NEW EAST CAPITOL SENIOR BUILDING PUD HEARING TESTIMONY

I. Social Benefits of Senior Building (5-6 min.)
Lawrence Dwyer, Director, Office of Planning and Development, District of Columbia Housing Authority (DCHA); Bernie Tetrault, Real Estate Development Advisor to the Executive Director, DCHA; Kim Kendrick, Regional Administrator, DCHA

A. Compatibility of New East Capitol PUD with HUD's goals for Hope VI development

1. Deconcentration of poverty and creation of mixed income neighborhoods with desirable amenities (e.g., community centers, shopping)

2. Development of attractive, less dense housing to replace large, high-density public housing complexes; creation of appealing landscaping and green spaces in urban environment; use of modern urban design principles; production of defensible spaces

B. Compatibility of New East Capitol PUD with District of Columbia objectives for redevelopment of city's public housing

1. Rehabilitation of aging public housing stock

2. Improvement of safety in notoriously dangerous housing projects

3. Recent successes of HOPE VI and other housing initiatives

C. Compatibility of New East Capitol PUD with District of Columbia and federal aims for affordable housing and quality housing for senior citizens.

1. Urgency regarding relocation of senior citizens from existing dilapidated senior housing in project area

2. Pricing of Senior Building units and subsidized rents available for low-income residents

II. Developer and Development (5-6 min.)
Cheryl Hamilton, Regional Director, A&R Development
John Kirkland, A&R Development

A. Background information on A&R Development's experience with HOPE VI projects, mixed income housing, projects with similar budgets and similar building types.

ZONING COMMISSION
District of Columbia
CASE NO.02-04
EXHIBIT NO.26

B. Summary of evolution of idea for New East Capitol PUD/Senior Building

1. Efforts of community stakeholders to apply for HOPE VI funds, to develop the request for proposals

2. Previous and existing site conditions (walk-up apartments on Senior Building site were demolished, senior citizens in Capitol View Plaza to be relocated)

C. Overview of project's managed care aspect and associated services

D. Overview of site location

1. Intersection of Blaine and 58th Street and north of East Capitol Market Place

2. Near planned residential housing and commercial center

3. Wooded area/open space at Watts Branch adjacent

D. Discussion of financing and Davis-Bacon Act constraints

E. Discussion of development tasks completed; timetable for remaining tasks

III. Employment Issues (2-3 min.)
Dana Henson, the Henson Development Company

A. Identification of the firm and its practice; summary of experience with similar projects

B. First Source Agreement, involvement of minorities and women in project

IV. Community Involvement (2-3 min.)
Linda L. Greene, Vice President, East Capitol View Community Development Corporation

A. Community involvement in planning Senior Building and larger New East Capitol project: ECV-CDC, New East Capitol Steering Committee, meetings with ANCs 7C and 7E

B. Community involvement after project completion, including possibility that ECV-CDC will partner with Community Health Initiatives, Inc. to be the in-house health care service provider.

C. Efforts to keep community informed and involved: newsletter and website

D. Community support for project

V. **Architecture (10-15 min.)**
Suman Sorg, AIA, Principal, Sorg & Associates Architects
Robert Swank, AIA

A. Identification of the firm and its practice; summary of experience with similar projects

B. Presentation of site and architectural plans for the Senior Building

1. Development data and brief mention that the applicant requests that the unzoned site be zoned R-5-A, in keeping with surrounding neighborhood

a. 135,900 g.f.a.

b. 150 one-bedroom units

c. Total Senior Building site area 153,748 s.f., or 3.85 acres (2.0 acres required for PUD)

d. 0.88 FAR (0.9 permitted as of right, 1.0 permitted with PUD)

e. Building height of 40 ft. and description of how measured (40 ft. permitted as of right, 60 ft. with PUD)

f. Lot occupancy 21% (40% permitted as of right and with PUD)

g. Lot width: 535 feet; lot area: 153,748 s.f.

h. Water demand: 25,000 gallons per day; sanitary sewer demand: 19,636 gallons per day

2. Summary of rationale for overall building design and placement

a. Placement intended to promote safety and accessibility and to accommodate change in grade and other environmental conditions

b. Public and common areas on first floor of center wing, two floors of residential units above; four flights of residential units

with in north wing with maintenance facility below; four flights of residential units in south wing, parking below

c. Views to and from building and relationship of facades to buildings in surrounding areas

3. Ingress/egress and parking accommodations (pedestrian entry and automobile drop-off; 31 parking spaces, cars protected from the elements)

4. Unit design (150 units, approximately 565 g.f.a each, one bedroom, one bathroom, small kitchen, open space/living room)

5. Mechanical/safety features (heat, fire stairs, elevators)

6. Building amenities (multi-purpose room, game room, fitness room, library, meeting room, doctor's office, laundry facilities on each floor, terraces)

7. Rationale for and benefits of changes in designs since initial submission (increased sunlight, removal of irregularly shaped units, increased program space, three-faced façade more complementary to surrounding neighborhood)

8. Adjustments based on consultations with Office of Planning

C. Discussion of environmental constraints

1. Erosion, sewage, structural and other problems with buildings previously on site.

2. Current storm water retention plan, site contouring

D. Discussion of exterior building materials (brick; Hardi-Plank panels or EIFS)

E. Discussion of two-stage street plan for Blaine St.

F. Review of necessary areas of flexibility for the project (e.g., site engineering, grading, street plan, utility system, roof, windows, land swap)

VI. Site Plan and Landscape Architecture (6-10 min.)
Leland Edgecombe, Principal, The Edgecombe Group, Landscape Architects

A. Identification of firm and its practice; summary of experience with similar projects

B. Discussion of landscape design goals

1. Enhancement of existing open spaces and wooded areas

2. Integration with remainder of PUD with surrounding neighborhood

3. Adjustments based on consultations with Office of Planning

C. Discussion of site characteristics and landscape plan, including outdoor amenities (garden, outdoor game area, pedestrian paths)

D. Discussion of site lighting

VII. Planning and Zoning Considerations (3-4 min.)
Nathan W. Gross, AICP, Arnold & Porter

A. Approval of a PUD requires that the Zoning Commission find that:

1. The proposed development is "not inconsistent" with the Comprehensive Plan;

2. The project's impacts on the surrounding area and on public services are not adverse or are acceptable given the public benefits created; and

3. The specific public benefits and project amenities proposed in the PUD are significant and are in the public interest.

Comprehensive Plan Policies

A. Hope VI – Major Local Development Initiative. The New East Capitol PUD is a major initiative at urban transformation sponsored by DCHA in partnership with experienced developers. This is an extremely high priority project for the city.

B. Housing Opportunity Area. The existing East Capitol Dwellings is a designated Housing Opportunity Area in the Comprehensive Plan. It is a high-priority location for construction of major new housing resources.

C. The proposed R-5-A zoning and proposed 0.88 FAR, 50-foot apartment house are clearly in compliance with the Moderate Density Residential designation on the Generalized Land Use Map of the Land Use Element.

D. The proposed Senior Building and the New East Capitol PUD generally are directly consistent with at least four of the 10 Major Themes of the Comprehensive Plan:

1. *Stabilizing and Improving the District's neighborhoods (§102);*

2. *Respecting and improving the physical character of the District (§106);*

3. *Preserving and promoting Cultural and Natural Amenities (§105);*

4. *Preserving and ensuring community input (§107).*

E. Policies supportive of affordable housing and housing for the elderly. A significant number of policies in the Comprehensive Plan encourage development of new housing for low and moderate income households and for senior citizens.

Potential Impact on Surrounding Area and City Services

A. Surrounding neighborhoods will benefit from New East Capitol PUD and the Senior Building in numerous ways: improved building and site appearance and landscaping; reduced crime; low traffic generation; improved social services for seniors; improved neighborhood property values; no adverse effect on local school capacity.

Summary of Project Amenities

A. Excellent architecture, urban design, landscaping, site planning

B. Environmental benefits, including remediation of previous soil erosion, sewerage problems, building deterioration and enhancement by means of well-planned new development with storm water controls, preservation of open space

C. Effective and safe vehicular and pedestrian access. The low ratio of automobile ownership will reduce vehicular travel to and from the site, and pedestrian pathways are designed to create convenient walking routes to stores, open space and adjacent housing.

D. The superior on-site amenities for seniors were described by the architect.

In summary, Madame Chairperson, we believe that the proposed planned unit development meets the standards of the PUD regulations, and we respectfully request approval.

VIII. Support Testimony

Felix Jones, President, Senior Resident Council
Evelyn Brown, Co-Chair of Steering Committee and President, Resident Council for East Capitol Dwellings