

ZONING COMMISSION COMMENTS

	COMMENT	ACTION
1.	<p>The Commission commented on the proposed span over Three-Quarter Street relative to its planning implications, and requested information regarding the impacts of the span on the livability of the site, views, and continuity of north-south access, and vistas. The Commission also questioned the overall benefit of the span, and requested the Applicant to demonstrate that the bridge is necessary and appropriate for this development.</p> <p>The Commission also requested additional rendered perspectives of the bridge.</p>	<p>The Applicant has prepared additional perspective renderings of the proposed Three Quarter Street span. The additional renderings are included in the Applicant’s revised set of architectural plans and drawings, attached hereto as <u>Exhibit C</u>.</p> <p>As shown in <u>Exhibit B</u>, the proposed Three Quarter Street span is included in the PUD master plan approved by the Commission pursuant to Z.C. Order No. 13-14. Following approval of the master plan, the Applicant proceeded to advance the design of the Parcel 2 Building in consultation with the Historic Preservation Review Board (HPRB), which, as discussed below, approved the concept design on April 30, 2015.</p> <p>The PUD master plan is grounded in several planning and design strategies which are reflected in the overall organization, use distribution, and treatment of historic resources on the site. These strategies include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflecting the tripartite organization of the existing historic site established by the North and South Service Courts through the “braiding” of north-south streets that physically and visually connect the service courts. • Clustering development at the northern end of the site, and establishing the North Service Court as a “Main Street” lined with multi-family, office, and retail uses. • Preserving important character defining elements of the site including, but not limited to, the plinth and Olmstead Walk. • Establishing architectural cohesion through a unified material palette and design gestures that evoke character defining features of the site such as framed openings, canted walls, and the draped landscape.

		<p>Mixed-use, multi-story development along the south side of North Service Court was always a consideration during the development of the master plan. To make this work from a planning and design perspective for Parcel 2, the Applicant determined after careful study that a span over Three Quarter Street was necessary. This determination was arrived at after the Applicant conducted several studies that evaluated different scenarios that did not span Three Quarter Street.</p> <p>The studies conducted for buildings that did not span Three Quarter Street resulted in a design that was inwardly focused toward Three Quarter Street, which is intended to play a more secondary role within the master plan's hierarchy of streets. These studies also created conflicts with other important master plan strategies, and resulted in programmatic inefficiencies.</p> <p>The Applicant considered an option entailing two smaller buildings, one entering off of Half Street, and the other entering off of 1st Street. However, this option was not feasible as the 1st Street entrance conflicts with the master plan and adversely impacts the continuity of the Olmstead Walk. The Applicant also considered a scenario that located the building entrances opposite each other along Three Quarter Street. However, this approach would require parking and loading entrances to move to Half Street, making it function more like a secondary service street rather than the site's primary north-south spine. This also results in the buildings being oriented inward to the site with their backs to both Half and First Streets, a result that is also inconsistent with the urban design strategy to develop a project that is outwardly focused and celebrates the spaces around the buildings.</p> <p>A two building scenario was also ruled out due to the inefficiencies inherent with separate, smaller footprint buildings. Constructing two smaller buildings without spanning Three Quarter Street would require additional cores; separated amenities, leasing, and lobbies; and a bifurcated residential brand. To mitigate these inefficiencies, the buildings would need to be built higher, which would cast additional shadows on the North Service Court;</p>
--	--	---

negatively impact the pedestrian experience along Three Quarter Street, a relatively narrow street; and impact the townhouses to the south.

A single building that maintains a connection between the two sides of Three Quarter Street results in a building that is outwardly focused to the spaces around it. The building's primary entrance will be located on Half Street, reinforcing the primary role Half Street plays in the overall organization of the site. Three Quarter Street will serve its intended function as a secondary street with loading, parking access, and secondary residential entries. Along 1st Street, the building continues to be outwardly focused with retail at the corner that welcomes visitors to the site, while the residential courtyard amenity affords views to the west. The bridge connection also allows a strong residential functionality and efficiency for the mixed-use project.

In addition to its programmatic benefits, the Applicant has taken great care to design the span in a manner that minimizes visual impacts and adds value to the overall experience of the site. Since approval of the master plan, the Applicant has made significant design revisions to the span in response to input provided by the HPRB regarding the relationship of the span to North Service Court and Three Quarter Street.

To reduce the impacts and presence along North Service Court, the dwelling units originally proposed on the north side of the bridge were removed, resulting in a single-loaded corridor with units only on the south. This change resulted in numerous benefits. First, it set back the bridge from North Service Court in excess of 40 feet, thereby placing it out of view and making the four-block diagram of the master plan more apparent. In addition, removing half of the units within the span reduced the width to only 33 feet, thus minimizing the amount of covered space beneath the span.

The Applicant also modified the form and materials of the bridge following HPRB's initial review. The angled form of the north façade allows the bridge to further recede from North Service Court. In addition, the underside of the bridge angles upward at its center creating a greater volume of space

		<p>that allows stronger reciprocal views between the historic North and South Service Courts, and contributes to the overall understanding of the site’s historic tripartite organization. From the south, views to the historic resources of the North Service Court will be clearly visible beneath the span, and when approaching from this direction the span will act as a gateway element into the North Service Court, evoking the framed views and entry portals found throughout the historic site.</p> <p>With regard to materials, the north and south sides of the span are primarily glass, giving it a light and transparent quality. The detailing of the glass wall recalls the diagonal pattern of the manhole covers above the underground vaults, and relates to the window pattern of the building.</p> <p>The design of the span also provides opportunity to contribute to the public experience. On the north side, there is an exciting opportunity for an art feature to be placed on the corridor wall and ceiling that can be viewed from the North Service Court. This feature could range from a beautiful material, color, or printed graphic element; a mural; or an artistic sculptural treatment on the ceiling. This artistic feature would contribute to the overall presence of art throughout the site, and bring additional excitement to the North Service Court.</p>
2.	<p>The Commission stated a concern with the requested flexibility from the roof structure setback requirement, and that relief should not be granted when there is any possibility that the roof structure could be visible from a street.</p> <p>The Commission stated that the plan should be modified to make the roof structures comply with the setback requirement.</p>	<p>While the exact elevator system for the building is still being identified, the Applicant will commit to meeting the 1:1 roof structure setback requirement through one or a combination of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of a system that has an override that is no taller than the smallest setback dimension shown on the roof plan; • Providing roof structure walls of unequal height; • Making minor adjustments to the configuration, footprint, and location of the elevator cores / stairway enclosures.

		Thus, the Applicant no longer requests flexibility from the roof structure setback requirement. However, to meet the required setback the Applicant requests flexibility to allow penthouse walls of unequal height (§411.5) and for the ability to make minor adjustments to the configuration, footprint, and location of the proposed elevator cores / stairway enclosures.
--	--	--

OFFICE OF PLANNING COMMENTS

	COMMENT	ACTION
1.	OP commented that the Applicant should provide further discussion of the “bridge” over Three-Quarter Street, its design, materials and views from Parcel 1 and the North Service Court.	See response above, as well as Exhibits B & C
2.	OP strongly recommended that the Applicant utilize a mechanical system that would allow the height of the enclosure to be as low as possible.	The Applicant commits to meeting the 1:1 setback requirement; and therefore, withdraws its request for roof structure setback flexibility. However, to meet the required setbacks the Applicant requests flexibility to provide penthouse walls of unequal height, and to make minor adjustments to the configuration, footprint, and location of the two proposed elevator cores / stairway enclosures.
3	OP commented that the Applicant needs to seek flexibility from § 411.3 for having multiple enclosures since this is a single building.	Per Section 411.4, multiple enclosures are permitted where roof levels vary by one floor or more, or when separate elevator cores are required. The proposed building has separate elevator cores. Therefore, the two proposed enclosures are permitted and no flexibility is needed.
4.	OP expressed support for the requested loading berth flexibility as it seems the proposal would provide an appropriate number of berths to better serve this mixed use building.	Per Section 2201.2, the loading requirement for the proposed building is calculated as if the entire building is occupied by residential dwelling units. This results in a requirement to provide one, 55-foot loading berth and one, 20-foot service/delivery loading space. Given the width of Three-Quarter Street, the number of dwelling units, and modest amount of retail proposed, the Applicant has requested flexibility to

	<p>OP requested that the Applicant provide information regarding the required 20-foot loading space.</p>	<p>provide two smaller loading berths in lieu of the required 55-foot loading berth. It is expected that the 40-foot loading berth proposed on the west side of Three-Quarter Street will be sufficient to accommodate the majority of the loading demand for the building. The 30-foot loading berth proposed on the east side of Three-Quarter Street will be used during infrequent instances where there is a need for two trucks to load / unload simultaneously. These instances will be scheduled such that they do not occur during peak delivery times.</p> <p>Given that most of the loading will take place in the 40-foot loading berth, the Applicant also proposes to utilize the 30-foot loading berth as the required service/delivery space, which will be managed through an effective loading management plan to avoid conflicts between the building’s loading and service/delivery needs. For example, the 30-foot loading berth will be reserved for service/delivery vehicles during specific peak times of the day. Loading or unloading of any kind will not be permitted within the 30-foot loading berth during these specified times. An analysis demonstrating the feasibility of the Applicant’s loading plan will be included in the information submitted to DDOT 45 days prior to the public hearing, and as part of the Applicant’s 20-day filing.</p> <p>Pursuant to Section 2201.5, all required service/delivery loading spaces must be clearly marked “For Service and Delivery Vehicles Only” and used exclusively for such vehicles. Therefore, the Applicant must request flexibility from Section 2201.5. As described above, rather than have a full-time dedicated service/delivery space, the Applicant proposes to devote the 30-foot loading berth to service/delivery vehicle use during specified times of the day. These specified time will be clearly marked outside the loading berth and properly enforced through a loading management plan.</p>
5.	<p>OP commented that it did not object to the flexibility in the exact location of individual affordable units, but would like the Applicant to</p>	<p>The Applicant can commit to a distribution pattern that does not overly concentrate affordable units on any one floor of the Parcel 2 Building.</p>

	<p>commit to an overall distribution pattern of affordable units that was not overly clustered.</p>	<p>Pursuant to Z.C. Order Number 13-14, the Commission granted flexibility “to vary the location and configuration of the affordable units on Parcels 2 and 4, so long as the proportion of studio, efficiency, and one-bedroom affordable units to all affordable units does not exceed the proportion of market-rate studio, efficiency, and one-bedroom units to all market rate units with a mixed-income building on Parcel 2.”</p> <p>In response to a request for additional information by OP made during the preparation of its setdown report, the Applicant prepared an affordable unit mix exhibit showing a potential distribution of affordable units within the Parcel 2 Building that did not overly concentrate the affordable units on any one floor. The exhibit also included a tabulation demonstrating that the proportion of smaller affordable units to all affordable units did not exceed the proportion of smaller market-rate units to all market-rate units. The exhibit is included on Page 53 of Exhibit C of this Prehearing Statement.</p> <p>The exhibit provided to OP included a note stating the potential affordable unit distribution was subject to change per the flexibility afforded by the Commission in Order No. 13-14. The note also states that the distribution of unit types across affordable and market-rate will remain consistent with the proportions described in the table included in the exhibit.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>OP commented that the submission did not provide a discussion and analysis of transportation specifically as it relates to parking and loading and the design of elements to promote effective and safe vehicular and pedestrian access, and transportation management measures. These details should be provided prior to the public hearing.</p>	<p>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 Second-Stage PUD.</p> <p>With regard to parking, at a minimum the documentation will include details on the proposed parking supply, which is currently planned at 222 spaces (155 for residential, and 67 for retail), and a specific discussion on the amount of residential parking being proposed.</p> <p>Regarding site access and loading, the information will contain diagrams showing circulation for loading, parking access, and pick-up/drop-off</p>

		<p>activity for the Parcel 2 Building. A discussion regarding the sufficiency of the proposed number and size of loading berths, and utilization of the 30-foot loading berth for service / delivery use will be included, as will information on how the access plan was developed, and if it meets DDOT's requirements and standards.</p> <p>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 accessing the two proposed loading berths will also be included. These diagrams will show all maneuvers necessary to reach DDOT designated truck routes (Michigan Avenue and/or North Capitol Street).</p> <p>Finally, The Stage 1 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plans will be reviewed for applicability to Parcel 2. It is anticipated that additional measures specific to Parcel 2 will be necessary, and will be developed in coordination with DDOT.</p> <p>The information required will be submitted to DDOT at least 45 days prior to 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.</p>
--	--	---