) + 4,701 (Restaurant)	Museum / Ancillary Retail Event Space	31,839 SF
West Wing of Historic Building	Retail / Service / Education	16,801 SF	Office / Institutional / Arts / Entertainment	18,602 SF
Residential Building	520 Units	443,833 SF	489 Units	441,110 SF

C. Adjustments to Areas of Flexibility

The Approved PUD included flexibility from the penthouse height and setback, court, and loading requirements of the Zoning Regulations, as well as flexibility to vary the amount of parking between 290-370 parking spaces. As a result of the changes in the Modified PUD, flexibility from the court and loading provisions is no longer required, and the Applicant now proposes a less-variable number of parking spaces. The penthouses now comply with all penthouse setback requirements, but relief is still requested to accommodate the height of the trellis feature of the pool and terrace, which at 15'4" tall is taller than the 12' penthouse habitable space but shorter than the 18'6" penthouse mechanical space. The height of the trellis element is tied to the height of the pool deck and terrace. The trellis itself is approximately 11'8" when measured from the top of the pool deck, which provides adequate height distance from the activities below. However, the pool deck is itself elevated 3'8" from the roof slab, resulting in a total height of 15'4" for the trellis. A trellis that aligns with the penthouse habitable space would only sit about 8' above the pool deck, which is too low. Conversely, a trellis that aligns with the mechanical space would be too high.

D. Adjustments to Proposed Conditions of Approval

The Approved PUD contains three sections with eighteen conditions of approval related to Project Development, Public Benefits, and other miscellaneous conditions. Broadly speaking, the Applicant proposes the same “Project Development” conditions, with adjustments as needed to reflect the current design and uses within the Project. Similarly, the Applicant proposes the same “Public Benefits” conditions, again with adjustments as needed to reflect the Modified PUD as well as specific revisions to conditions 7(g) through 7(i), which relate to benefits associated with the now-defunct Corcoran Gallery of Art.

IV. Compliance with Requirements of the Zoning Regulations

The Approved PUD was approved under the 1958 Zoning Regulations, as amended. As set forth in 11-A DCMR § 102.4, the Modified PUD is processed under the procedural requirements of the 2016 Zoning Regulations, and the substantive requirements of the 2016 Zoning Regulations apply to the requested changes.

Generally, modifications of significance to a consolidated PUD should meet the requirements for and be processed akin to a second-stage PUD when, as here, the modifications only impact the building design and detailed site plan. 11-Z DCMR § 704.3; see also 11-X DCMR § 302.1(b) (outlining scope of a second-stage PUD application). The review of the modification is “limited to impact of the modification on the subject of the original application.” 11-Z DCMR § 704.4. Section 704.4 also notes an intent by the Commission to not “revisit its original decision” in a PUD modification. As set forth below, the Modified PUD satisfies the requirements of the Zoning Regulations for review and approval of a modification of significance to a consolidated PUD.

A. Filing Requirements

Attached as Exhibit F is a certificate of compliance with the filing requirements for a second-stage PUD, which are the procedural requirements for this modification of significance.

B. Evaluation Standards

As discussed above, the evaluation of a modification of significance is generally limited to the impact of the modification on the original PUD. Here, the modifications are generally limited to the design of the Project and do not materially impact the planning, uses, amenities, benefits and impacts that formed the basis of the Commission's prior determination that the Project complied with the overall PUD evaluation standards. In other words, the Modified PUD continues to comply with the evaluation standards as outlined in Z.C. Order No. 07-13D, which authorized the Approved PUD, including:

- The determination that the impacts of the PUD on the surrounding area and city services and facilities are favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable given the quality of public benefits;
- The conclusion that specific public benefits and project amenities proposed as a part of the PUD are adequate and balancing of the relative value of the public benefits and project amenities offered, the degree of development incentives requested, and the potential adverse effects of the PUD; and
- The consistency of the PUD with the Comprehensive Plan and other adopted policies;

The impact of the design and site plan modifications shown in the Revised Plans on the Commission's earlier approval are addressed in detail below.

1. Project Impacts on the Surrounding Area

The Commission previously concluded that the PUD would have favorable impacts on walkability, economic development, tourism, environmental protection, affordable housing, and public safety, and accordingly the impact of the project on the surrounding area and the operation of city services was acceptable given the quality of public benefits in the project. The Project's location, mix and size of uses as well as the amount and location of parking and loading facilities in the Modified PUD all remain consistent with the Approved PUD. Accordingly, the Commission's conclusion that the impact of the Project is acceptable remains intact.

2. Public Benefits and Project Amenities

Generally, the Project continues to propose the same public benefits and amenities proffered in the Approved PUD, which the Commission determined were acceptable benefits and amenities that are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and are otherwise superior benefits related to urban design, landscaping and open space, housing and affordable housing, transportation measures, and uses of special value to the neighborhood. As the Project continues to contain the same mix of uses, at the same size and configuration previously proposed, the Modified PUD continues to comply with the findings under the Approved PUD.

The only anticipated modifications are to three conditions regarding benefits related to the Corcoran Gallery of Art, which is no longer in existence.

(a) *Housing/Affordable Housing.* The Modified PUD will result in a significant addition to the District's housing stock and to Southwest in particular. Consistent with the Approved PUD, twenty percent of the residential units will be set aside for households earning no more than 80% of the AMI, as is required by the legislation and related covenants that govern the disposition of the Property from the District.

(b) *Historic Preservation.* The Project continues to facilitate the renovation and adaptive reuse of the historic portions of the Randall School. As described above and shown on the Revised Plans, the Modified PUD will permit a greater degree of preservation and renovation of certain key features of the historic school, including the central front and rear facades.

(c) *Sustainable Design Features.* The Applicant continues to commit to a minimum equivalent of LEED Silver for each of the museum and residential components under the LEED-2009 standard.

(d) *First Source Employment Opportunities/CBE Agreement.* The Applicant continues to commit to both a First Source Employment Agreement with goal of utilizing District residents for at least 51% of the jobs created by the Project, and a Certified Business Enterprise Agreement that will commit the Applicant to achieve, at minimum, the goal of 35% percent participation by local, small, or disadvantaged businesses in the contracted development costs in connection with the design, development, and construction for the Project created as a result of the Modified PUD.

(e) *Public Courtyard.* The Project continues to provide the neighborhood with a courtyard that is open to the public on a daily basis. As discussed above, the Modified PUD will further enhance the functionality and attractiveness of this signature amenity.

(f) *Features of Special Value to the Neighborhood.* The Applicant remains committed to the remaining public benefits related to the museum use, which were outlined in the Approved PUD Order and based on the previous agreements with ANC 6D, except for three conditions related to the Corcoran Gallery of Art. Since the approval of the Approved PUD, the Corcoran has closed, and accordingly these benefits are no longer deliverable.

3. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, the General Purpose and Intent of the Zoning Regulations, and the Approved PUD

The Project continues to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with other adopted public policies related to the Property. The Property is in the Mixed-Use High Density Residential / Medium Density Commercial category on the Future Land Use Map, and the proposed scale and mix of uses in the Project remains wholly consistent with the Future Land Use Map. The Project also remains consistent with Land Use, Housing, Economic Development, Urban Design, Historical Preservation and the Arts and Culture Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Further, the Project is not inconsistent with the recently adopted Southwest Neighborhood Small Area Plan, which calls for the development of I Street SW as a cultural corridor that will enhance Southwest's identity as a premier arts and cultural neighborhood. The Project also continues to be consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Regulations, and the goals of the planned unit development process, including in particular the overall massing, development envelope, policy objectives, character and appropriateness of the Approved PUD.

V. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant submits that the enclosed application meets the standards of Chapter 3 of Subtitle X and Chapter 7 of Subtitle Z of the Zoning Regulations. Therefore, the Modification of Significance of the PUD should be approved and adopted by the Zoning Commission.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Zoning Commission set the PUD applications down for a public hearing at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

GOULSTON & STORRS, PC

_____/s/_____

John Epting

David Avitabile

Benjamin Kayden

Date: September 11, 2017