

ZONING COMMISSION COMMENTS

	COMMENT	ACTION
1.	The Commission requested additional information on Market Square and Market Shed. Specifically, the Commission inquired about the Applicant’s “intent” for Market Shed, both from a design and program perspective. In addition, the Commission inquired about the Applicant’s current intentions with regard to year-round activation and programming of Market Square, particularly during winter months. The Commission also requested information that conveys a better understanding regarding the relationship of the low-scale Market Shed against the façade of the adjacent Parcel 1 Building. Finally, additional information was requested regarding the primary pedestrian circulation routes to and through Market Square, including the relationship between the public elevator located along the north side of the Parcel 1 Building, which provides access to the below-grade garage, and the Maine Avenue Fish Market to the north.	As stated in Z.C. Order No. 11-03 (the “Order”), the Applicant’s overall intent for Market Square is for it to be treated as a tightly defined urban plaza reminiscent of Pike Place Market in Seattle, Washington. It is intended to build upon the heavily trafficked commercial activities of the existing Fish Market, while preserving important views from Banneker Overlook. Therefore, the Applicant has carefully calibrated the scale of Market Square and Market Shed, and the massing of the Parcel 1 Building, to maintain views to the waterfront while establishing a comfortable transition that connects the lower heights of the Fish Market buildings to the higher density Southwest Waterfront development, and provide a distinctive pedestrian experience and multi-level retail/pedestrian environment.” Programmatically, Market Shed is envisioned as a year-round active use that will enliven Market Square. Currently, the Applicant is envisioning a bakery/coffee shop, florist, or tea shop as potential uses. The structure has been designed to accommodate either one use, or two separate uses, one on either side of a central covered passageway that will allow pedestrians to circulate through the structure between the Parcel 1 Building and the Fish Market. As shown on <u>Sheets 2.9 – 2.10 & 2.13 – 1.14</u> of the architectural drawings submitted with the Applicant’s initial application (Case Record Exhibits 2A1 – 2A13), <u>referred to herein as Exhibit 2A</u>, Market Shed is designed as a low-scale structure composed of two enclosed areas that measure approximately 900 and 580 square feet, and are unified by a single, standing seam metal roof. The enclosed areas consist primarily of transparent glass storefront set within a structural steel frame, with portions of the storefront being operable so the structure can open up onto Market Square during times of favorable weather. Some of the lower portions of the structure consist

		of insulated metal panel. The roof of Market Shed has a butterfly profile similar to other open space structures throughout the Wharf. The roof reaches its low point at the covered, but unenclosed, pedestrian passage that separates the two enclosed areas. Given the central location of Market Shed within Market Square, the structure has been designed to achieve several objectives. First, as shown in <u>Exhibit C, Sheet 3.1</u>, Market Shed plays a significant roles in establishing the primary circulation patterns within Market Square. With regard to pedestrian circulation, Market Shed follows the alignment of the important visual connection established between the Banneker Overlook, Maine Avenue, Market Square, and the Wharf / waterfront. In addition, as described above, Market Shed is also designed to facilitate another primary circulation pattern between the Southwest Waterfront development and the Fish Market by means of the covered pedestrian passageway that separates the two enclosed areas of the structure which has been purposely aligned with the Parcel 1 Building’s public elevator lobby that provides access to the public parking garage. With regard to scale, as shown in <u>Exhibit 2A, Sheet 2.3</u>, the height of Market Shed generally aligns with the two-story high podium level of the Parcel 1 Building, which establishes a relationship between these two buildings and helps transition to the lower-scale buildings of the Fish Market by creating a comfortable scale and environment in Market Square at the pedestrian level and allowing views from the Banneker Overlook over the Market Shed building (see Exhibit 2A, Sheets 2.13 & 2.14)
2.	The Commission asked for additional information regarding the proposed penthouse height and setback along the west façade of the building, and in particular with regard to its compliance with the federal 1910 Height of Buildings Act.	Based on longstanding interpretations of the federal 1910 Height of Buildings Act (the “Act”), the façade of the Parcel 1 Building that faces the Washington Channel is not considered an “exterior wall” for purposes of measuring compliance with the Act since it does not front on a public street. Therefore, the requested flexibility from the

		roof structure setback requirement of the Zoning Regulations can be granted without violating the Act. In fact, the Commission has already granted similar flexibility for Parcel 2 of the Southwest Waterfront redevelopment project. In that case, the proposed building was approved with a height of 130 feet, and roof structure setback flexibility was granted along the north façade that adjoins the private mews street, known as Blair Alley, between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 (<i>see</i> Z.C. Order No. 11-03A(1), Condition A(5)(b)).
3.	The Commission requested additional sections and views of the proposed penthouse, including views from street level, the waterfront, and from the roof of Parcel 2.	The Applicant is in the process of preparing the requested sections and perspective views. They will be included as part of the Applicant's submission that is filed 20-days prior to the public hearing.
4.	The Commission noted the loading and trash area needed to be reevaluated to address the comments raised by DCOP regarding activation of the northeast corner of the Parcel 1 Building. In addition, the Commission also noted the function and operability of the loading area needed further analysis.	The Applicant is currently evaluating whether there are alternative locations for the trash room and fire control room that are currently located on the ground floor along this portion of the Maine Avenue façade, and the feasibility of locating an active use in this portion of the building. There are several factors that limit the Applicant's options for locating these elements of the building. First, three of the four sides of the building are more significant and have more activated frontages where utilitarian uses such as loading and trash facilities are not desired. These include the Maine Avenue entry, retail frontage along Market Square, and the atrium lobby along the Wharf. Nonetheless, there are element such as the fire control that are required to be accessible from Maine Avenue; therefore, the Applicant has done its best to minimize the presence of these features. In addition, the location of the parking garage entrance, which was approved as part of the Second-Stage PUD in Z.C. Case No. 11-03A and is currently under construction, is located along the southern

	mews alley, known as Blair Alley, SW, across from the loading and trash facilities for Parcel 2. Therefore, locating the loading facilities for Parcel 1 along this same frontage was deemed most appropriate. As a result of the location and required ramp length for the parking garage entrance and the site grading, there is limited space along the east and west ends of the mews alley to accommodate other essential “back of house” building components like the trash room, mail room, electrical / data equipment, and the fire control room. Further, as previously stated, the fire control room is required to be located accessible from Maine Avenue and placing it elsewhere on the Maine Avenue façade would have detrimental effects on the other office and retail uses in the building. These components would not be appropriate at the west end of the mews, closer to the waterfront, as they would be difficult to access, challenged by approved site grading, and would be visible from the Wharf and waterfront. Therefore, the Applicant determined it was most appropriate to locate some of these elements at the east end of the mews alley near Maine Avenue. Further, the Applicant has concerns regarding the commercial viability of a retail use in this location given the resultant size, configuration, and adjacencies of the space. In addition to studying possible alternatives to modify the design / configuration of the proposed loading facilities, and location of the trash room and fire control room, and whether a small retail use is spatially feasible, the Applicant is exploring other ways to animate this portion of the building should it be determined that an active use is infeasible. Examples of possible approaches the Applicant could take are shown in <u>Exhibit C, Sheet 4.6</u>, which include the introduction of water as a way to increase connections to the waterfront, which has been utilized at several other entry points along Maine Avenue, or the placement of seating or public art to activate this small portion of the Maine Avenue façade.
--	--

5.	The Commission requested additional information demonstrating that views to the Washington Channel from the Banneker Overlook will be consistent with what was approved in the First-Stage PUD.	The proposed Second-Stage PUD for Parcel 1 is consistent with what was approved in the First-Stage PUD with respect to the view corridor from Banneker Overlook to the Washington Channel. In order to preserve views to the Washington Channel, the plans approved as part of the First-Stage PUD include an approximately 100-foot view corridor between the Parcel 1 Building and the buildings of the Maine Avenue Fish Market, measured above the podium level of the Parcel 1 Building. This view corridor is illustrated on Sheet 5.12 of the approved First-Stage plans (dated June 28, 2011), and is attached hereto as <u>Exhibit B</u>. In addition, the approved First-Stage PUD also included the placement of a low-scale building within Market Square at approximately the same height as currently proposed. The Applicant has further developed the design of the Parcel 1 Building since the First-Stage PUD; however, the 100-foot view corridor from Banneker Overlook remains consistent with what was initially approved. As shown on the proposed ground floor plan, attached as <u>Exhibit C, Sheet 1.17</u>, the 100-foot view corridor is provided above the two-story podium level of building. In addition, while the massing of the podium level has been modified to respond to comments made by the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA), the overall concept of Market Square as being a tight urban plaza has been retained. See <u>Exhibit 2A, Sheet 2.14</u> for a rendered perspective showing the view corridor from Banneker Overlook in relation to the current design of the Parcel 1 Building, Market Square, and Market Shed.
6.	The Commission requested information regarding lighting and noise attenuation to mitigate potential impacts of certain uses located in the penthouse, such as a bar, nightclub, restaurant, or cocktail lounge.	The overall strategy for the lighting design for the parcel 1 building is to light the building from the inside, out. This lighting strategy creates a glow that illuminates from the inside of the building while highlighting the architecture on the outside that is not overpowering. The glow from the inside diffuses outward and provides enough light to register the exterior façade of the building. The lighting strategy is

	akin to a lantern, in this case the lantern sits on the water's edge and glows from the inside out. In the day the natural light from the outside reflects and refracts light to inform the built structure; its form on the outside and inside. At night the building glows from the inside, outward. The glow on the inside defines the building, it's function and it's form from the inside and the outside. At both day and night the surrounding natural environments, like the water's edge reflect and refract the light to inform the Architecture of the Building. The building massing does include projections, overhangs, terraces, balconies, and reveals that will need to be lit. The lighting used for these architectural elements and forms will highlight certain elements and masses, and will be focused on the element and will not cast light widely from the building. These same lighting strategies that would be used throughout the building would apply as well at the penthouse level. To the south is Parcel 2, a residential building. As currently proposed, much of the mechanical equipment / back of house program is located on the east and south portion of the roof level. Therefore, there will be limited interior and exterior program space oriented toward Parcel 2. By limiting the amount of rooftop public program that is in proximity to Parcel 2, there will be less light and noise transmitted at these areas, thus minimizing the impacts of light and noise on Parcel 2. Further, the Parcel 2 Building is the same height as the Parcel 1 Building; therefore, any activity on the roof level of Parcel 1 will be above the top floor of the residential uses on the adjacent building thereby eliminating line of sight concerns. Lighting on the exterior of the rooftop would be kept at low light levels for the outside amenity spaces. The lighting on the exterior would also be directional to highlight and wash surfaces and create a glow that would not be directed outward from the building.
--	---

7.	The Commission noted it was not supportive of the Applicant's request for flexibility to change the actual materials of the building, but was supportive of changes to the color of materials.	While the Applicant's preference is to implement the terra cotta panel façade system above the podium-level of the building, factors related to cost, availability, and constructability could ultimately make this material choice not feasible. The Applicant is currently evaluating a range of different options that include: • Keeping the majority of the façade system, as proposed, while simplifying the façade that faces Parcel 2; • Reducing the surface area of the terra cotta façade system per unit area; and • Utilizing an extruded aluminum façade system that matches the profile of the proposed terra cotta system. Therefore, as a way to provide the Commission additional assurance regarding the final material selection for the façade system, while affording the Applicant a narrow range of flexibility that can accommodate necessary adjustments, the Applicant is proposing an alternative façade material composed of an extruded metal panel system that would replace the terra cotta panel system should the need arise. A palette sheet for the alternative material selection is provided in <u>Exhibit C, Sheet 4.5</u>. In addition, details regarding where on the building façade these alternative materials would be utilized are included in <u>Exhibit C, Sheets 1.27 & 1.30</u>. The Zoning Commission has granted similar flexibility for the Capital Yacht Club (see Z.C. Order No. 11-03A(3)) Therefore, in response to the Commission's comments, the Applicant would like to modify its request to allow flexibility to permit selection of the preferred terra cotta panel façade system, or in the alternative the metal panel façade system, and to vary the final selection of the color of the material types proposed without reducing the quality of materials.
----	---	--

8.	The Commission requested information regarding why the Applicant has decided not to pursue a cogeneration plant on Parcel 1, as previously approved in the First-Stage PUD.	A cogeneration plant was not a part of the First-Stage PUD approval for Parcel 1. Rather, a combined heating and power (“CHP”) or “cogeneration” facility was proposed as part of the Second-Stage PUD for Parcel 2 (<i>See</i> Z.C. Order No. 11-03A(1) at Findings of Fact 35 & 36). According to Order No. 11-03A(1), the cogeneration facility may be located at the northwest corner of the Parcel 2 Building. However, at the time of the second-stage PUD for Parcel 2, due to outstanding issues related to critical design features of the co-generation facility, the Applicant requested, and the Commission granted, flexibility to replace the cogeneration facility with alternative heating and power sources “if the utility companies have not supplied the Applicant with the necessary commitments and infrastructure plans to incorporate the CHP Plant into the building prior to submission for the building permit for Parcel 2, ...” (<i>see</i> Z.C. Order No. 11-03A(1) at Condition B(1). The Applicant has provided a cogeneration facility within the penthouse of Parcel 2.
9.	The Commission requested information regarding the status of the Applicant’s fulfillment of CBE and First Source commitments pursuant to the conditions of the First-Stage PUD, including information, if available, on the percentage of construction jobs that have been fulfilled with District residents.	As of the end of Q2-2015, Hoffman-Madison Waterfront (HMW) achieved 41.8% CBE participation. At the end of September 2015, 38.1% of new hires were DC residents and 40% of new hires were from Ward 8. 48% of new apprentices were DC residents and 5% of the new apprentices were from East of the River. Our percentage of DC residents in jobs and apprenticeships will increase now that the underground work requiring highly skilled and experienced workers is almost complete. We have a very close working relationship with DOES and meet approximately monthly with them. We also have established an Interagency Collaboration Group, comprised of DC Agency Directors, which meets quarterly to review the status of HMW’s efforts and accomplishments regarding CBE, Jobs, Apprenticeships, Affordable Housing and other community benefits, and to make recommendations for any adjustments needed.

10.	The Commission requested information on the status of the effort to redevelop the Fish Market.	The Applicant is moving forward with the design of a by-right redevelopment of the Fish Market that is consistent with the Final Fish Market Development Plan that has been approved by the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development. To date, the Applicant has completed Letters of Intent with two of the three existing Fish Market tenants.

OFFICE OF PLANNING COMMENTS

	COMMENT	ACTION
1.	OP requested the Applicant to evaluate the design / configuration of the proposed loading facilities, and location of the trash room and fire control room, located at the northeastern corner of the building, adjacent to the mews alley between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2, to determine whether this corner of the building could be activated, possibly with a small retail use, albeit small.	See response to Zoning Commission Comment #4
2.	OP noted that the habitable portion of the penthouse is labeled as “Office/Retail,” however the Applicant’s written statement only indicates that the Applicant seeks the ability to pursue bar, restaurant, nightclub, or cocktail lounge uses.	The manner in which the Applicant requested this particular area of flexibility was as if the proposed penthouse regulations were in effect, which would allow office and retail uses permitted in the C-3-C District to be located in the penthouse as a matter of right, with a special exception required for bar, restaurant, nightclub, or cocktail lounge uses (see Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Z.C. Case No 14-13, proposed Section 411.4). Therefore, to further clarify the Applicant request, flexibility is sought to allow office, retail, bar, restaurant, and/or cocktail lounge uses within the proposed penthouse of the Parcel 1

		Building. Note, the Applicant no longer requests flexibility to allow a nightclub use at the penthouse level.
3	OP noted that the penthouse wall on the western side of the building facing the Washington Channel is directly above the exterior wall of the 10th floor, and therefore has a zero setback. While expressing support for the appearance of the building in this location, DCOP noted that it had informed the Applicant that setback relief above the Height Act limit of 130 feet could not be granted through zoning.	See response to Zoning Commission Comment #2
4.	OP noted that the Applicant's request for flexibility to increase the penthouse height up to a maximum of 20 feet, a height contemplated under the proposed penthouse regulations (ZC #14-13), and requested elevation drawings and renderings showing what the taller penthouse would look like.	The Applicant has prepared additional elevations showing the Parcel 1 Building with a 20-foot penthouse which are attached as <u>Exhibit C, Sheets 1.11 – 1.14</u>. Additional renderings showing a 20-foot penthouse, from the same perspectives of those already submitted to the record, will be included in the Applicant's submission that is filed 20-days prior to the public hearing.
5.	OP expressed no objection to the request for loading relief provided the Applicant justifies the reduction in the size or number of facilities and commits to loading management techniques, such as limited loading hours, and a loading coordinator for the building.	The Applicant is currently working with the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) on identifying the scope of transportation documentation that is necessary for the proposed Parcel 1 Second-Stage PUD. The transportation report that will be prepared for the Second-Stage PUD will supplement the traffic impact study prepared for the First-Stage PUD application, in keeping with the conditions of the first stage approval which state "for each stage two PUD application filed for the project, the Applicant shall provide a supplemental transportation impact study, including transportation demand mitigation measures" (see Z.C. Order No. 11-03 at Condition C(4)).

	Regarding site access and loading, the information will contain diagrams showing circulation for loading, parking access, and pick-up/drop-off activity for the Parcel 1 Building. A discussion regarding the sufficiency of the proposed number and size of loading berths, and the use of Market Square for service and delivery needs the 30-foot, will also be included. For freight/delivery trucks, truck routing maps will be included to show how trucks will travel to and from the site. Detailed truck maneuvering diagrams showing trucks the proposed loading berths will also be included. These diagrams will show all maneuvers necessary to reach DDOT designated truck routes For bicycle and pedestrian access, the information will include details on accommodation of pedestrians and bicycles within the Parcel 1 Second-Stage PUD site, including Market Square, pertaining to bicycle parking, sidewalk widths and pedestrian accommodations. Finally, the information will provide a review of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plans from Parcel 1's First-Stage and Phase 1's Second-Stage PUD, including its performance monitoring elements, and will propose site-specific strategies to be incorporated for Parcel 1 based on its updated development program and site design. The transportation information developed will be submitted to DDOT in advance of the public hearing. This information will also be provided to DCOP, and will be included in the Applicant's submission that is filed 20-days prior to the public hearing.
--	--

6.	OP requested the Applicant to provide an update on the effectiveness and success of its efforts to employ CBE firms for construction activities thus far, and the status of its compliance with CBE and First Source commitments that were included as conditions in the First Stage PUD (Z.C. Order No. 11-03). In addition. OP requested detail on the status of implementing the Workforce Intermediary Program (WIP) that the Applicant committed to as part of the First-Stage PUD, as well as that of the overall local hiring and job training.	As of the end of Q2, HMW achieved 41.8% CBE participation. At the end of September 2015, 38.1% of new hires were DC residents and 40% of new hires were from Ward 8. 48% of new apprentices were DC residents and 5% of the new apprentices were from East of the River. We project that our percentage of DC residents in jobs and apprenticeships will increase now that the underground work requiring highly skilled and experienced workers is almost complete. We have a very close working relationship with DOES and meet approximately monthly with them. Clark has established an Opportunities Trailer at The Wharf where applications are taken. DOES participates in the application process so all applicants are entered into the DOES system. We also have established an Interagency Collaboration Group, comprised of DC Agency Directors, which meets quarterly to review the status of HMW's efforts and accomplishments regarding CBE, Jobs, Apprenticeships, Affordable Housing and other community benefits, and to make recommendations for any programmatic adjustments needed to help us achieve our goals. At Closing with The District, the balance of the \$1 million in funding for the District's Workforce Intermediary Program was paid by HMW. HMW is awaiting implementation of the WIP and in the meantime has established an excellent working relationship with DOES that is essentially serving as the WIP at present. DOES is assuming responsibility for the workforce training contract of Building Futures (BF), previously administered by the WIC. DOES, BF, DCHA and HMW are working collaboratively to target participation in an upcoming BF training cohort early next year to Public Housing Residents. DOES has agreed to provide a small stipend to allow participation by public housing residents. We all are optimistic that this demonstration program will be successful.
----	--	--

7.	OP requested the Applicant to provide an update on the temporary staircase and ramp to Banneker Overlook, a proffered amenity that the Applicant is required to construct pursuant to the conditions of the First-Stage PUD, including the status of the Environmental Assessment (EA) review and construction funding.	As part of the public benefit and project amenity package that was proffered as part of the First-Stage PUD, the Applicant, in coordination with the National Park Service (NPS), is required to seek approvals to construct temporary pedestrian connections from the L'Enfant Promenade and Banneker Overlook to the Waterfront, including a temporary staircase from Banneker Overlook to the Fish Market, surface pedestrian connections from the north side of Maine Avenue to the Fish Market, and new signage and street furniture (see Z.C. Order No. 11-03 at Findings of Fact 50(g)). According to Order No. 11-03, Condition B(1), which refers to Exhibit 60 of the case record, the Applicant is required to construct, as part of the public infrastructure and parks component of the Southwest Waterfront redevelopment, and subject to agreement with the National Park Service (NPS) and approvals by the required governmental authorities, the following improvements which are intended to connect the project site to L'Enfant Plaza: • Temporary staircase from Banneker / 10th Street Overlook to 1100 Maine Avenue, SW (the Fish Market) • Surface pedestrian connection and crosswalk from the north side of Maine Avenue to Fish Market • Striping, signage, and street furniture, as necessary. Since approval of the First-Stage PUD, the Applicant has worked closely with several federal and District agencies to advance the implementation of the above mentioned improvements. The Maine Avenue surface pedestrian connection and crosswalk have been constructed and the Applicant will carry out implementation of the striping,
----	--	--

	signage, and street furniture improvements continually throughout the redevelopment project, as appropriate. Concerning the temporary staircase improvement, the Applicant has been working with the NPS, the agency that has administrative jurisdiction over the federally-owned Banneker Overlook, to advance the federal environmental and historic preservation review processes required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106). Completion of both NEPA and Section 106 are required to obtain the approvals by governmental authorities that are referred to in the PUD approval order. With regard to NEPA, the NPS, in cooperation with the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC), has begun the process to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed temporary staircase. Recently, NPS completed the public scoping phase of the EA process which is required to introduce the purpose and need of the project and solicit input from interested stakeholders on the alternatives that should be considered the EA and the range of environmental topics to be analyzed. Now that scoping is complete, NPS will use the input received during this phase to identify the range of EA alternatives and environmental analysis. Regarding Section 106, on July 20, 2015, the NPS initiated consultation with the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to evaluate the potential effects of the temporary staircase on Banneker Overlook, which has been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of
--	--

		Historic Place. Section 106 consultation will continue in tandem with the NEPA process With respect to funding, the Applicant has worked with the DC Council and DDOT to identify \$500K in FY16 funding to support the environmental compliance, design, due diligence, and preconstruction work necessary for the construction of the temporary staircase using future DDOT out-year capital improvement appropriations. As previously stated, the Applicant is required to construct the temporary staircase pursuant to First-Stage PUD approval. Therefore, it is expected that the Applicant will provide project, design, and construction management services, and seek reimbursement from DDOT using identified FY16 funds and future budget appropriations for FY17 and beyond. The funding and design of the project is expected to be consistent with the Applicant's proffer as to the general specifications of the improvements to be constructed, including the temporary staircase.
--	--	--

8.	OP noted that the walkway at the second story crossing over the lobby would allow the best views through the building if it were completely open, or if it was enclosed by glass. OP also noted that the lobby through the building could provide an additional interesting view from Maine Avenue to the waterfront, an important goal of planning for the site. However, the placement of the elevator core blocks much of the potential view. OP stated other methods to open up the view should be employed.	The second story walkway passing through the building lobby is designed as an open bridge with transparent glass railing and minimal depth structure. The profile of the bridge can be seen in Exhibit 2A, Sheet 1.24. The column grid and elevator core for the Parcel 1 Building was established to provide the optimum design and function for the typical office floors. This placement allows for single or multi-tenant office layouts, increases visibility and access to windows within the space, and provides optimal depth to core ratios on each floor. This design has been incorporated into the design of the parking garage which is nearing completion of construction and the Applicant's ability to make changes to the general footprint and volume of the building lobby is extremely limited. . With regard to views from Maine Avenue and the design approach for the lobby, as currently designed the lobby vestibule on Maine Avenue will utilize a high-transparency glazing system. Therefore, two-story views through the lobby to the waterfront will be afforded, but also appropriately focused so as to create an experience that opens up to the waterfront as one moves through the lobby, under the low-profile pedestrian bridge, and into the atrium that faces the Wharf. Finally, due to the central location of the elevator core within the lobby and on axis with the Maine Avenue entry, the Applicant intends to apply a special cladding to the core so as to treat it more like a sculptural object within the space rather than just a utilitarian element of the building.
----	--	--