

MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM: *JL for* Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director Development Review & Historic Preservation

DATE: May 13, 2016

SUBJECT: MODIFICATION- ZC 08-34F (Capitol Crossing PUD)
Modification of Approved Second Stage PUD

I. BACKGROUND AND RECOMMENDATION

Capitol Crossing V, LLC (Applicant) has petitioned the Zoning Commission for minor modifications to the approved PUD pursuant to ZC Order 08-34A, effective March 1, 2013. The Zoning Commission approved the First Stage PUD and a Zoning Map amendment to the C-4 district pursuant to ZC Order 08-34 and the Second Stage PUD pursuant to ZC Order 08-34A. The approved Second Stage PUD involves commercial development on the “South block” of the development site, which is located in Lot 44, Square 568 between 2nd, 3rd, E and F Streets, NW. The approved office building on the South block will be 12 stories tall with ground floor retail.

The Office of Planning has reviewed the proposed changes and does not oppose the minor modification.

II. MODIFICATION

The requested modifications to ZC Order No. 08-34A are as follows:

1. Elimination of one of three approved eco-chimneys
 - Since the Second Stage PUD was approved in 2013, the two eco-chimneys proposed for the Center and North blocks of the project have been determined to be sufficient to meet Code and a 3rd eco-chimney would not be necessary for cleaning exhaust. The Applicant proposes to remove the eco-chimney approved for the west side of the South block since it is no longer needed.
2. Changes to the approved building design
 - Design refinements to the façade treatment on the building (see Exhibits 1D2 and 1D3): The original design showed the facades’ curtain walls with applied glass fins and the Applicant proposes to revise this design with curtain walls with both flat and integrated angled walls.
 - Removal of the 11th floor terrace:
The Applicant proposes to retain only the 12th floor terrace on the southeast corner of the

building and to infill the approved 11th floor level terrace. The Applicant notes that this infill would not increase the overall approved density of the project.

- Revisions to the approved roof plans:
The Applicant proposes to incorporate habitable space in the building's penthouse on the main roof and to add a trellis with landscaping on the lower roof. The penthouse habitable space would be for tenant or communal use, but the Applicant will return to the Zoning Commission if the penthouse use is proposed to be a restaurant. The proposed penthouse changes would reduce the need for flexibility that was granted in ZC Order 08-34A by eliminating two of the five approved roof structures. The proposal complies with all penthouse height and setback requirements and no additional flexibility is requested. The proposed 15,000 SF of habitable space in the penthouse would require a contribution to the Housing Production Trust Fund, which the Applicant has committed to providing.

These proposed modifications do not require any additional flexibility from the zoning regulations.

III. RECOMMENDATION

The zoning regulations state:

- 3030.1 *The purpose of this section is to create an expedited procedure to be known as the "Consent Calendar." The procedure shall allow the Commission, in the interest of efficiency, to make, without public hearing, minor modifications and technical corrections to previously approved final orders, rulemaking, or other actions of the Commission, including corrections of inadvertent mistakes.*
- 3030.2 *For purposes of this section, "minor modifications" shall mean modifications of little or no importance or consequence.*
- 411.24 *A request to add penthouse habitable space to a building approved by the Zoning Commission as a planned unit development or through the design review requirements of Chapters 16, 18, 28, or 29 prior to January 8, 2016, may be filed as a minor modification for placement on the Zoning Commission consent calendar, pursuant to § 3030 provided:*

OP finds that the proposed minor modifications - elimination of one eco-chimney, changes to the penthouse and lower roof, and design changes to the building's façades - would be in keeping with the original PUD approval and would have little consequence on the overall project. Therefore, OP does not oppose the minor modification.