

# Holland & Knight

800 17th Street, NW, Suite 1100 | Washington, DC 20006 | T 202.955.3000 | F 202.955.5564  
Holland & Knight LLP | [www.hklaw.com](http://www.hklaw.com)

Mary Carolyn Brown  
(202) 862-5990  
[carolyn.brown@hklaw.com](mailto:carolyn.brown@hklaw.com)

March 2, 2015

***VIA IZIS (3/2/15) AND  
HAND DELIVERY (3/3/15)***

Zoning Commission for the  
District of Columbia  
441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 210S  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: Z.C. Case No. 14-09 – Planned Unit Development ("PUD")  
and Related Map Amendment at 9<sup>th</sup> & L Streets, N.W. (Square 369)

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of QC 369, LLC ("Applicant"), we submit herewith (i) the chart of the Applicant's final list of public benefits proffered for the planned unit development (Exhibit A), and (ii) revised drawings depicting roof structure setbacks (Exhibit B).

1. Revised Roof Structure Setbacks. At its meeting on February 23, 2015, where the Commission took proposed action to approve Case No. 14-09, the Commission suggested that certain portions of the roof structures were not adequately set back from the exterior walls. The Applicant has revised two areas of the roof to address these issues. First, the pool deck is now three feet, eleven inches above the roof level, instead of the eight feet previously shown on the drawings. The revision is depicted on Sheet A-216, View 3. Second, in View 6 on that same sheet, the Applicant has modified the building edge to be uniform above and below the twelfth floor, with the mechanical plinth and railing set back from the exterior wall a distance equal to their height. The Applicant continues to request relief from the setback requirements of 770.6 to allow the mechanical penthouse not to be set back along the east wall of the courtyard (i.e., the west wall of the hotel penthouse), as shown on View 9 of Sheet A-216. The Applicant also reconfirms its request not to set back the plinth (3'-11") with railing (42") a distance equal to their combined height along the west elevation of the building, which abuts a court and alley (see Views 3 and 4 on Sheet A-216).

March 2, 2015

Page 2

2. Revised Public Benefits.

a. Affordable Housing. In response to the Commission's concern that a five-year affordability period was too short, the Applicant offers in the alternative a total of two affordable units (80% AMI) for a period of ten years. The Applicant prefers the four-unit option for a five-year period because it will serve a greater number of District residents and, unlike the ten-year option, allows tenants to continue beyond the five-year period if they wish to remain in the unit. The Applicant, however, will abide by the preference of the Commission on these two alternatives.

b. Employment for District Residents. The Applicant has added a condition to its proffers that it will seek the assistance of the Department of Employment Services in filling job openings with District residents. The Applicant submits the results of its employment efforts through a related entity for the Marriott Marquis Hotel, as requested by the Commission (Exhibit C).

Respectfully submitted,

Holland & Knight LLP

By: Mary Carolyn Brown  
Whayne S. Quin  
Mary Carolyn Brown

Attachments

cc: Stephen Gyor, Office of Planning (w/attach. via email)  
Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2F (w/attach. via email)