

John T. Epting jepting@goulstonstorrs.com 202-721-1108 Tel

Cary R. Kadlecek ckadlecek@goulstonstorrs.com 202-721-1113 Tel

May 12, 2016

VIA IZIS

Chairman Anthony Hood District of Columbia Zoning Commission 441 4th Street NW, Suite 210S Washington, DC 20001

Re: Z.C. Case No. 15-13 – Applicant's Post-Hearing Submission

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission:

The Commission held a public hearing for the above-referenced case on April 4, 2016. The Commission is scheduled to take proposed action in this case on June 13, 2016. This letter provides additional information or describes changes to the plans in response to questions and comments from the Commission.

A. Materials samples

The Applicant will provide a materials board to the Commission at the June 13 public meeting.

B. Brickwork quality

As the Applicant testified at the public hearing, the Applicant's mason does high-quality work. The mason has worked on the Applicant's other projects in the District, including the Naylor Court Stables in Shaw. Photos of the high-quality brickwork on that project are attached as Exhibit A.

C. E Street façade changes, particularly window treatment

The Applicant has revised the E Street façade to more appropriately blend with Capitol Hill residential architecture. The proportions of the windows have been updated, and the window surround has been enlarged. The mullion at double windows have been given more width as

Tage 2

well. Buttressing has been added to the arched pedestrian pass through. All muntins have been removed along this elevation providing one over one lites.

D. *New rendering of E Street elevation*

The new rendering of the elevation, showing the changes, is included on page A31 of the attached plans.

E. Windows on industrial buildings facing north courtyard

The Applicant revised the windows to double hung units with a transom throughout. The muntins have been retained on the north courtyard building, as well as the three unique townhouse units on the southern courtyard. Smaller panes of glazing were typical in the historic buildings that provide the design inspiration for the 'industrial' looking portion of the project. The new windows are shown throughout the attached plans.

F. The "bridge"

The bridge is necessary for the entire project to remain one building for zoning purposes. It is the only above-grade connection between the south row of townhouse units and the rest of the project. The Applicant has revised the bridge into more of an element connecting the buildings and providing a threshold into the courtyard. The use of the bridge will be private space. The Applicant investigated a number of ways to make this public/community space, but the access to it had a much larger negative impact on the courtyard than the benefit it would provide. The space works well in plan with the adjacent building on the west side of the courtyard. The plan is negatively affected if it is located on the east side and will also further visually constrict a narrow public alley.

G. "Watkins Alley" signage

This signage, on the south side of the building facing the alley, has been removed, as shown throughout in the attached plans.

H. Skylights on plans

Skylights are now accurately shown throughout the attached plans, including on the bird's eye view.

I. Correct color of resurfaced alley

The attached updated drawings show the accurate color of the alley once it is resurfaced in the proposed material. This change is shown throughout.

J. Full landscape plans

The site plans on pages A.05, A.06, and A.56 of the attached plans include the full landscape plans.

K. Location of kitchens in townhouse units

All pre-construction purchasers of the townhouse units will have the option of locating the kitchen at either the rear or front of the unit.

L. Theoretical rear yard area

As shown on the illustration on page A.42 of the attached plans, the theoretical rear yard would have an area of 8,734 square feet. The provided courtyards have an area of 7,362 square feet. Nevertheless, as described in the prehearing submission and at the public hearing, reorienting the project to have a rear yard instead of the central mews (courtyard) would destroy the unique and contextual site plan, would result in a loss of three units, and would render the project much more suburban in character.

M. Final list of benefits and amenities

The final list of the Applicant's proffered benefits and amenities is attached as **Exhibit B**.

N. Updated IZ unit location plan

The IZ unit location plan is shown on page A.04 of the attached plans.

O. Outdoor balconies

The balconies of the upper flat units are shown on the relevant elevations and perspectives in the attached plans.

P. Porous pavers and "green alley" for alley resurfacing

The Applicant will resurface a portion of the public alley adjacent to the project site, as described in the attached benefits and amenities list. The Applicant investigated the possibility of resurfacing the alley with porous pavers or resurfacing it to DDOT's "green alley" standards. However, the Applicant cannot make this commitment. The cost of these alternatives is significantly greater than asphalt, and given the extent of the overall benefits and amenities package, this additional cost is not feasible for the project.

Q. Effect on project by relocating the parking garage entrance to the east

Relocating the garage entrance to the east side of the south block would adversely affect the project by creating design challenges and decreasing the quality of the site plan. In addition to the safety and maneuvering challenges for cars existing the garage in this location, the central

1 age 4

mews (courtyard) would have to be reduced and at least one of the townhouse units would be lost. As shown on the illustration included on page A.43 of the attached plans, relocating the garage entrance would reduce much of the courtyard because the above-grade covering of the ramp would occupy portions of the courtyard and areas where a townhouse unit would normally stand, thereby reducing housing and open space while increasing the amount of structure on the site. This results in a significantly less attractive and desirable site plan.

Sincerely,

/s/ John Epting John T. Epting

/s/ Cary Kadlecek
Cary R. Kadlecek

Attachments