

Exhibit G: **Outline of Testimony: Eric J. Leibmann, AIA, WDG Design Architect**

- I Witness Name, Background, Current Position
- II History of WDG's Efforts for 100 M Street Site
- III Project Objectives
- IV Site Assets, Liabilities, and Opportunities
 - A Assets
 - 1 Slope from NW to SE
 - 2 Width of First Street, SE
 - B Liabilities and Quirks
 - C Opportunities and Challenges ("CG Overlay, TDRs in overall development envelope, ground floor clear height)
- V Elements of Proposed Building and Project vis-à-vis CG Criteria
 - A M Street set back (§ 1604 3)
 - B First Street public space (Landscape Architect, plan, § 1604 2)
 - C. Articulation and Siting along M Street View Corridor (§ 1604 2)
 - D Closed Court #1 (Almost a Court Niche, also § 1604 2)
 - 1 Bend in lot limit
 - 2 Articulation instead of simple seam in surface
 - E Definition of Corners and Eastern Face Courtyards (or Niches) to support § 1604.2 – regulation widths/areas are destructive
 - F Ground Floor
 - 1 Allocation of area for "preferred uses" (§ 1604 4)
 - 2. Provision of height such uses require within overall 130' height limit
 - 3 Frontage requirements as to glass and doors (§ 1604 6)
 - G. Canopy and Penthouse design (§ 1604 2)
 - H Remaining "1604" criteria not covered above
 - 1 No offending M Street driveway (§ 1604 7)
 - 2 Other provisions do not apply (§§ 1604 5 and 1604 8)
 - I Cumulative Impact of All Above – Not Possible without zoning relief for
 - 1 At least two, possibly three, courtyards (Lindsley Williams to detail these)
 - 2 Depth of rear yard
 - J. Flexibilities Sought
 - 1 Adjusting for vent shaft engineering
 - 2 Roof structure engineering
 - 3 Percent of glass on north elevation's court yard facing apartment building (code)
- VI. **Conclusions – Overall building design is one of "superior quality" satisfying all requirements of CG overlay as well as establishing practical difficulties and absence of adverse impacts for zoning relief for courts and partial rear yard relief sought**