

MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM: *JL for* Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director

DATE: November 28, 2016

SUBJECT: **Supplemental Report** for ZC #16-10, 400 Florida Avenue, NE
Consolidated Planned Unit Development and Related Map Amendment

At the October 27, 2016 Public Hearing the Commission requested additional information from the applicant, and requested the Office of Planning’s (OP’s) response to the materials submitted. Below is the OP review of the additional information (Exhibit 42) against comments made by the Commission at the public hearing.

As noted in the OP testimony at the public hearing, OP is supportive of the proposed development, including its height, density, and use mix. Submissions provided prior to or at the hearing addressed some of the OP and Commission concerns from setdown, while additional clarification was provided in the additional filings by the applicant.

While the following table raises a few points that require some additional clarification prior to final action, OP can now recommend **approval** of the application. The applicant is also expected to provide a final outline of benefits and amenities, for the Commission to assess whether they are commensurate with the level of flexibility gained through the PUD.

ZC Comment	Applicant Response	OP Analysis
Parking – Provide proof of scheme drawings showing why relief from parking is justified / why parking cannot reasonably be provided onsite	A diagram is provided as Exhibit 42C. A written summary of the difficulty and expense in providing onsite parking is also provided in Exhibit 42, with additional economic justification provided in Exhibit 42D. .	OP is not opposed to this relief. This scenario was intended to be a possibility within the Florida Avenue Market area. As demonstrated by the applicant, this relief represents a significant cost benefit to the applicant, which should be reflected in the final benefits and amenities proffer.

ZC Comment	Applicant Response	OP Analysis
<p>Parking – Provide a copy of a parking agreement with other owner(s) where parking would be located</p>	<p>Provided as Exhibit 42A.</p>	<p>The site for the parking, 1250 4th Street NE, is the subject of PUD 14-07, and is located less than two blocks of the subject site. The approved PUD required about 200 parking spaces pursuant to zoning, and is approved to provide up at least 480 spaces, so the development will have the excess parking spaces. The agreement is to provide the parking in perpetuity.</p>
<p>Parking – Show on a map the relationship between the proposed parking and the subject site</p>	<p>Provided in Exhibit 42 as drawing A002.</p>	<p>The parking location is reasonably proximate; OP anticipates that the applicant will provide on-line and written information to hotel guests regarding the location and access to parking, and/or provide valet parking.</p>
<p>Design - Provide description and blow-up of the bay window projection detail</p>	<p>Provided as drawing A114.</p>	<p>The intent of the projection regulations is to ensure that projections read as individual bays, rather than the mass of the building pushing out into public space. While structurally the balconies may be separate from the bay slab, the design visually makes the projection the building façade, rather than ornamentation on the façade. This will require review as a public space permit through DDOT’s permitting process; preliminary discussions with staff are that some additional refinements to the design are necessary to comply with the intent of the regulations.</p>
<p>Design – Provide detail of brickwork</p>	<p>Provided as drawing A404</p>	<p>OP is supportive of this brick detailing.</p>
<p>Roof – Provide larger plans and perspective views showing the penthouses and uses proposed; parapets; sections of areas requiring penthouse setback relief; penthouse visibility from the alley</p>	<p>Roof plans – A 110 and A111 Perspectives - A214 and A215; Views generally from the alley - A216 and A217; Detailed sections - A304 - A306</p>	<p>These drawings provide more information regarding the rooftop penthouse area. The plans show the rooftop bar, for which flexibility is now requested (Exhibit 42, page 3). As noted, the bar will require a contribution to a Housing Production Trust Fund; the applicant estimates this at \$31,000 which seems low for this amount of penthouse space. OP will work with the applicant to confirm this amount at the building permit stage. OP also notes that some drawings (L02B) continue to show this as “amenity space” rather than “hotel bar”; the plans should be made consistently correct prior to final action. Penthouse setback flexibility also appears to be needed for the elevator tower on the residential side of the building, as the 20’ elevator tower does not meet 1:1 setback from the open court on the north side of the building.</p>

ZC Comment	Applicant Response	OP Analysis
Roof – provide a lighting plan for the rooftop	Provided as drawings L02B through L02D	Generally the lighting appears to be low intensity and downward focused. OP is not opposed to the lighting plan proposed.
Roof – Ensure that all handrails provide the 1:1 setback	Handrails show on the building sections A 302 – A305. The application states that all handrails are incorporated into the parapet.	It is not clear that all of the handrails provide the 1:1 setback from the edge of the roof. As relief was not requested, the handrails would have to conform, or the project at the building permit stage would have to return to the Commission for additional relief. The Commission may wish to include a note in the Order, for the benefit of the Zoning Administrator, that no relief was provided for handrails.
Affordable Housing – Deconcentrate IZ units from the back	Provided in Exhibit 42.	The affordable units appear to be more equitably dispersed throughout the building, including corner units and units on the 9 th floor. There would be 7 units at 50% AMI, and 7 units at 80% AMI; the Order states that a minimum of 6% of the residential gross floor would be devoted to households earning up to 50% of the AMI; and a minimum of 6% of the residential gross floor area to households earning up to 80% of the AMI. OP is supportive of this proffer, as commensurate with the level of flexibility gained through a PUD such as this.
Employment – Examine more robust commitment to DC hiring (51%)	The applicant committed to this at the hearing, and this is reflected in the draft Order.	OP is supportive of this change.
Signage – Vertical sign needs to be rethought; too large and intense	Provided as A221.	A221 shows the proposed locations for the hotel and the residential signs, generally close to ground level. A design of the signage has not been provided. OP is supportive of the general size and location; the Commission may wish to request a description of the signage prior to final action, and that applicable renderings include the signs.

ZC Comment	Applicant Response	OP Analysis
<p>Provide more detailed layout of ground floor lobbies / activation of streetscape</p>	<p>An updated ground floor plan was provided as A102, showing the incubator space, the art wall, and retail and sundry shop fronting the street. A description of the incubator space was also provided, as well as confirmation that the gallery wall is no longer proffered as an amenity of the PUD; replaced by an proffer to install streetscape improvements on the square along 4th and 5th street, north of the subject site.</p>	<p>The applicant has added detail to the area of the hotel lobby. OP supports the addition of retail on 5th Street, and the Sundry shop at the corner of 4th Street and Florida Avenue. OP remains supportive of the second floor restaurant and loggia. The street level renderings indicate extensive use of glass with multiple entry points to the building. As revised, the ground floor should provide an active set of uses, which will help to activate the street.</p> <p>One of the shapes included on the floorplan seems indicative of a bar, but is not labeled as such; the floor plan should be clarified prior to final action.</p> <p>Renderings (example A209 and A212) should be revised to accurately show the proposed hotel loading bay.</p> <p>OP also notes that the location where a potential new building is shown on A217 is now within a historic district, and it is unlikely that a building of that size and scale would be possible. This would impact the long term visibility of this part of the subject building.</p>