

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

June 10, 2015

Via IZIS and Hand Delivery

Zoning Commission for
The District of Columbia
441 4th Street, NW, Suite 210-S
Washington, DC 20001

**RE: ZC Case No. 14-21 / Barry Place Partners, LLC
Consolidated PUD and Related Map Amendment / Post Hearing Submission**

Dear Members of the Commission:

The information herein and the enclosed documents are submitted on behalf of Barry Place Partners, LLC (the “Applicant”), as requested by the Zoning Commission during the public hearing on May 21, 2015, for Case No. 14-21 (the “Application”).

A. **Building Design.** The Zoning Commission suggested that the Sherman Avenue (west) façade be improved, and the Commission indicated that it favored some of the original design elements of the building. In response, the Applicant enhanced the Sherman Avenue building façade, as depicted on Sheets 23 and 38-42 of the enclosed plans. The Applicant also changed the building material at the corner of Barry Place and 9th Street from a light gray cementitious panel to wood paneling, as depicted on Sheet 22 of the enclosed plans.

Please note that the enclosed plans are a comprehensive set of all of the plans previously submitted to the Zoning Commission, including those submitted during the public hearing, and include the revisions recommended by the Zoning Commission. As such, they supersede all of the plans previously submitted by the Applicant in connection with the Application.

B. **Job Training Scholarships.** The Zoning Commission requested more details about the type of training offered by the Applicant and the value of the 50 scholarships proffered in connection with the application. Additionally, the Commission wanted information in support of the 1.5-mile radius for the pool of potential scholarship applicants.

The proposed training includes EPA Type I, II, III and Universal certification. It will be administered by the Refrigeration Supply Company which, since 1990, has trained more than 14,000 people with hands-on teaching by experienced field technicians

supplemented by class course work. The estimated value of this training for 50 people is approximately \$500,000.

Attached as Exhibit B is an exhibit that shows those areas of the city within a 1.5-mile radius of the PUD site. Those areas include the Truxton Circle, Edgewood-Eckington, Hanover-Bates Street, East Central Shaw, Mount Pleasant, Adams Morgan, Columbia Heights, Pleasant Plains, Southern Petworth, Parkview and Bloomingdale neighborhoods and the residential communities of LeDroit Park and Kelly Miller, Garfield Terrace, Park Morton and Sursum Corda. We submit that between these areas there are 50 people who are eligible and interested in receiving the scholarships for the job training offered by the Applicant.

C. **Re-Creation of Mural.** The Zoning Commission requested more information about the reproduction of the existing mural on the exterior wall of the warehouse building. The Applicant intends to digitally reproduce the mural, *Seasons in the City*, and install it at the entry lobby of the apartment house. The mural was painted by Chor Boggie, Alicia Decoy Cosnahan, Leon Rainbow, Asad Ultra Walker, Peter Krsko and 20 local young artists in 2009. The Applicant will continue to research the history of the mural and protocol for the reproduction of the mural with the District's Commission on the Arts and Humanities.

D. **Security Plan for Garage.** The Commission expressed concern about the safety of an open garage. In response, the Applicant included security measures in the garage, which are reflected on Sheet 49 of the enclosed plans.

The plan shows the location of a security fence surrounding the residential parking on Level 1 (the garage entrance and upper parking level). The lower level parking is secured by a roll up door or grille at the top of the ramp from the lower level. The residents of the building will access the lower level and upper level residential parking via a remote control device that operates the door/grille at the lower level and the gate arm at the upper level.

The security fence creates a 14-space retail parking area just south of the loading docks and maneuvering area. The retail parking is separated from the dock area by gate arms and a ticket dispenser for retail parking control. The configuration of the fence separates the retail parking from all residential parking and from the building and elevator entrances. The configuration of the fence allows unimpeded access by hand trucks and dollies from the loading dock to the rear of the retail space through the walkway and ramps that were part of the design previously. At the end of the "corridors" created by the security fence, there will be emergency egress gates that will be programmed to allow exiting only in case of emergency.

In addition to the fence and gate system, there will be surveillance cameras and "blue light" emergency call boxes on both levels of the parking garages.

E. **Courtyard Elevations.** The courtyard elevations requested by the Zoning Commission are shown on Sheets 24 and 25 of the Plans.

F. **Response to DDOE Report.** The Applicant has reviewed the project specific comments and other recommendations provided in the DDOE reports dated May 6, 2015. The Applicant is already claiming some of the credits suggested by the agency and will evaluate the feasibility of implementing into the project the other comments and recommendations.

G. **Proposed Sidewalk Improvement on Barry Place.** Since the public hearing, the Applicant and DDOT have continued to work toward an agreement on the extent of the sidewalk improvement recommended by DDOT on the north side of Barry Place at its intersection with 8th Street. From these discussions, the Applicant and DDOT agreed that the Applicant would install a 4-foot wide concrete sidewalk circumventing the two existing catch basins. The sketch of the proposed improvement is attached as Exhibit C and estimated to cost approximately \$25,000. The final details of the design will be subject to review and approval by DDOT at the time of public space approval/permitting for the project.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicant is agreeable to the following as a condition of the approval of the Application:

The Applicant agrees to repair the sidewalk gap on the north side of Barry Place, between 8th Street and Georgia Avenue, with an installation of a 4'-wide concrete sidewalk that circumvents the two existing catch basins, as shown on the sketch attached as Exhibit __ of the record. The details for said improvement will be subject to review and approval by DDOT at the time of public space review. The Applicant shall not be obligated to make any sidewalk improvement for this section of Barry Place in connection with the project beyond the concept outlined in this condition.

H. **Loading Dock Configuration.** The Zoning Commission asked the Applicant to consider a different configuration for the loading dock. Specifically, the architect was asked whether the loading dock could back up to the northernmost section of the retail in order to be provide better access to the retail uses and a better segregation of parking and loading.

Reconfiguring the loading dock as suggested would significantly impact the project. For example, shifting the ramp to the south results in the loss of 8 parking spaces on Level P2 and 12 parking spaces on Level P1. This adjustment in the loading dock

location also forces inefficiencies in circulation for both trucks and residents by adding a drive aisle on the north end of P1. The current trash layout would also be affected because the trash room would either have to be split or relocated to the back of the loading dock. By moving the combined trash room to the back of the suggested loading dock location, residential units will have to be removed in order to make room for the new residential trash room and chute. Finally, the entrance into the parking garage will be less aesthetically pleasing because instead of seeing a ramp and bike storage, a passerby will view trash facilities and metal overhead doors.

I. **Elevator Override.** The elevator override height has decreased by 5'-5" based on the four major elevator manufacturers with machine room-less elevators. The four major manufacturers that provided this information are Kone, Schindler, Thyssen Krupp, and Otis. The elevator override penthouse roof is now at the same level as the high roof, as depicted on Sheet 47 of the enclosed plans.

Respectfully submitted,
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

By: *Leila M. Jackson Batties*
Leila M. Jackson Batties

cc: Ms. Jennifer Steingasser, Office of Planning (via email)
Mr. Joel Lawson, Office of Planning (via email)
Ms. Maxine Brown-Roberts, Office of Planning (via email)
Mr. Jonathan Rogers, DDOT (via email)
Mr. James Turner, Chair, ANC 1B (via email)