

**ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZONING COMMISSION ORDER NO. 16-29**

Z.C. Case No. 16-29

**Poplar Point RBBR LLC (d/b/a Columbian Quarter Holdings)
(First-Stage PUD and Related Map Amendment)**

**(Square 5860, Lots 97, 1025-1031, 1036, and 1037, a portion of the alley to be closed and
Square 5861, Lot 91)**

January 16, 2018

Pursuant to notice, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia (“**Commission**”) held a public hearing on December 4, 2017 to consider an application from Poplar Point RBBR LLC (d/b/a Columbian Quarter Holdings) (“**Applicant**”) for review and approval of a first-stage planned unit development (“**PUD**”) and related amendment to the Zoning Map from the MU-14 Zone District to the MU-9 Zone District (together, “**Application**”). The Commission considered the Application pursuant to Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (“**Zoning Regulations**”), Subtitles X and Z. The public hearing was conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 4 of Subtitle Z of the Zoning Regulations. For the reasons stated below, the Zoning Commission hereby approves the Application.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Application, Parties, and Hearing

1. The property that is the subject of the Application consists of Lots 97, 1025-1031, 1036, and 1037 in Square 5860 and a portion of the alley to be closed and Lot 91 in Square 5861 (“**Property**”) and is located on Howard Road SE in Ward 8, within the jurisdiction of Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (“**ANC**”) 8A and 8C. The Property is located on either side of Howard Road SE and in between Interstate 295 and South Capitol Street SE. The Property is near the Anacostia River waterfront in Ward 8 and consists of approximately 271,219 square feet (including private streets), or approximately 6.23 acres, of land area. The Property is currently located in the MU-14 Zone District. (Ex. 2.)
2. On September 21, 2016, the Applicant delivered a notice of its intent (“**NOI**”) to file the Application to all owners of property within 200 feet of the perimeter of the Property as well as to ANC 8A and ANC 8C (the “**ANCs**”), pursuant to Section 300.7 of Subtitle Z of the Zoning Regulations. (Ex. 2C)

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

3. On December 13, 2016, the Applicant filed the Application for approval of a first-stage PUD and related Zoning Map amendment from MU-14 Zone District to MU-9 Zone District (the “**Initial Application**”). (Exhs. 1-2113).
4. The Application was accepted as complete by the Office of Zoning (“**OZ**”) by letter dated December 21, 2016 (Ex. 4). OZ referred the Application to ANC 8A, ANC 8C, the Councilmember for Ward 8, and the District of Columbia Office of Planning (“**OP**”) and notice of the filing of the application was published in the *D.C. Register*. (Exhs. 5-9).
5. On February 17, 2017, OP delivered a report (the “**OP Setdown Report**”) on the Application, recommending that the Commission set down the Application for public hearing, and requested additional information from the Applicant. (Ex. 10)
6. During its public meeting on February 27, 2017, the Commission unanimously voted to set down the Application for a public hearing (“**Setdown**”). See February 27, 2017 Transcript (“**Tr. 1**”) of the Zoning Commission Regular Public Meeting.
7. On July 5, 2017, Applicant filed its initial pre-hearing statement and supporting exhibits (“**PHS**”), which included information in response to the requests from OP and this Commission, resumes of the Applicant’s proposed expert witnesses and outlines of testimony and paid the requisite hearing fees. The Applicant’s PHS included updates to the Application in response to OP and this Commission’s comments at Setdown, including information about interim uses at the site, additional setbacks to reduce overall massing, clarification of zoning data, more meaningful building connections, improved streetscape, removal of architectural embellishments on the roof, reduction of projecting balconies and bay windows, and refinements to public benefits and amenities. (Exhs. 12-14).
8. Notice of the public hearing to be held on October 26, 2017 was mailed to ANC 8A, ANC 8C, and to owners of property within 200 feet of the Property. (Ex. 18). Notice of the public hearing was published in the *D.C. Register* on August 18, 2017, in Volume 64, Issue 3. (Ex. 15).
9. On September 14, 2017, the Applicant caused notice of the Public Hearing to be posted at the Property and on October 23, 2017, the Applicant filed an affidavit describing the maintenance of such posted notice. (Ex. 20, 27)
10. On August 30, 2017, the Applicant filed a comprehensive transportation review (the “**CTR**”). (Exhs 17 -17b).

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

11. The Application was further updated by pre-hearing submissions filed on October 6, 2017, including additional information on public benefits and amenities, community outreach and engagement, and updated architectural plans, drawings, and renderings (the “**Initial 20-Day Statement**”). (Exhs. 21- 21B).
12. On October 16, 2017, OP, the District Department of Transportation (“**DDOT**”), and the District Department of Energy and the Environment (“**DOEE**”) each submitted a report (respectively, the “**Final OP Report**”, the “**DDOT Report**”, and the “**DOEE Report**”). (Exhs. 22-24).
13. On October 18, 2017, ANC 8C filed a letter raising concerns with respect to the use of the name “Poplar Point”. (Ex. 25).
14. On October 19, 2017, ANC 8A filed a letter requesting a postponement of the public hearing. (Ex. 26).
15. On October 23, 2017, the Applicant filed a request for postponement of the public hearing until December 4, 2017, which request was approved, in response to the concerns of ANC 8A and ANC 8C. (Ex. 28).
16. On November 14, 2017, the Applicant filed a supplemental pre-hearing statement (the “**Second 20 Day Statement**”), addressing the concerns of ANC 8C with respect to the use of the name “Poplar Point” and the comments raised by OP, DDOT, and DOEE in their respective reports, an update on community outreach and engagement, and updated architectural plans, drawings, and renderings. (Exhs. 38-38C).
17. On December 4, 2017, the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) filed a letter describing WMATA’s coordination with the Applicant on proposed improvements to the Anacostia Metro Station entrance (generally, the “**WMATA Improvements**”). (Ex. 47).
18. A public hearing was conducted on December 4, 2017 (the “**Public Hearing**”). The Applicant provided testimony from Bill Hellmuth of HOK, Jami Milanovich of Wells + Associates, and Thomas Skinner, Louis Dubin, and Stephan Rodiger of Redbrick LMD, and John Epting of Goulston & Storrs, PC. (December 4, 2017 Transcript (“**Tr. 2**”) of the Zoning Commission, Public Hearing Case No. 16-29). The Commission accepted Jami Milanovich and Bill Hellmuth, who have previously been accepted as experts before the Commission, as experts in this case. (Tr. 2, 11-12).

Parties to the Proceeding and Request for Party Status

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

19. In addition to the Applicant, ANC 8A and ANC 8C were automatically parties in this proceeding and submitted reports in support of the Application. (Exhs. 40 and 43).
20. On December 4, 2017, Current Area Residents EoTR (CARE) submitted a request for party status at 4:58 pm (Ex. 48, Tr., 2, p.7). This Commission denied this request by a vote of 5-0-0 both for being untimely and for being substantively lacking, for the reasons described below (Tr., 2, p.7-11).
21. As set forth in the Zoning Regulations, a request for party status that is to be considered at a public hearing shall be filed with the Commission not less than 14 days prior to the public hearing. In this case, the Public Hearing was originally scheduled for October 26, 2017 and was rescheduled to December 4, 2017. Additionally, at or before the time of filing the request, the person requesting party status shall serve a copy of the request on the applicant and the affected ANC. At the time of the filing request, the person requesting party status shall file an affidavit of service to all parties with the Commission. Z §§ 404.4, 404.7, 404.8.
22. CARE's request for party status was not filed 14 days prior to the Public Hearing, rather it was filed at 4:58 pm on December 4, 2017, the day of the rescheduled hearing. (Tr. 2, pp.7-11). The Applicant and the ANCs, who are parties in this proceeding, were not served with copies of the filing, and an affidavit of service was not filed with this Commission. (Tr. 2, pp. 7-11). Therefore, the Commission finds that CARE's request for party status was untimely filed and also does not comply with the service requirements set forth in the Zoning Regulations. Z §§ 404.4, 404.7, 404.8
23. As further set forth in the Zoning Regulations, Z § 404.1, a person requesting party status and their authorized representatives, must file with the Commission a Request for Party Status and certain information is to be included in the initial filing with the Commission, including:

“(h) A written statement setting forth why the person should be granted party status, including reference to the following:
 - (1) The property owned or occupied by the person, or in which the person has an interest, that will be affected by the action requested of the Commission;
 - (2) The legal interest the person has in the property, such as owner, tenant, trustee, or mortgagee;
 - (3) The distance between the person's property and the property that is the subject of the application before the Commission;
 - (4) The environmental, economic, social, or other impacts likely to affect the person and/or the person's property if the action requested of the Commission is approved or denied; and

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- (5) An explanation of how the person's interests as identified in response to paragraph (4) would likely be more significantly, distinctively, or uniquely affected in character or kind by the proposed zoning action than those of other persons in the general public.” Z § 404.1(h)
24. The Commission shall grant party status only if the person requesting party status has clearly demonstrated that the person's interests would likely be more significantly, distinctively, or uniquely affected in character or kind by the proposed zoning action than those of other persons in the general public. Z § 404.14.
25. In addition to untimely filing of the request for party status, the Commission finds that CARE has not satisfied the substantive requirement for party status that “the person requesting party status has clearly demonstrated that the person's interests would likely be more significantly, distinctively, or uniquely affected in character or kind by the proposed zoning action than those of other persons in the general public.” Z § 404.14.
26. The Commission found that the long distance of 5,000 feet and 1,000 feet between CARE members’ property and the Property, was well beyond the 200-foot distance from the Project that triggers notification of the Application. Furthermore, Commissioner Hood stated that “if you have concerns within five thousand feet, then I think that that opens up. That doesn’t make you unique or differently affected than anyone else in this.” (Tr. 2, p.9). Due to the distance between CARE members’ property and the Project, this Commission finds that CARE has not clearly demonstrated that its interests are likely to be more significantly affected than those of other persons in the general public.
27. Additionally, the Commission found that the arguments made in the request for party status were not specific. Commissioner May stated that “the arguments that are made in this application seem to be very general in nature. And they’re not the sort of specific connection to the project that would ordinarily trigger consideration as a party.” (Tr. 2, p.9) Vice Chair Miller concurred stating “I agree that they’re not uniquely, significantly, adversely affected.” (Tr. 2, p.10).
28. As the request for party status was both untimely, and did not satisfy the requirements of Z § 404.14 and Z §404.1(h), the Commission denied this request by a vote of 5-0-0. (Tr., 2, p.11).

Persons in Support and Opposition

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

29. Larry Greenhill of Savage Technical Services, Frederick Savage of Savage Technical Services, Jimmy Whitehead of Land Matters, LLC, Freddie Winston, and Thomas Brown of Training Grounds Inc. spoke in support of the Application. This testimony noted that Redbrick LMD is undertaking training and employment efforts not just in Ward 8, but in the wider "DMV" (Tr. 2, 104-111, 117-125).
30. Paulette Matthews, a Barry Farm resident, testified in general opposition to change in the area, but not specifically against the Project. (Tr. 2, pp.111-116).
31. Chris Otten of DC for Reasonable Development: Ward 8 Review Team (DC4RD: W8RT), Empower DC and Barry Farms Tenants & Allies (BFTAA) spoke in opposition to the Application and filed his comments into the record. (Tr. 2, pp.125-129 and Ex. 49). Mr. Otten expressed concerns with impact of the Project on the community aesthetic, culture, and demographic of Ward 8 and Barry Farms, the surrounding recreational area and environment, infrastructure, flood plain, and traffic. Mr. Otten also expressed concerns with the status of any "contract" between the developers and the city with respect to job creation and benefits for Ward 8, the amount of affordable family sized housing, conditions of job training associated with the Project for Ward 8 residents, and public benefits for the surrounding community, as well as the retail and commercial uses at the Project. Mr. Otten additionally mentioned in his written testimony that the Project "completely blows out the DC Height Act as well as it relates to Howard Road, representing a canyon effect that is otherwise discouraged by all city planning documents. (Ex. 49 and Tr. 2, pp.125-129).

Close of Public Hearing

32. At the close of the Public Hearing, the Commission asked the Applicant to address certain aspects of stormwater management, solar panels, Inclusionary Zoning (IZ), phasing, recreational space, rooftop amenities, workforce training amenity, and a quantification of public benefits and amenities. (Tr. 2). The Applicant addressed those issues in a post-hearing submission dated December 18, 2017, which included a list of proffered benefits and amenities and draft conditions ("**Post-Hearing Submission**"). (Exhs. 51, 51A, and 51B).

Overview of the PUD Site

33. The Property consists of approximately 271,219 square feet of land area (including private streets), or approximately 6.23 acres, located on either side of Howard Road SE and in between Interstate 295 and South Capitol Street SE in close proximity to the Anacostia Metrorail station. The site is bounded by National Park Service (NPS) property to the north, the Anacostia Metrorail station to the east, and the Interstate 295 and South Capitol Street SE interchanges to the south and west. (Ex. 2).

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

34. The Property is largely unimproved with some small commercial buildings. The Property is located entirely in the MU-14 Zone District. The surrounding area features a variety of uses and zone categories. To the north is unzoned National Park Service property, to the east and southeast are residential and mixed-use communities, and Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling is located to the southwest. Property immediately to the south of the Property is in the PDR-1 Zone District, and the residential and mixed-use areas to the east and southeast are predominantly in the RA-1 Zone District. (Ex. 2).
35. The Property is located within the Poplar Point area on the Anacostia River. The Anacostia, Historic Anacostia, and Barry Farms neighborhoods are located to the east and southeast of the Property. Across the Anacostia River are the Buzzard Point, National Ballpark, and Navy Yard areas. The site is adjacent to the Anacostia Metrorail station, which serves as a Green Line Metrorail station as well as a pick-up point for numerous bus lines. (Ex. 2).
36. The Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan locates the Property in the Mixed Use High Density Residential/High Density Commercial, as well as Institutional, land use categories. The Property is also located within the Central Employment Area of the District. (Ex. 2).

Project Description

37. The Project will raze the existing improvements at the Property to develop a mixed-use project providing residential, retail, and office uses across five “buildings,” referred to as Buildings A-E (the “**Project**”) (Ex. 2, 13, 21-21B, 38, 38A1, 38A2, 51-51B).
38. Buildings A, D, and E are planned for office use, Buildings B and C will both be residential buildings. All buildings will have ground floor retail uses and two levels of underground parking. The residential buildings will contain a mix of studio, one bedroom, 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom units. (Ex. 38, 38A1, 38A2).
39. The Project will provide a meaningful connection between Buildings B and C as well as between buildings D and E. (Ex. 13, 21, 38, 38A1, 38A2)
40. In total, the Project plans, excluding each building’s penthouse square footage, to construct approximately 52,120 gross square feet of retail use, approximately 691,590 gross square feet of residential use (approximately 700 residential units), and approximately 1,614,670 gross square feet of office space. (Ex. 38, 38A1, 38A2).
41. The Applicant plans to construct the Project in three phases. Buildings A and D, both designed for office use with ground floor retail, are expected to be Phase I. Building C,

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

designed for residential use with ground floor retail, is expected to be Phase II, and Building B, designed for residential use with ground floor retail, and Building E, designed for office use with ground floor retail, are expected to be Phase 3. (Ex. 38, 38A1, 38A2).

42. Because the Property is largely undeveloped or underdeveloped, the Project presents a significant opportunity to improve the streetscape and surrounding area. As part of the Project, the Applicant will conduct major streetscape improvements, including creating a network of private streets intersecting the buildings to create a traditional grid network with a large private alley behind the northern buildings. (Ex. 38, 38A1, 38A2)
43. The public and private street network will meet DC standards and will have space for two-way traffic, parking, and bicycle lanes along Howard Road. The Project also includes significant pedestrian space, with a 14 foot and 16 foot pedestrian realm on the sides of Howard Road SE. (Ex. 38, 38A1, 38A2)
44. The overall circulation plan of the Project not only provides effective circulation for the Project, but creates openings along the private streets and alleys for future development in the Poplar Point area. The Applicant has designed the Project to anticipate and foster future development to seamlessly connect to the Project's three phases. The Applicant will also coordinate the development of bicycle lanes to connect to the Anacostia Riverwalk Trail and other bicycle networks in the District. (Ex. 2, 38, 38A1, 38A2)
45. The Project will contain two levels of underground parking underneath all of the buildings. The Project will contain 983 vehicular parking spaces. The Applicant has requested flexibility to adjust the parking downwards if needed to meet market demand. The Applicant will provide the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required by the Zoning Regulations, with approximately 90 short-term bicycle parking spaces, and 590 long-term bicycle parking spaces.
46. The Project will contain garage access from the private street between Buildings A and B and from the service drive Buildings D and E. Loading entrances for Buildings D and E will be provided from the service drive between the buildings, and loading entrances for Buildings A, B, and C will be provided from the alley to the north of the Project. (38, 38A1, 38A2).
47. The Applicant will devote 10% of the residential gross floor area to affordable Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) units at both 50% and 60% AMI. The unit mix and income distribution of the units will be as follows: 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be programmed with 3 bedroom units with half at 50% AMI and half at 60% AMI. The remaining 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be proportional to the gross floor area reflected in the market unit mix at 60% AMI. The market unit mix will be determined during the planning and design of Phase 2 of the

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

PUD with the delivery of the first residential building. The Applicant will provide residential penthouse IZ at 8% of the total habitable penthouse space at 50% AMI. The Applicant will provide a housing trust fund payment for habitable space on the roof of the offices. (38, 38A1, 38A2. 51-51B).

48. The Project will be constructed to a FAR of 8.99 and a height of 130 feet. The MU-9 District permits a maximum FAR of 9.36 in a PUD project. A PUD project in the MU-9 Zone District is permitted a maximum building height of 130 feet. (2, 38, 38A1, 38A2, 44A1-A10, 51-51b).

PUD Flexibility

49. The Applicant requested flexibility to vary the phasing anticipated for the Project, vary interim uses at the Property while the other phases of the Project are being finalized; and adjust the parking downwards if needed to meet market demand, but not below the minimum required by the Zoning Regulations. (Ex. 13).

Government Agency Reports

50. In the OP Setdown Report, OP requested that the Applicant (a) provide retail on the ground floor of all buildings, (b) provide more details on the interim uses of the site, (c) examine deeper commitment to amenities, (d) provide full roof and penthouse plans, including height and setbacks, as well as rear yard/ court-in-lieu calculation, (e) show the meaningful connection between Buildings D and E, (f) explain why Building D needs a separate parking entrance from Building E, and show where loading occurs for Building D, (g) withdraw the request for flexibility to vary the locations of the office and the residential components, and the request for flexibility to provide above-ground parking within the building's core instead of underground parking. (Ex. 10)

51. In response to the OP Setdown Report, the Applicant provided the following information and made the following updates to the proposed Project in its PHS and Initial 20-Day Statement (Ex. 13-13D, 21-21B):

- (a) Applicant proposed to provide ground floor retail at all buildings;
- (b) Applicant provided additional information about the interim uses of the site, including interim storing, staging, and parking, as well as urban farming;
- (c) Applicant provided additional benefits and amenities, including workforce development, streetscape improvements, and additional details with respect to the communication with WMATA about improvements to the Anacostia Metrorail station;
- (d) Applicant provided roof and penthouse plans;

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- (e) Applicant provided information on the redesigned bridge between buildings D and E and clarified the loading entrance for Building D;
- (f) Applicant further refined the streetscape and relocated the westernmost curb cut along Howard Road; and
- (g) Applicant withdrew its requests for flexibility to vary the locations of the office and residential components and its request to provide above-ground parking within the building's core instead of underground parking.

52. In the Final OP Report, OP requested that Applicant (a) provide additional retail on the ground floor of all buildings, (b) offer a greater IZ percentage, deeper affordability, and more three-bedroom IZ units, (c) provide an examination of archaeological resources on the Property, (d) quantify details and timing of the proposed WMATA improvements, (e) clarify why Building D requires a separate parking entrance from Building E, and clarify where loading occurs for Building D, (f) confirm whether the residential portion of the Project will be rental or condominium, (g) make design adjustments to break up facades through indentations, rather than just projection, and provide more renderings of Howard Road, toward the river and open spaces, (h) provide more detail on the meaningful connection between buildings D and E, (i) provide that all new private streets and alleys should be accessible to the public and not closed off for tenant use only, and a public access easement should be a condition of approval of the PUD, and (j) explore ways to make the general contractor apprenticeship more robust (Ex. 22). At the Public Hearing, OP inquired about the size and mix of the IZ units and suggested that the Applicant proffer 12% of the entire floor area as IZ units and supported ANC 8A's questions regarding recreation space. (Tr. 2, p.82).

53. The Applicant addressed OP's comments in its Second 20-Day Statement and in its Post-Hearing submission as follows (Ex. 38-38B, 51-51B):

- (a) Continuous ground floor retail is provided at the Project;
- (b) The Applicant shall devote 10% of the residential gross floor area to affordable Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) units at both 50% and 60% AMI. The unit mix and income distribution of the units shall be as follows: 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be programmed with 3 bedrooms with half at 50% AMI and half at 60% AMI. The remaining 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be proportional to the gross floor area reflected in the market unit mix at 60% AMI. The market unit mix will be determined during the planning and design of Phase 2 of the PUD with the delivery of the first residential building;
- (c) The Applicant is committed to a Phase I study to learn more about the archaeology of the site;
- (d) The Applicant will continue to work with WMATA to quantify details and timing of WMATA improvements;

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- (e) The entrance to Building D along Howard Road is removed;
- (f) The Applicant requested that the determination of residential units as rental or condominium be addressed at the PUD Stage-Two Residential submission, as at this early, first-stage of the PUD process, it is premature to determine whether the residential portion of the Project is rental or condominium.
- (g) The Applicant has provided more detail of building facades and streetscape perspectives that reflect the breaking up of facades and massing of the buildings;
- (h) The Applicant clarified that Buildings D and E will have a passable connection between them, but demising walls with double doors may be added by future tenants;
- (i) The Applicant agreed to provide public access in the private streets and service road as a condition of PUD approval;
- (j) The Applicant commits to enter into a workforce development agreement as part of the Stage-Two PUD, with an appropriate community organization, such as an ANC.
- (k) Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first building, the Applicant shall work with NPS WMATA, OP, DDOT, DPR, ANC 8A and ANC 8C to optimize open space and recreation placemaking opportunities throughout the Project as well as adjacent parks and underutilized land. The design of the open space and recreation improvements shall include a collaborative public charrette process of the Applicant's design team, local neighborhood families, ANC Commissioners, NPS, WMATA and DC public agencies, including OP.
- (l) The Applicant shall provide outdoor open space courts at and above grade in buildings A, B, D and E. In addition, all 5 building will have programmed rooftop amenities within the outdoor open spaces. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for each of these buildings, the Applicant shall deliver these open space courts and amenities.

54. In the Final OP Report, OP noted that it does not generally object to the Applicant's requested flexibility, consisting of (a) PUD-Related map Amendment from MU-14 to MU-9 (the "**Map Amendment**"), (b) flexibility to vary the phasing anticipated for the Project as the proposed phasing may need to be revised to meet market demands, (c) vary interim uses at the Property while the other phases of the Project are being finalized, and (d) adjust parking downwards if needed to meet market demand. (Ex. 22)

55. At the Public Hearing, OP noted its appreciation for the Applicant's adjustment of the ground floor retail to be located on the entire street frontage, the Applicant's agreement to perform Phase I archaeology studies, and the Applicant's apprenticeship program. (Tr. 2, p.81-82).

56. This Commission finds that the Applicant satisfactorily addressed all of OP's comments and questions.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

57. This Commission finds that OP's reports and testimony were thorough and credible and helpful in considering the Application and accordingly gives such testimony the great weight it is entitled.
58. In the DDOT Report, DDOT expressed no objection to the PUD with several conditions, as outlined in the DDOT Report. (Ex. 23). In its Second 20-Day Statement and in the testimony of Jami Milanovich at the Public Hearing, the Applicant responded to DDOT's report and addressed all of the conditions outlined in the DDOT Report, with the modification that the Applicant will provide either an annual car share membership to all new residents over the age of 16 in the first three years after initial delivery of the residential building or provide an annual Capital Bikeshare membership to all new residents over the age of 16 in the first 3 years after initial delivery of the residential building (in lieu of providing both). (Tr. 2 pp.27, 82-84). In the testimony of Jami Milanovich, the Applicant also clarified that the Applicant will provide the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required by the Zoning Regulations. (Tr. 2, p.84).
59. The Commission finds that the DDOT Report was thorough and credible and helpful in considering the Application and accordingly gives such testimony its appropriate weight in reviewing the Application and further finds that the Applicant satisfactorily addressed all of DDOT's comments as appropriate for this first-stage PUD.
60. In the DOEE Report, DOEE recommended support and approval of the PUD, and noted several items as a part of the specific building plans and applications for the Second Stage PUD (Ex.24). In response to the DOEE Report, the Applicant has agreed to refine the conceptual stormwater management plan to generate additional retention volume, capturing stormwater volume up to a 1.7" storm event. Additionally, the Applicant has designed and engineered the building footprint outside of the 100 and 500 year flood plain. (Ex. 51). In its Second 20-Day Statement, the Applicant committed to evaluate DOEE's comments as the second-stage of the PUD is developed. (Ex. 38-38B). This Commission finds that the Applicant has therefore satisfactorily addressed DOEE's comments as appropriate for this first-stage PUD.

ANC Reports

61. At its regularly scheduled, properly noticed meeting on November 7, 2017, with a quorum of 6 commissioners present, ANC 8A voted unanimously in support of the PUD. ANC 8A recognized and appreciated the level of engagement the Applicant has had with ANC 8A and the Community. ANC 8A specifically noted support for the proposed height, density and proposed mix of uses of the Project, the Howard Road SE streetscape, WMATA Anacostia Metro Station, and transportation improvements, as well as the transit-based housing,

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

affordable housing, neighborhood retail amenities, LEED Gold Certification and other sustainability measures, workforce development training, internship and apprenticeship opportunities. (Ex. 43).

62. At the Public Hearing, Greta Fuller, Commissioner for ANC 8A-06 testified in support of the Project. As part of her cross-examination of the Applicant, Ms. Fuller requested additional details on the plans for recreation spaces for the residents of the Project and the surrounding community (Tr. 2, pp. 74-78).
63. The Applicant has provided additional information about the plans for recreation spaces at the Project in its Post-Hearing Submission, including plans for a collaborative public charrette process including the Applicant's design team, local neighborhood families, and the ANCs to optimize open space and recreation placemaking opportunities throughout the Project. (Exhs. 51, 51A, 51B).
64. At its public meeting on November 1, 2017, with a quorum of 5 commissioners present, ANC 8C voted 4-1 to support the development of the Project. (Ex. 40). At the hearing, Mary Cuthbert, Chair of ANC 8C, testified in support of the Project. Ms. Cuthbert noted a concern about traffic on Howard Road SE. (Tr, 2. p.91). As noted in the Applicant's Post-Hearing Submission, and by Jami Milanovich in her testimony at the Public Hearing, DDOT thoroughly evaluated the traffic impacts of the Project and determined that the proposed mitigation plan is adequate to mitigate the traffic impacts of the Project, and offered a finding of "no objection", subject to the conditions discussed at the Public Hearing. (Tr. 2, p. 83, Ex. 51, 51B).

Commission Questions and Comments

65. At the Public Hearing, the Commission asked the Applicant (a) for additional information on the timing of the WMATA proffer, (b) whether the Applicant will refine the stormwater plan and generate additional retention volume, especially at grade, capturing stormwater volume up to a 1.7" storm event as requested in the DOEE Report, (c) for a commitment on solar panels at the first-stage of the PUD, (d) for additional information on the plans for the west side of the Property where there is a large building setback, (e) requested deeper affordability, (f) requested additional information about the unit mix, (g) requested information on the trust fund payment for the habitable space on the roof of the office buildings, (h) requested details on the phasing of the Project, (i) requested additional information about the roof top amenities, (j) requested more information about the open space at ground level as a project amenity, (k) requested a quantification all of the proffered public benefits and amenities, (l) requested additional information about the connection between the buildings, (m) requested additional information about the workforce

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

development program offered by the Applicant, and (n) requested additional information about the traffic impact associated with the removal of the I-295 southbound off-ramp at Howard Road. (Tr. 2)

66. The Applicant responded completely to the Commission's questions and comments at the Public Hearing and in its Post-Hearing Submission. The Applicant's responses are supported by substantial evidence:

- (a) Timing of WMATA Proffer: At the Public Hearing, the Applicant confirmed that prior to the issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy for the first building, the Applicant will complete construction of the WMATA improvements.
- (b) Stormwater retention: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant clarified that it will refine the conceptual stormwater management plan to generate additional retention volume up to a 1.7" storm event.
- (c) Solar: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant clarified that it shall provide rooftop solar panels, as shown on the plans in Exhibit 51A of the Record, that will generate an estimated 436,626 kwh.
- (d) Open Space: Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first building, the Applicant shall work with NPS WMATA, OP, DDOT, DPR, ANC 8A and ANC 8C to optimize open space and recreation placemaking opportunities throughout the Project as well as adjacent parks and underutilized land.
- (e) Affordability, Unit Mix, and Trust Fund Payment: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant noted that it will devote 10% of the residential gross floor area to affordable Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) units at both 50% and 60% AMI. The unit mix and income distribution of the units will be as follows: 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be programmed with 3BRs with half at 50% AMI and half at 60% AMI. The remaining 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be proportional to the gross floor area reflected in the market unit mix at 60% AMI. The market unit mix will be determined during the planning and design of Phase 2 with the delivery of the first residential building. The Applicant will provide residential penthouse IZ at 8% of the total habitable penthouse space at 50% AMI and will provide a housing trust fund payment for habitable space on the roof of the offices of \$196,912.
- (f) Phasing: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant provided additional information with respect to a phasing plan for the Project, describing three phases for construction of Buildings A-E.
- (g) Rooftop Amenities: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant noted that all 5 buildings will have programmed rooftop amenities within outdoor open spaces. These

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

respective open space amenities will be delivered prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for each of the buildings.

- (h) Open Space at Ground Level: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant noted that the design of the open space and recreation improvements shall include a collaborative public charrette process of the Applicant's design team, local neighborhood families, ANC Commissioners, NPS, WMATA and DC public agencies, including OP. The Applicant also noted it will create a community pocket park adjacent to the Metrostation plaza entrance.
- (i) Quantification of Public Benefits and Amenities: The Applicant provided a comprehensive quantification of public benefits and amenities as part of its Post-Hearing Submission.
- (j) Connection between Buildings: At the Public Hearing, the Applicant explained that the connection between the buildings was modified to be more substantial and significant in response to comments made prior to the Public Hearing (Tr. 2, pp. 47-48).
- (k) Workforce Development: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant provided a detailed description of workforce development program.
- (l) Traffic impact associated with the removal of the I-295 southbound off-ramp at Howard Road: In its Post-Hearing Submission, the Applicant's traffic engineer, Jami Milanovich, provided a detailed response to this Commission's question regarding traffic impact associated with removal of the I-295 southbound off-ramp at Howard Road.

(Ex. 51, 51A, 51B).

Person in Opposition

67. At the Public Hearing, Chris Otten of DC for Reasonable Development: Ward 8 Review Team (DC4RD: W8RT), Empower DC and Barry Farms Tenants & Allies (BFTAA) provided testimony in opposition to the Project. Mr. Otten noted the following concerns with the Project: (a) approval of the Project represents a significant public entitlement requiring that the development review process consider the impacts on the surrounding area, (b) the Project is suited to "the downtown business district", (c) the use of immediately adjacent streets to measure the Project's height as permitted by the Height Act of 1910 will lead to a "canyon effect that is otherwise discouraged by all city planning documents", (d) concerns about (i) training and hiring from the affected communities of Ward 8; (ii) addressing permanent and affordable commercial and retail incubator space for upcoming Ward 8

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

entrepreneurs, small businesses and social service and cultural organizations; and (iii) assessing how Ward 8 will benefit from the Project, (e) concerns about the adverse impact on the site's archaeological and cultural features, (f) concerns that the Project will eliminate recreation and aesthetic resources, (g) concerns that the Project does not include family-sized affordable housing (3, 4, 5, 6, bedrooms), (h) concerns about the 500-year floodplain due to climate change and the location of the Project, and (i) concerns about traffic and Metro impacts of the Project. (Ex. 49, Tr. 2, pp. 126-129).

68. The Commission has considered the responses to Mr. Otten's concerns provided by the Applicant in its Post-Hearing Submission as well as the Applicant's Initial Application, Initial 20-Day Statement, and Second 20-Day Statement, and CTR and finds that the Applicant has satisfactorily responded to Mr. Otten's concerns: (Exhs. 2, 13-13D, 17-17B, 21-21B, 38-38C, 51, 51A, 51B):

- (a) The Project is a significant public entitlement: The Applicant has thoroughly investigated and addressed all impacts of the project not only on the community but the District as a whole and the Project's extensive public benefits far outweigh any adverse impacts. This Commission notes that the Applicant has undergone coordination with DDOT and agreed to adhere to a Transportation Management Plan, as well as to provide significant multi-modal transportation improvements as part of the Project, and with the implementation of the multi-modal improvement and robust Transportation Management Plan, the Project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on the surrounding roadway network. (Ex. 44A10). Additionally, the Project offers commendable public benefits, which this Commission finds outweigh any adverse impacts of the Project. Strong community support for the Project has been demonstrated. Both ANC 8A and ANC 8C, as well as 11 local community groups and organizations, and Ward 8 Councilmember Trayon White support the Project. These groups are well-positioned to evaluate any impacts of the Project on Ward 8. (Exhs 30-37, 39-41, 43, 45- 46).
- (b) The Project is suited to the "downtown business district": As noted by the Applicant in its Post- Hearing Submission (Ex. 51), the Property is in fact within the Central Employment Area ("CEA"). Further, the site is classified on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan as High Density Residential and High Density Commercial as well as Institutional. The High Density Commercial/High Density Residential Classification is the highest classification of the Comprehensive Plan. The Project is therefore appropriate for the Property and location.
- (c) Height of the Project: As noted by the Applicant in its Post-Hearing Submission, (Ex. 51), the City's primary planning guidance actually encourages very high density and height in this exact location. As noted by OP at Setdown, the Zoning Administrator

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

has made determinations that all buildings comprising the Project front on either South Capitol Street or Anacostia Freeway. (Tr. 1, 26). The Project is supported by OP, and the Applicant has designed the connections between the buildings to be raised from the street level which preserves the view shed to Anacostia Park and the river. (Ex. 21-21B). The design of the streetscape as well as the building facades, which the Applicant updated in design in response to OP comments, will also contribute to an open atmosphere at the Project, rather than a “canyon effect”.

- (d) Workforce Development Commitment and Retail Uses; The Applicant is providing significant workforce opportunities for Ward 8 residents and small businesses. As noted in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission (Ex. 51), not only do ANC 8A and ANC 8C support the project and the proffered amenities, but also the Ward 8 Councilmember and 11 local community groups and organizations (Exhs. 30-37, 39-41, 43, 45- 46). The Applicant further notes that support of such groups also signifies that any impacts on the local communities are being addressed. The ANCs and the Councilmember are in the best position to weigh any of the displacement pressures cited by Mr. Otten from the Project against the overall benefits of the Project. The Applicant has described extensive workforce development plans which this Commission finds commendable, and the Applicant plans to offer neighborhood serving retail amenities and services.
- (e) Archaeological and Cultural Impact: The Applicant is addressing Mr. Otten's stated concerns about adverse impact on the site's archaeological and cultural features by proffering an archaeological study as one of the Project's amenities. Additionally, as described in the Applicant's Post-Hearing Submission (Ex. 51), the Applicant has committed to working in partnership with the Historic Anacostia Preservation Society and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to support actions that benefit the Historic Anacostia District and preserve the historic character and fabric of the neighborhood. This Commission finds that the Applicant has therefore taken concrete and meaningful steps to investigate and address any adverse impact of the Project on the Property's archaeological features and is working to ensure that the history of the Property and community are preserved;
- (f) Recreation and Aesthetic Resources: Mr. Otten raises concerns that the Project will “permanently eliminate the recreational and aesthetic resource” of the “open air and calm nature of the project site and thereabouts along the Anacostia river.” (Ex. 49). The Applicant stated in its Post-Hearing Submission that the Property is directly adjacent to Anacostia Park and the location offers numerous other recreational activities, including connecting bike paths. (Ex. 51). This Commission also recognizes that the Applicant's WMATA amenity proffer includes a pocket park, which will be designed to serve residents and neighbors as well as a commitment “to work with the National Park Service on increasing the opportunities to leverage the

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Anacostia Park's natural, cultural and recreational amenities for the neighborhood's use and enjoyment." (Ex. 51). This Commission finds that the Applicant's provision of a pocket park, and commitment to working with the National Parks Service to enhance the neighborhood's use of Anacostia Park will avoid the permanent elimination of the recreational and aesthetic resource of the "open air and calm nature of the project site and thereabouts" about which Mr. Otten is concerned;

- (g) Affordable Housing: Mr. Otten is concerned about the number of affordable family sized housing units, including units up to 6 + bedrooms offered by the Project. The Applicant notes that 3 bedroom affordable units are being provided and such housing mix and type are supported by the Office of Planning. The Applicant has adjusted its proffer of affordable housing in response to comments by OP and is offering family sized affordable 3-bedroom units. The Project, including its unit mix, is supported by ANC 8A and ANC 8C, the elected representatives for the Ward 8 population. This Commission finds that the Applicant is offering a meaningful number of affordable family sized units;
- (h) Floodplain: Mr. Otten noted concerns with respect to the Project's location in the flood plain. Based upon discussions with the Office of Planning and DOEE, the Applicant proposed a design and build strategy to avoid development in the 100- and 500-year flood plain for a sustainable and resilient Project. As part of the Application, the Applicant designed and engineered the building footprint outside of the 100- and 500-year floodplain while simultaneously meeting all the requirements of local and federal regulations. (Ex. 51). This Commission finds that the Applicant has taken satisfactory steps to address flood plain concerns;
- (i) Traffic Impact: The Applicant's traffic engineer has thoroughly addressed concerns about traffic and metro impacts in its response to Mr. Otten's testimony. (Ex. 51B). The Applicant has undergone coordination with DDOT and agreed to adhere to a Transportation Management Plan, as well as provide significant multi-modal transportation improvements as part of the Project, and with the implementation of the multi-modal improvement and robust Transportation Management Plan, the Project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on the surrounding roadway network. (Ex. 44A10). This Commission therefore finds that adverse traffic impacts are being satisfactorily addressed by the Applicant.

69. For the foregoing reasons, the Commission finds that the Applicant has satisfactorily addressed the concerns raised by Mr. Otten at the Public Hearing and in his written testimony.

Development Incentives: Map Amendment and Flexibility

70. The PUD process specifically allows greater flexibility in planning and design than is possible under strict application of the Zoning Regulations. Under the Zoning Regulations, this Commission retains discretion to grant relief from the development standards of the Zoning Regulations and to allow for project flexibility development incentives. X §§ 303.1, 303.11, 303.13. The Zoning Regulations specifically allow the Commission to approve any such zoning relief that would otherwise require the approval of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Generally, such relief is available at the discretion of the Commission. *Id.* § 303.13. A Zoning Map amendment is a type of development incentive and accordingly is addressed here. *Id.* § 303.12.
71. As part of the Application, the Applicant requested the Commission grant the following development incentives (collectively, the “**Development Incentives**”): (a) the Map Amendment; (b) flexibility to vary the phasing anticipated for the Project (c) the flexibility to vary interim uses at the Property while the other phases of the Project are being finalized; and (d) flexibility to adjust the parking downwards if needed to meet market demand, but not below the minimum required by the Zoning Regulations.
72. The Commission finds that, overall, the Project conforms to the Zoning Regulations, except for the modest relief set forth in the immediately foregoing paragraph. Where the Project requires relief and flexibility, the Commission finds that such relief is either minimal in nature or reasonable in light of the proposed uses and Public Benefits and otherwise does not derogate or impair, but rather is in accordance with, the general intent and purposes of the Zoning Regulations. The general intent and purposes of the Zoning Regulations are, *inter alia*, to promote the “public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and general welfare to (a) provide adequate light and air, (b) prevent undue concentration of population and the overcrowding of land, and (c) provide distribution of population, business, and industry, and use of land that will tend to create conditions favorable to transportation, protection of property, civic activity, and recreational, educational, and cultural opportunities; and that will tend to further economy and efficiency in the supply of public services.” 11-A DCMR (“**11-A**”) § 101.1 (“**Zoning Purposes**”).
73. The Project is in harmony with the Zoning Purposes because it protects light and air on the Property and surrounding properties, prevents overcrowding by providing outdoor open spaces and public spaces, and provides a more equitable distribution of business land uses that create favorable conditions with respect to transportation (e.g., transit-oriented employment opportunities). The Project is also consistent with the Zoning Regulations. For the reasons set forth above, the Commission finds the Applicant has satisfied the standards necessary for the Commission to grant the requested Development Incentives.

PUD Requirements

74. As set forth in the Zoning Regulations, the purpose of the PUD process is to provide for higher quality development through flexibility in building controls, provided that the project that is

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

the subject of the PUD: (a) results in a project superior to what would result from the matter-of-right standards; (b) offers a commendable number or quality of meaningful public benefits; (c) protects and advances the public health, safety, welfare, and convenience; (d) is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and does not result in action inconsistent therewith; (e) does not circumvent the intent and purposes of the Zoning Regulations; and (f) undergoes a comprehensive public review by the Commission in order to evaluate the flexibility or incentives requested in proportion to the proposed public benefits (collectively, the “**PUD Requirements**”). X §§ 300.1, 300.2, and 300.5.

(a) For the following reasons, the Project is superior to the development of the Property under the matter-of-right standards:

- Housing. The Project adds approximately 700 units to the housing stock of the District, including 3-bedroom units, located within walking distance from the Anacostia Metrorail station.
- Retail Uses. The Project will add over 52,000 gross square feet of ground floor retail uses in a transit-oriented location.
- Other Public Benefits. The Project includes other Public Benefits, none of which would be required or feasible under a matter-of-right development. Only a project the scale of the one proposed herein could contribute the high quality urban design, architecture, landscaping, planning, amount of housing and level of affordability, and the environmental, transportation/mass transit, and other community benefits described more thoroughly below. A developer of matter-of-right units on the Property would have no incentive or reason to provide any of the uses of special value enumerated above.
- Community Engagement. A matter-of-right development would not have afforded the community and the ANCs as many opportunities to engage with the Applicant and provide feedback.

(b) The Public Benefits are commendable in number and quality. The Project's Public Benefits are discussed in detail below. For the reasons set forth more fully in the Public Benefits findings, the Public Benefits are of a commendable quality. There are multiple distinct categories of Public Benefits for the Project, and an absolute number that the Commission finds to be commendable. Finally, the Commission finds that the Public Benefits are meaningful. The Public Benefits address the preferences, needs and concerns of community residents, were developed following the Applicant's robust community engagement process, supported by OP, and are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- (c) The Project protects and advances the public health, safety, welfare, and convenience.
- Public Health. The Project protects and advances the public health by being designed in a high-quality manner and in compliance with all applicable construction codes. The Project includes a number of mitigation measures, including the Transportation Demand Management program (“TDM”), which protect and affirmatively advance the public health. The Project also encourages walking through the pedestrian-friendly streetscape, measures that advance public health. The Project does not entail any overcrowding or overpopulation, but instead rationally increases residential density near a Metrorail station and a considerable amount of protected open space. The Project also complies with, and exceeds many, applicable environmental performance standards.
 - Safety. The Project protects and advances safety: the Project has been designed in a manner to allow pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles to safely share space, and will provide ground-floor retail to promote active use and engagement with the Project.
 - Welfare. The Project protects and advances the public welfare by bringing much-needed economic activity to Ward 8, which has long been overlooked for the purposes of locating new market-rate housing and retail.
 - Convenience. Finally, the Project protects and advances the public convenience by adding new neighborhood-serving retail uses as well as transit-oriented housing and office development.
- (d) The Project is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and would not result in any action inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Extensive findings regarding the Project’s lack of inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan are provided below.
- (e) The Project does not circumvent the Zoning Purposes. The Project does not circumvent the Zoning Purposes. The general intent and purposes of the Zoning Regulations are, *inter alia*, to promote the “public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity, and general welfare.” 11-A § 101.1. Findings regarding the Project’s protection and advancement of the public health, safety, convenience, and welfare are provided above.
- Morals. The Project promotes morals insofar as the Applications were undertaken in concert with extensive community outreach. The Commission finds that this community dialogue exemplifies public morals as expressed through the Zoning Regulations and PUD process.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- Order. The Project exemplifies orderly, well-planned development that is undertaken on behalf of the best interests of the residents of the District with respect to the above-cited objectives. The Project complies with all of the specific development standards set forth in the Zoning Regulations, except where flexibility is hereby requested, which flexibility is minor in this instance and expressly contemplated as part of the PUD process. X §§ 300.1, 303.1. The Project allows for an appropriate amount of light and air by virtue of its bulk, height, orientation, setbacks and location.
 - Prosperity. As noted with respect to public welfare above, the Project promotes prosperity by putting to productive use land that is currently underutilized. The Project also promotes public prosperity with respect to its future provision of tax revenue to the District and its addition of many new employees in Ward 8.
- (f) The Project has undergone a comprehensive public review by this Commission, which has evaluated the Project's flexibility and incentives in proportion to the Public Benefits. The Commission has reviewed the entirety of the record. The record is complete with multiple detailed briefings from the Applicant and reports from multiple District agencies and the ANCs. The Commission heard presentations on the Application and had the opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant, OP, and the ANCs. In every material way, the Applicant responded satisfactorily to the requests from the Commission. The Applicant has also responded thoroughly to OP, DDOT and the ANCs comments. The record in this matter is unquestionably full, and the Commission has reviewed it in its entirety.

75. The Commission finds that the Project satisfies the PUD Requirements.

PUD Balancing and Evaluation Standards

PUD Balancing

76. As set forth in the Zoning Regulations, the Commission must evaluate and grant or deny a PUD application according to the standards of Section 304 of Subtitle X. The Applicant has the burden of proof to justify the granting of the Applications according to such standards. X § 304.2

77. The Commission's findings in relation to a PUD must be supported by substantial evidence. *See Howell v. District of Columbia Zoning Comm'n.*, 97 A.3d 579 (DC 2014). The Commission finds that the Applicant has satisfied the relevant evidentiary threshold to carry its burden of proof in the instant proceeding. The Applicant has provided multiple filings containing volumes of evidence all relevant to this proceeding. This Commission, in its reasonable

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

determination, accepts such filings as containing evidence adequate to support the findings contained herein.

78. Pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 304.3, in deciding on the Application, the Commission has, according to the specific circumstances of the Application, judged, balanced, and reconciled the relative value of: (a) the Public Benefits and other project amenities offered as part of the Project, (b) the Development Incentives requested by the Applicant (where, pursuant to Subtitle X, Section 303.12, the requested Map Amendment is a type of PUD incentive), and (c) any potential adverse effects (collectively, the “**PUD Balancing Test**”).

(a) The Public Benefits are numerous and of a high quality. In sum, the Project provides the numerous and high quality Public Benefits. A full accounting of the quality of the Public Benefits is provided below.

(b) The Project's Development Incentives are comparatively minor and appropriately granted in light of the Public Benefits. The Commission finds that the Applicant requests comparatively minor Development Incentives for the Project. The Project's individual Development Incentives are described above. The most significant, by far, of the Development Incentives is the Map Amendment, which allows the Applicant to construct the Project to a higher density and greater height than is possible as a matter-of-right. The Development Incentives underlie and indeed make possible the Public Benefits, and the Public Benefits justify the additional height and density afforded by the Map Amendment.

(c) Any potential adverse effects of the Project are appropriately mitigated or outweighed by the Public Benefits. Mr. Otten listed some potential adverse effects of the Project. The Applicant responded to these potential adverse impacts of the Project. Such responses are incorporated herein. As this Commission found in response to each individual articulated concern or objection to the Project, these potential adverse effects are either not valid or capable of being mitigated or appropriate in light of the Public Benefits.

(d) The Public Benefits together outweigh the Project's potential adverse effects and justify the Development Incentives. The Commission returns to a familiar point in its review of the record in this proceeding: the Project adds much-needed housing, including affordable family-sized housing, as well as transit-oriented retail and office development and numerous Public Benefits. These items are the crux of the Project's trade-off for the reasonable additional height, density and flexibility of use sought through the Application.

79. The Commission has reviewed the record, identified the circumstances of the Applications, the Property, the Project and the surrounding area, and balanced, reconciled, and judged the Public

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Benefits against the PUD Incentives and potential adverse effects. In sum, the Commission finds that the Project satisfies the PUD Balancing Test.

PUD Evaluation Standards

80. As set forth in the immediately succeeding paragraphs, the Commission hereby also finds that the Project: (a) is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or other adopted public policies and active programs (collectively, the “**Plan**”) related to the Property; (b) does not result in unacceptable project impacts on the surrounding area or on the operation of District services and facilities but instead is either favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable given the quality of public benefits in the project; and (c) includes specific public benefits and amenities, which are not inconsistent with the Plan with respect to the Property (collectively, the “**PUD Evaluation Standards**”). *See X § 304.3.*

The Project Is Not Inconsistent with the Plan

81. Comprehensive Plan Purposes. The purposes of the Comprehensive Plan are to: (a) define the requirements and aspirations of District residents, and accordingly influence social, economic and physical development; (b) guide executive and legislative decisions and matters affecting the District and its citizens; (c) promote economic growth in jobs for District residents; (d) guide private and public development in order to achieve District and community goals; (e) maintain and enhance the natural and architectural assets of the District; and (f) assist in conservation, stabilization and improvement of each neighborhood and community in the District. *See DC Code § 1-306.01(b).* The Project advances these purposes by furthering social and economic development through the construction of new residential, retail, and office uses on currently underutilized land, investing in a District neighborhood that seeks new investment, committing to the implementation of the TDM measures, and improving the urban design and public space surrounding the Property. The Project assists in the improvement and stabilization of the urban environment in the immediate neighborhood and the District as a whole.

82. OP Findings regarding the Comprehensive Plan. The OP Setdown Report and OP Final Report find that the Project is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. *See Exh. 10, 22.* The Commission gives great weight to these OP findings, which the Commission hereby adopts as if restated herein. The Commission credits the testimony of the Applicant, OP, ANC 8A and ANC 8C, regarding the consistency of the Project with the Comprehensive Plan, and concludes that the PUD and related rezoning is not inconsistent with the Plan and fosters numerous themes and elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Based on the substantial evidence in the record, the Commission concludes that the proposed PUD and Map Amendment is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, for the reasons described in detail below.

83. Future Land Use Map and Generalized Policy Map

The Framework Element provides guidelines for using the Future Land Use Map. This Element states that the Future Land Use Map should be interpreted “broadly” and notes that the zoning for an area should be guided by the Future Land Use Map interpreted in conjunction with the text of the entire Comprehensive Plan. The Framework Element also clearly provides that

Z.C. ORDER NO. 16-29

Z.C. CASE NO. 16-29

Page 24

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

density and height gained through the PUD process are bonuses that may exceed the typical ranges cited for each category. Comprehensive Plan § 226(c).

On the Future Land Use Map the Property is mapped for mixed uses. The Property is mapped for Mixed Use High Density Residential/High Density Commercial, as well as Institutional, land uses. The High Density Residential designation characterizes neighborhoods and corridors with high-rise apartment buildings (8 stories or more). The Plan notes that “the R-5-D and R-5-E Zone districts are generally consistent with the High Density Residential category.” §225.6. The High Density Commercial “designation is used to define the central employment district of the city and other major office employment centers on the downtown perimeter . . . characterized by office and mixed office/retail buildings greater than eight stories in height.” § 225.11. The Plan notes that the C-3-C Zone District under the 1958 Zoning Regulations, now the MU-9 Zone District, is appropriate for the High Density Commercial designation.

The Project is consistent with the Future Land Use Map because the Property is in the exact designation for which re-zoning of the Property to the MU-9 Zone District (which was the C-3-C Zone District when the Comprehensive Plan was written) is appropriate and contemplated by the Future Land Use Map. The Project will create a prime office, retail, and residential property in close proximity to a major Metrorail station in accordance with the overall vision of the Future Land Use Map.

On the Generalized Policy Map, the Property is designated as a “Land Use Change Area.” Land Use Change Areas “are areas where change to a different land use from what exists today is anticipated.” § 223.9. These areas “include many of the city’s large development opportunity sites.” § 223.10. The Framework Element specifically notes that the Lower Anacostia Waterfront/Near Southwest Area, where the Property is located, is predicted to house 16.5% of the District’s household growth and 20.3% of its job growth. §215.19. The proposed Project on the Property is a quintessential Land Use Change Area development. The Project will take largely vacant and underutilized land and provide office, retail, and housing near a Metrorail station that is pedestrian friendly and enhances a vacant property on the Anacostia River. Therefore, the Project is not inconsistent with the Property’s designation on the Generalized Policy Map.

i. Land Use Element

The Project is not inconsistent with the Land Use Element. The proposed Project advances several policies of the Land Use Element. First, the Land Use Element advises that the Central Employment Area (“CEA”) should include higher density mixed use areas, § 304.8 (LU-1.1.3 Central Employment Area), and that specifically the Near Southeast/Navy Yard area should see “mixed use neighborhoods combining high-density residential, office, [and] retail.” §304.11 (LU-1.1.5 Urban Mixed Use Neighborhoods). Additionally, the Land Use Element encourages a “mix of new uses on large redeveloped sites,” §305.7 (LU-1.2.2 Mix of Uses on Large Sites), including Poplar Point. Finally, the Land Use Element encourages development around Metrorail stations with “the establishment and growth of mixed use centers at Metrorail stations,” §306.10 (LU-1.3.1 Station Areas as Neighborhood Centers), including supplying housing and affordable housing around Metrorail stations. §306.12 (LU-1.3.3 Housing Around Metrorail Stations). Here, the

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Project presents a large site within the CEA ideal for high-density mixed use as proposed by the Project. The Project will provide office, retail, and housing, including affordable housing, in close proximity to a Metrorail station on a currently largely vacant site.

Second, the residential use at the Project meets the goals of “maintaining the multi-family residential character of the District’s Medium- and High- Density residential areas” by taking an underutilized and undeveloped area and developing that property to office, retail, and multi-family residential use at the Property. § 309.15 (LU-2.1.10 Multi-Family Neighborhoods).

The Land Use Element encourages creative parking management to respond to the level of demand and mitigate congestion. §§ 306.15, 309.16, and 312.12 (LU-1.3.6 Parking near Metro Stations, LU-2.1.11 Residential Parking Requirements, and LU-2.4.8 Addressing Commercial Parking Impacts). The Element focuses developments on placing “a priority on attractive, pedestrian-friendly design and a de-emphasis on auto-oriented uses and surface parking.” §306.4 (LU-1.3 Transit-Oriented and Corridor Development). The Project meets the objectives of the Land Use Element by offering an appropriate amount of below-grade parking for residents, visitors, and employees of the Project. The Property is also located adjacent to a major Metrorail station, and as part of the Project the Applicant proposes improvements to the Metrorail station to help make the Poplar Point area truly transit-oriented.

ii. Transportation Element

The Project is not inconsistent with the Transportation Element. The Transportation Element encourages pedestrian-oriented development around transit stations, § 403.1 (T-1.1.4 Transit-Oriented Development) and discourages auto-oriented uses such as “drive-through” business, and large surface parking lots, § 404.8 (T-1.2.3 Discouraging Auto-Oriented Uses). Additionally, the element encourages “transit-oriented and transit-accessible employment throughout the region.” §405.11 (T-1.3.1 Transit-Accessible Employment). The Project is a model transit-oriented development and adds none of the auto-oriented features the Comprehensive Plan seeks to discourage. As discussed, the Project is located in close proximity to the Anacostia Metrorail station and multiple bus lines at the Metrorail station. Therefore, the site encourages residents, students, and employees to take public transit based on the convenient location and opportunity to do so. Further, the Project will provide below-grade parking at the Property, but will not employ any auto-oriented uses such as large surface parking lots. This enables the Project to account for traffic generated by the Project, while still encouraging pedestrian access to the site, thus furthering the Transportation Element’s policies. Finally, the Project includes numerous improvements related to bicycles, including bike lanes, long and short term bicycle parking, and connection to the overall DC bicycle network, thus advancing the Element’s policies regarding bicycle integration and safety. §§409.8-10 (T-2.3.1 Better Integration of Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning; T-2.3.2 Bicycle Network; T-2.3.3 Bicycle Safety).

iii. Housing Element and Economic Development Element

Z.C. ORDER NO. 16-29

Z.C. CASE NO. 16-29

Page 26

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

The Project is not inconsistent with the Housing Element or the Economic Development Element. By having numerous residential units, the Project “provide[s] new housing to meet the needs of present and future District residents at locations consistent with District land use policies and objectives.” § 503.2 (H-1.1.1 Private Sector Support). The specific location of the Project in a vacant area on the Anacostia waterfront in close proximity to the Anacostia Metrorail station fulfills the Housing Element’s goal of “promot[ing] mixed use development, including housing, on commercially zoned land, particularly . . . around appropriate Metrorail stations,” § 503.5 (H-1.1.4 Mixed Use Development). The Project specifically provides “new high-density housing in Central Washington and along the Anacostia River,” §503.7 (H-1.1.6 Housing in the Central City) with a “new neighborhood developed on [a] large site.” §503.8 (H-1.1.7 New Neighborhoods). The ground-floor retail use at the Project “create[s] additional shopping opportunities in Washington’s neighborhood commercial districts to better meet the demand for basic goods and services.” §708.7 (ED-2.2.3 Neighborhood Shopping). This mixed-use development will “promote the vitality and diversity of Washington’s neighborhood commercial areas.” §713.5 (ED-3.1.1 Neighborhood Commercial Vitality).

iv. Urban Design Element

The Project is not inconsistent with the Urban Design Element. The Project furthers the Element’s goal of creating “neighborhood centers . . . that reinforce community identity” by creating an “urban square [that] stimulate[s] vibrant pedestrian street life and provide[s] a focus for community activities.” § 910.9 (UD-2.2.3 Neighborhood Centers); §913.15 (UD-3.1.8 Neighborhood Public Space). The Project “creates [an] attractive and interesting commercial streetscape” that will make the Property a place-maker for this area of the District. The Project also “protects major views in the city,” §904.6 (UD-1.2.4 View Protection) in the way it designed the “buildings . . . and pedestrian walkways on or near [a] waterfront site.” §905.10 (UD-1.3.5 River Views). Finally, the Project considers “not only the site itself, but the broader context presented by surrounding neighborhoods,” §911.6 (UD-2.33 Design Context for Planning Large Sites) by designing and anticipating “a street grid that is more compatible with the texture of Washington’s neighborhoods.” §911.4 (UD-2.3.2 Large Site Scale and Block Patterns).

v. Lower Anacostia Waterfront/Near Southwest Area Element

The Property is within the Lower Anacostia Waterfront/Near Southwest Area Element. This element encourages the exact kind of mixed-use development contemplated by the Project – “Create new mixed use neighborhoods on vacant or underutilized waterfront lands. . . . new neighborhoods should be developed at . . . Poplar Point.” §1908.3 (AW-1.1.2 New Waterfront Neighborhoods). The Element also encourages “bring[ing] more retail services and choices to the Anacostia Waterfront as well as space for government and private sector activities, such as offices.” §1908.4 (AW-1.1.3 Waterfront Area Commercial Development), which the Project provides in significant amounts.

Specifically, for the Poplar Point area, the Area Element prioritizes creating “a new transit-oriented mixed use neighborhood . . . linked to the Anacostia Metrorail station. . . . [which]

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

include[s] a significant component of affordable housing, . . . retail . . . [and] segments of the future development . . . devoted entirely to office use to encourage location of Federal office space and other office space.” §1914.9 (AW-2.4.3 Poplar Point Mixed Use Neighborhood). The Project provides all of these uses as contemplated by the Area Element. Further, the scale of the development is consistent with the Area Element as it “recognizes the area’s proximity to a Metrorail station and other major surface arterials and that the area is physically separated from surrounding neighborhoods and, therefore, may accommodate buildings and site plans unlike but compatible with the fine-grained pattern found in nearby Historic Anacostia.” §1914.11 (AW-2.4.5 Scale of Development at Poplar Point). Finally, the Project will “capitalize on significant views to the river and U.S. Capitol,” §1914.12 (AW-2.4.6 Poplar Point Vista and View Preservation) and will “bring economic development opportunities to adjacent neighborhoods.” §1914.13 (AW-2.4.7 Poplar Point as an Economic Catalyst). The Project will create a truly mixed use, vitalizing development for the underutilized area as the start of future development in this area of the District.

84. Taken as a whole, the Project is not inconsistent with the District or Area Elements of the Plan or with the objectives of other adopted public policies applicable to the Property. There are individual objectives in these site-specific plans that the Project either does not address or does not substantially advance. Planning policy documents by their very nature are comprehensive and occasionally internally contradictory. However, the Project is not inconsistent with the broad public planning objectives for Ward 8.
85. The Commission finds that there were no particularized allegations of inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan raised by OP, the ANC or any other agency, party or person. Therefore, for the reasons set forth more fully above the Commission finds that the Applications, including the Map Amendment, is not inconsistent with the Plan.

Project Impacts

86. For the following reasons, the Commission finds that the Project does not result in unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area or on the operation of District services and facilities but instead is either favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable given the quality of Public Benefits.

i. Zoning and Land Use.

- (a) From a land use perspective, the Project creates no unacceptable impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. Any impacts from the Project’s proposed land use are either favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable given the quality of the significant public benefits included as part of the Project. The Project will create prime office, residential, and retail space in an undeveloped area within the Central Employment Area in close proximity to a major Metrorail station, including affordable housing. The height and density of the Project are appropriate given the proximity to transit, the Comprehensive Plan’s

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Future Land Use Map designation, and the avoidance of adverse impacts on nearby residential areas. The Project will improve the Poplar Point area and begin the overall area development, including beginning the street grid and utility improvements needed for the area. The Project will have a positive land use impact that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other planning goals of the District of Columbia.

- (b) The Applicant requests a Zoning Map Amendment for the Property to the MU-9 Zone District. This proposed zone plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan locates the Property in the Mixed Use High Density Residential/High Density Commercial, as well as Institutional, land use categories, and the Property is located within the Central Employment Area. At the Property, the Applicant proposes a truly mixed-use development with robust office, residential, and retail uses. The proposed MU-9 zoning is necessary to accommodate these uses at the proposed height and density. The Comprehensive Plan explicitly lists the proposed MU-9 Zone District as consistent with the High Density Commercial designation. § 225.9. Additionally, the MU-9 Zone is generally described as a zone that permits high density development, specifically located in the Central Employment Area. The Property is located in the Central Employment Area and ripe for high-density development. Accordingly, the proposed rezoning of the Property to the MU-9 Zone District is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
 - (c) The Project's introduction of additional retail helps attract and retain a critical mass of commercial uses in the neighborhood. This effect is a favorable land use impact of the Project. The proposed retail uses create economic opportunities and continue the stabilization of the neighborhood. The contribution of new, high-quality multifamily housing units to Ward 8 has additional positive impacts on the surrounding areas. Moreover, the Project's conversion of underutilized lots to productive and active uses, and the creation of a thoughtfully-designed pedestrian space also has positive impacts.
 - (d) To the extent there are any ancillary unfavorable land use impacts arising out of the Project, such impacts are either mitigated by the Project's design or offset by the quality of the Public Benefits associated with this Project.
- ii. Transportation and Mobility Impacts. The Commission credits the testimony of the Applicant's traffic consultant and DDOT and finds that the traffic, parking, and other transportation impacts of the Project on the surrounding area are capable of being mitigated through the measures proposed by the Applicant and are acceptable given the quality of public benefits of the PUD.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- (a) The Project will not have an adverse impact on the facilities that it will rely on for service. The Anacostia Metrorail station is adjacent to the Property. Numerous Metrobus lines also service the site via the Anacostia Metrorail station, and it is expected that many of the Project's occupants and visitors will use public transit. The Project also over 900 parking spaces to accommodate the parking demand of residents, employees, and visitors who may choose to drive to the Project. Bicycle usage will also be coherently integrated into the design of the Project, including the bicycle lanes on the streets, connecting into the overall D.C. bike network, and providing both long term spaces and short term spaces in connection with the Project.
 - (b) The Applicant's traffic expert submitted a detailed comprehensive transportation review ("CTR") evaluating proposed transportation impacts of the Project. The Project includes a robust TDM plan to mitigate any transportation impacts. To the extent the Project creates transportation or mobility impacts on the neighborhood or District more generally, they are either capable of being mitigated through the TDM or acceptable given the quality of the Public Benefits.
- iii. Project Impacts on City Services and Project Environmental Impacts. The Project does not have any adverse impacts on the public facilities or District services that it relies on for service. Likewise, the Project does not have adverse environmental impacts.
- (a) Water Demand. The Project contains approximately 2,358,380 square feet of new GFA. The average daily water demand for this Project can be met by the existing District water system. The proposed connection for the fire and residential water supply will be made within the existing distribution system and will be coordinated with DC Water. The Project has multiple individual water meters.
 - (b) Sanitary Sewer Demand. The proposed connection for the sanitary sewer line will be made with the existing distribution system and will be coordinated with the D.C. Department of Public Works and the D.C. Water and Sewer Authority.
 - (c) Stormwater Management. The project will meet or exceed the current stormwater management requirements of the D.C. Department of the Environment. The proposed Best Management Practices for water quality will be designed and constructed in compliance with the standards set by the D.C. Department of Public Works, the D.C. Department of the Environment, and the D.C. Water and Sewer Authority.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- (d) Solid Waste Services. Solid waste and recycling materials generated by the Project are to be collected regularly by a private trash collection contractor.
 - (e) Electrical Services. Electricity for the new building is provided by Pepco in accordance with its usual terms and conditions of service. All electrical systems are designed to comply with the D.C. Energy Code. Transformers will be installed on the Property in accordance with Pepco's design guidelines.
 - (f) Energy Conservation. The Project is designed in full compliance with Article 24 (Energy Conservation) of the Building Code. Conformance to code standards minimize the amounts of energy needed for the heat, ventilation, hot water, electrical distribution, and lighting systems contained in the building. The Project will include features attaining LEED-Gold certification for the Project.
 - (g) Erosion Control. During excavation and construction, erosion on the Property will be controlled in accordance with District law.
- iv. Other Impacts. The findings related to issues raised by the ANC, other agencies, Otten and the Commission includes additional discussion on the Project's impacts and the Commission's balancing thereof. In sum, the Project's impacts are either capable of being mitigated or not unacceptable in light of the Public Benefits.

Public Benefits

87. The objective of the PUD process is to encourage high-quality development that provides public benefits and amenities by allowing greater flexibility in planning and design than may be possible under matter-of-right zoning. X § 305.1.
88. The Project achieves the goals of the PUD process by creating a high quality mixed-use commercial development with significant related Public Benefits. The Commission finds that the Project includes the following Public Benefits, which are not inconsistent with the Plan as a whole with respect to the Property.
89. Subtitle X, Section 305.4 requires that a majority of the public benefits of the proposed PUD relate to the geographic area of the ANC in which the application is proposed. Findings with respect to the geographic effect of the Public Benefits are addressed in the following paragraphs. In general, the Public Benefits relate to the area of the ANCs.
90. The Applicant, in its written submissions and testimony before the Commission, noted that the following benefits and amenities will be created as a result of the Project, in satisfaction of the enumerated PUD standards in X Section 304- 305:
- (a) Housing and Transit Based Housing

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Pursuant to Section 305.5(f) of Subtitle X of the Zoning Regulations, the production of housing is a public benefit that the PUD process is designed to encourage. The Project will create approximately 700 new residential units, including 3-bedroom units, within a 1/8 mile from the Anacostia Metro station plaza entrance. There is currently no housing at the Property, and therefore the Project will create all new housing in an underserved area, totaling approximately 691,590 gross square feet of new housing. (Ex. 2, 38, 38A1, 38A2)

(b) Affordable Housing

Pursuant to Section 305.3(g) of Subtitle X, the production of affordable housing above what is required under the Inclusionary Zoning (“IZ”) regulations is considered a public benefit of a PUD project. The Applicant will devote 10% of the residential gross floor area to affordable Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) units at both 50% and 60% AMI. The unit mix and income distribution of the units will be as follows: 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be programmed with 3 bedroom units with half at 50% AMI and half at 60% AMI. The three-bedroom affordable units will serve larger families at the Project. The remaining 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be proportional to the gross floor area reflected in the market unit mix at 60% AMI. The market unit mix will be determined during the planning and design of Phase 2 with the delivery of the first residential building. The Applicant will provide residential penthouse IZ at 8% of the total habitable penthouse space at 50% AMI. The Applicant will provide a housing trust fund payment for habitable space on the roof of the offices. (38, 38A1, 38A2).

(c) Superior Urban Design and Architecture

Section 305.5(a) of Subtitle X lists urban design and architecture as categories of public benefits and project amenities for a PUD. The proposed Project exhibits many characteristics of exemplary urban design. Specific features include the use of a variety of public spaces, redesigning the streetscape and providing public access to new private streets, well-designed sidewalks with street trees and active storefronts along Howard Road SE, and well-located and carefully designed parking garages, loading zones, alleys, and private streets for not only the Project but also future development of nearby properties.

The Project also features exceptional architectural design. The Property's prominence on the Anacostia River, proximity to the Monumental Core of Washington across the river, and position as a primary point of entry and departure from the Anacostia community are reflected in the proposed architectural massing of the Project. The whole of the mass sits comfortably at the base of Washington's green topographic bowl and relates strongly to downtown. The east and west ends of the buildings clearly reflect their importance as gateways, and are scaled to read as such from both near and far. To the north of Howard Road, the Project is broken into three distinct volumes separated by private streets, welcoming future development of Poplar Point anticipated by the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative. At

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

the same time, the development is sensitive to maintaining views of the river from the community.

The architectural design is clean, classic, and contemporary. The gateway ends of the Project are treated as light and transparent volumes, and the glassy facades facing west to the river will reflect their relationship to the water. Office uses face west to downtown, and residential uses face east to Anacostia. All of the buildings are urban in character, and within the Project their focus is on creating a positive urban street presence. A clearly defined retail base and streetscape will enhance the pedestrian scale and environment. The Metrorail entrance improvements proposed by the Applicant further enhance the Project's connection to the greater community. (Exhs. 2 – 2I13, 13- 13B, 21-21B, 38A1-38A2, 44A1-44A10).

(d) Streetscape Plans

Section 305.5(l) of Subtitle X states that streetscape plans are considered to be public benefits and project amenities of a PUD. In order to capitalize on the pedestrian activity generated by the office, retail, and residential features of the Project, the Applicant has proposed significant streetscape improvements as a key benefit and amenity of the Project. The existing streetscape is dilapidated and needs complete redesign. The Applicant proposes to completely redesign the streetscape with appropriate sidewalks. Further, as part of the Project, the Applicant proposes to create private streets with public easements for access not only to the Project, but for future access to adjacent properties. The Howard Road frontage will be created in a manner that is place-making, creating a destination point in the community. Streetscape enhancements will include street trees and special paving features. Additionally, the Project will include regrading and replacing and undergrounding all of the utility lines along Howard Road SE in front of the Property.

The Applicant proposes other streetscape improvements related to the Project that will also significantly improve pedestrian access along this key gateway location. The Applicant will replace the existing streetscape with new improvements that include new street trees and other plantings to create more defined, attractive pedestrian access. Finally, the Applicant is proposing significant bicycle-related streetscape improvements, including bicycle lanes along Howard Road SE and a greater bicycle connection to the Anacostia Riverwalk Trail and the bicycle lanes in the District. (Exhs. 2 – 2I13, 13- 13B, 21-21B, 38A1-38A2, 44A1-44A10).

(e) Site Planning, and Efficient and Economical Land Utilization

Pursuant to Section 305.5(c) of Subtitle X of the Zoning Regulations, "site planning and efficient and economical land utilization" are public benefits and project amenities to be evaluated by the Zoning Commission. The site is currently underutilized and fails to capitalize on its proximity to the Anacostia Metrorail station. The site currently has little activity and does not encourage any pedestrian access. The proposed Project has been designed to provide residents, customers,

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

employees, and visitors with open and inviting public and private spaces for entertainment and relaxation as detailed above. Additionally, the proposed private streets and alleys will be designed for future, adjacent development. The Project transforms an underutilized and inactive area into an attractive 21st century mixed-use development. (Exhs. 2 – 2I13, 13- 13B, 21-21B, 38A1-38A2, 44A1-44A10).

(f) Environmental and Sustainability Benefits

Section 305.5(k) of Subtitle X states that environmental benefits are considered to be public benefits and project amenities of a PUD. The Project will provide a number of environmental benefits that improve sustainability of the site and contribute to the sustainability of the neighborhood. These sustainability features include a commitment to achieve LEED v.4 Gold for all of the buildings, capitalizing on the strategic potential of a transit-oriented location proximate to a Metrorail station, updating existing utilities, and planting additional street trees. The Applicant will provide rooftop solar panels that will generate an estimated 436,626 kwh. Additionally, the Applicant proposes to underground the utilities along the Howard Road SE street frontage. The Applicant proposes to clean up the contaminated Property by removing hazardous materials, contaminated soils, and underground tanks in connection with each of the development phases. Additionally, the Applicant will follow a design and build strategy to avoid development in the 100- and 500- year floodplain and will refine the conceptual stormwater management plan to generate additional retention volume. (Exhs. 2 – 2I13, 13- 13B, 21-21B, 38A1-38A2, 44A1-44A10).

(g) Uses of Special Value

Subtitle X, Section 303.5(q) lists uses of special value to the neighborhood or the District of Columbia as a whole as public benefits and project amenities of a PUD. The Project will provide the following uses of special value:

- i. Ground Floor Retail: The proposed Project will provide approximately 52,120 square feet of ground-floor retail uses as well as streetscape improvements along the Project frontage, which have been previously recognized by the Commission as uses of special value. The Project will also create much-needed jobs in an underutilized area in the District.
- ii. Additional Retail Amenities and Services: The Applicant anticipates offering neighborhood serving retail amenities and services or other street activating uses, including pop-up retail amenities.
- iii. Transformation of adjacent vacant property: Situated adjacent to Building A at the western gateway to the Columbian Quarter PUD, DDOT owns 40,689 SF of vacant land on Square 5860 /Lot 0937. The Applicant shall collaborate with DDOT and

Z.C. ORDER NO. 16-29

Z.C. CASE NO. 16-29

Page 34

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

other DC agencies to determine viable options to transform the adjacent vacant property for future placemaking opportunities by incorporating buildings with ground floor retail or street activating uses that serves the neighborhood, activates the streetscape and seamlessly connects with the larger urban form.

(h) Mass Transit Improvements: In addition, the Applicant has engaged in discussions with the community and the District Department of Transportation (“DDOT”), as well as the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (“WMATA”) regarding the Anacostia Metrorail station. The Metrorail station is in great need of improvements. The Applicant proposes, as part of the Project, to assist in improving the Anacostia Metrorail station, including improvements to the entrance to the station nearest the Project.

(i) Open Space and Recreation Space

- The Applicant shall provide significant open space at the Property, including in the private streets the Applicant is committing to create off of Howard Road. These private streets occupy approximately 11,000 square feet at the Property. Given the FAR of the Project, this foregoes almost 100,000 square feet of development potential to provide open space and connecting points to future development in the area. This open space will break up the massing of the Project and create a natural urban design that avoids a monolithic superblock.
- Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first building, the Applicant shall work with NPS WMATA, OP, DDOT, DPR, ANC 8A and ANC 8C to optimize open space and recreation placemaking opportunities throughout the Project as well as adjacent parks and underutilized land. The design of the open space and recreation improvements shall include a collaborative public charrette process of the Applicant's design team, local neighborhood families, ANC Commissioners, NPS, WMATA and DC public agencies, including OP.
- The Applicant shall provide outdoor open space courts at and above grade in buildings A, B, D and E. In addition, all 5 building will have programmed rooftop amenities within the outdoor open spaces. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for each of these buildings, the Applicant shall deliver these open space courts and amenities.
- The Applicant shall create a community pocket park adjacent to the Metrostation plaza entrance.
- The Project is directly adjacent to the 1,108- acre Anacostia Park managed by the National Park Service. On November 12, 2017, National Capital

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Region Director Bob Vogel signed a Finding of No Significant Impact selecting Alternative #3 of the Anacostia Management Plan/Environmental Assessment as the final plan that provides a framework on how the National Park Service will manage Anacostia Park's natural and cultural resources and shape how people experience Anacostia Park for the next two decades. As a neighbor and partner with the National Park Service, the Applicant shall continue to work with the National Park Service on increasing the opportunities to leverage the Anacostia Park's natural, cultural and recreational amenities for the neighborhood's use and enjoyment.

(j) Employment and Career Training Opportunities

The Applicant shall provide workforce career development and job opportunities at the Project for Ward 8 residents, including the following:

- Applicant shall engage in a partnership with DMPED's Ward 8 Works Program to connect Ward 8 residents with preconstruction and construction jobs on the Project in Ward 8. As one of the largest real estate and community developers in Ward 8, the Applicant is taking an active role in participating on the Ward 8 Works Program's Orange Core Team. Through a series of planning meetings in the summer and fall of 2017, the Applicant will be updating DMPED and participants on specific Ward 8 Works development and construction projects, with hiring timelines and the types of jobs that will be available at the Project.
- Applicant shall offer a one-year professional internship opportunity in the real estate professional field for a Ward 8 high school and college rising senior. By the end of the 2017-18 school year, the Applicant will offer an internship to an Anacostia or Ballou 11th grade High School student living in Ward 8 and a college student who graduated from Anacostia or Ballou High School. The mentoring and internship program will focus on all aspects of Stage One PUD development, including acquisitions, zoning and land use law, design, development, pre-construction, construction, marketing and branding, leasing, property management and asset management. Through Redbrick LMD's departments and development partners, the high school and college student will be mentored and trained by the leading real estate experts in the Washington, DC area.
- Applicant shall create construction jobs during the 5-10-year predevelopment and construction period build-out of the Project. Through the Ward 8 Works Program and Redbrick LMD's Construction Apprenticeship Program, Ward 8 residents will have the opportunity for immediate and long-term employment opportunities in the construction field. By the time of the first construction closing in Phase 1, the Applicant will commit to hiring a Ward 8 resident to participate in a hands-on, twoyear apprenticeship program with the general contractor and developer that will

Z.C. ORDER NO. 16-29

Z.C. CASE NO. 16-29

Page 36

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

focus on all aspects of construction during first construction phase of the Project.

- Through Redbrick LMD's Real Estate Professional Service Internship Program, Ward 8 residents will have the opportunity for long-term employment opportunities in the residential property management field. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first residential building, the Applicant will commit to hiring a Ward 8 resident to participate in a hands-on, one-year internship program with the property manager and developer that will focus on all aspects of residential property management during the leasing and stabilization of the first residential building at the Project.

(k) Historic and Archeological Preservation

- The Applicant will work in partnership with the Historic Anacostia Preservation Society and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to support and implement solutions for the benefit of the Historic Anacostia District that preserve the historic character and fabric of the neighborhood.
- The Applicant will also complete a consolidated Phase IA Cultural Resources Investigation / Phase IB Archaeological Survey. The Applicant's archaeological Phase IA work plan, including cut-and-fill and geomorphology analysis, will be submitted for SHPO approval before the Phase IA assessment commences in 2018. Dr. Ruth Troccoli, District Archaeologist at the Office of Planning, requested that the Phase IB be completed prior to site grading work for bridge staging and other uses. The Applicant anticipates the completion of the consolidated Phase IA-B work plan and report by spring 2018.
- Depending on the Phase IA-B report findings, Dr. Troccoli and Applicant shall work together on a Phase II work plan, report and appropriate mitigation measures as part of the Project's archaeological public benefits. In coordination with solutions to benefit the Historic Anacostia District, potential benefits include providing historic neighborhood property markers and virtual web tour as a part of the existing African American Heritage Trail program prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first residential building.

(l) Effective and safe vehicular and pedestrian access, transportation management measures, connections to public transit service, and other measures.

- The Applicant shall establish a TDM program in cooperation with DDOT.
- The Applicant shall underground utilities at the Project.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- The Applicant shall implement the following transportation improvements prior to the initial certificate of occupancy for the phase of the project that triggers the need for the improvement, as determined by traffic studies conducted for each Stage 2 PUD
- (i) Prepare a traffic signal warrant study for the Suitland Parkway/Howard Road intersection and, if warranted, install a traffic signal at the intersection, subject to DDOT permit approval.
- (ii) Modify the traffic signal at the intersection of Howard Road and Firth Sterling Avenue to include a northbound advance left turn phase on Howard Road with a concurrent eastbound right turn overlap, subject to DDOT permit approval.
- (iii) Modify the traffic signal at the intersection of Firth Sterling Avenue and Suitland Parkway to include a eastbound advance left turn phase on Firth Stirling Avenue and a southbound right turn overlap to run concurrently with the westbound left turn phase, subject to DDOT permit approval.
- (iv) Restripe Sumner Road SE to provide separate eastbound left and right turn lanes at its approach to Martin Luther King Junior Avenue, subject to DDOT permit approval. The removal of approximately three to four parking spaces will be required to accommodate the separate turn lanes.

Consistency of the Public Benefits with the Plan

91. The Commission also finds that the Project's Public Benefits are not inconsistent with the Plan because each is an integral part of the Project, which itself is not inconsistent with the Plan. Moreover, such Public Benefits are each tangible, quantifiable, measurable, or capable of being completed or arranged prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the Project.

92. Accordingly, the Project satisfies the PUD Evaluation Standards.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Procedural and Jurisdictional Conclusions

1. A PUD application must adhere to certain procedural requirements. X § 307.1; Z §§ 205, 300, 400-08, 600-06, 700-707. This Commission must hear any PUD in accordance with the contested case procedures of Subtitle Z, Chapter 4. X § 300.3. This Commission has found and hereby concludes: (i) the Application satisfies the PUD application requirements, and (ii)

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

the Applicant, OZ, OP, and this Commission have satisfied the applicable procedural requirements, including the applicable notice requirements of the Zoning Regulations.

- i. The minimum area included within a proposed PUD must be no less than 15,000 sf and all such area must be contiguous. X § 301. The Application satisfies these minimum area and contiguity requirements.
 - ii. The Application is subject to compliance with the D.C. Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended, D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.01 *et seq.* (the “Act”).
2. A request for party status must satisfy the requirements of Subtitle Z, Chapter 4, § 404. This Commission has found and hereby concludes that the request for party status of CARE does not satisfy the requirements. The request for party status of CARE is both untimely and has not “clearly demonstrated that the person's interests would likely be more significantly, distinctively, or uniquely affected in character or kind by the proposed zoning action than those of other persons in the general public” as required under Subtitle Z, Chapter 4, § 404.14.

Evidentiary Standards

3. The Applicant has the burden of proof to justify the granting of the Application according to the PUD and Map Amendment standards. X §§ 304.2, 500.2. The Commission’s findings in relation to a PUD must be supported by substantial evidence. *See Howell v. District of Columbia Zoning Comm’n.*, 97 A.3d 579 (DC 2014). Substantial evidence is defined as “such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support” the conclusions contained herein. *D.C. Library Renaissance Project v. District of Columbia Zoning Comm’n.*, 73 A.3d 107, 125 (DC 2013). The Applicant’s filings, testimony, and expert witness presentations are credible and thorough and reasonably adequate to support the Commission’s analysis and conclusions contained herein. Accordingly, the Applicant has provided substantial evidence to demonstrate that the Project satisfies the relevant PUD evaluation standards.
4. The Commission is required to give “great weight” to the issues and concerns of the affected ANC. D.C. Code § 1-309.10(d)(3)(A). This Commission has considered the written and oral testimony from ANC 8A and ANC 8C and in so doing fully credited the unique vantage point that ANC 8A and ANC 8C hold with respect to the impact of the proposed application on the ANCs’ constituents. The Commission concludes that the Applicant appropriately engaged in dialogue with ANC 8A and ANC 8C and thoroughly addressed the issues and concerns of ANC 8A and ANC 8C. The Commission affords great weight to ANC 8A and ANC 8C’s recommendation for approval of the Application, and concurs with ANC 8A and ANC 8C’s recommendation.
5. The Commission is also required to give great weight to the written reports of OP. D.C. Code § 6-623.04; Z § 405.8. This Commission has reviewed the OP Setdown Report, and OP Final Report and heard testimony from OP and finds that OP supports the Application. The

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Commission gives great weight to OP's recommendation to approve the Application and the Commission concludes it has properly granted OP's reports the great weight they are due.

Consistency with the PUD Process, Zoning Regulations, and Plan

6. Pursuant to the Zoning Regulations, the purpose of the PUD process is "to provide for higher quality development through flexibility in building controls, including building height and density, provided that a PUD: (a) Results in a project superior to what would result from the matter-of-right standards; (b) Offers a commendable number or quality of meaningful public benefits; and (c) Protects and advances the public health, safety, welfare, and convenience, and is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan." X § 300.1.
7. The PUD process is intended to "provid[e] for greater flexibility in planning and design than may be possible under conventional zoning procedures, [but] the PUD process shall not be used to circumvent the intent and purposes of the Zoning Regulations, or to result in action that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan." X § 300.2.
8. The Commission concludes (i) the application satisfies the PUD application requirements and (ii) the Applicant, Office of Zoning, OP, and the Commission have satisfied the applicable procedural requirements, including the applicable notice requirements of the Zoning Regulations.
9. This Commission has found that the Project generally conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations except for the few areas of articulated relief, which are nonetheless consistent with the intent and purposes of the Zoning Regulations. The Project is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, this Commission concludes that the Project does not circumvent the Zoning Regulations and is not inconsistent with the Plan. This Commission concludes that the approval of the Application is an appropriate result of the PUD process. The Project is a high-quality mixed-use development that is superior to what could be constructed on the Property as a matter-of-right via the underlying zoning. This Commission has found that the Public Benefits are meaningful and are commendable both in number and quality. Finally, this Commission has found that the Project does not injure but instead advances the public health, safety, welfare or convenience, and is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation Standards

10. The Commission must evaluate the Map Amendment request and approve it only if it is not inconsistent with the Plan. X §§ 500.1, 500.3. The Commission has judged, balanced, and reconciled the relative value of the project amenities and public benefits offered, the degree of development incentives requested (including the proposed map amendment), and any potential adverse effects, and concludes the approval of the PUD is warranted.
11. As part of a PUD application, the Commission may, in its discretion, grant relief from any building development standard or other standard (except use regulations). X §§ 303.1, 303.11. The Applicant seeks flexibility to vary the phasing anticipated for the Project, vary interim uses at the Property while the other phases of the Project are being finalized; and adjust the parking

Z.C. ORDER NO. 16-29

Z.C. CASE NO. 16-29

Page 40

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

downwards if needed to meet market demand, but not below the minimum required by the Zoning Regulations. The Commission has found that such items of relief do not impair the Zoning Purposes and are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission concludes it may exercise its discretion to grant such development incentives subject to the Conditions (as such term is hereinafter defined) hereof.

12. The PUD is within the applicable height and bulk standards of the Zoning Regulations. The proposed height, density, and other PUD-related flexibility will not cause an adverse effect on nearby properties, and will create a more appropriate and efficient utilization of land at a significant transit-oriented location. The mix of residential, retail, and office uses are also appropriate for the site's location.
13. The Zoning Regulations define public benefits as "superior features of a proposed PUD that benefit the surrounding neighborhood or the public in general to a significantly greater extent than would likely result from development of the site under the matter-of-right provisions of this title." X § 305.2. Such public benefits must satisfy the following criteria ("**Public Benefit Criteria**"): (a) benefits must be tangible and quantifiable items; (b) benefits must be measurable and able to be completed or arranged prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy; (c) benefits must primarily benefit the geographic boundaries of the ANC; and (d) monetary contributions shall only be permitted if made to a District of Columbia government program or if the applicant agrees that no certificate of occupancy for the PUD may be issued unless the applicant provides proof to the Zoning Administrator that the items or services funded have been or are being provided. *Id.* §§ 305.3, 305.4. Based on this Commission's findings regarding the Public Benefits as well as the Conditions of this Order, this Commission concludes that the Public Benefits benefit the surrounding neighborhood or the District as a whole to a significantly greater extent than would a matter-of-right development and readily satisfy the Public Benefit Criteria.
14. The PUD provisions require the Commission to evaluate whether the Applications: "(a) [are] not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the subject site; (b) [do] not result in unacceptable project impacts on the surrounding area or on the operation of city services and facilities but instead shall be found to be either favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable given the quality of public benefits in the project; and (c) [include] specific public benefits and project amenities of the proposed development that are not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan or with other adopted public policies and active programs related to the subject site." *Id.* § 304.4. The Commission has reviewed the entire record and issued findings to support its conclusion that the Applications satisfy the PUD Evaluation Standards. In particular, the Commission concludes the Project is not inconsistent with the Plan as a whole, accepts the entirety of the Applicant's impact analysis contained in the record and concludes that the Project does not have any unacceptable impacts. The Commission further concludes that the Project includes the Public Benefits, which are also not inconsistent with the Plan.
15. This Commission must undertake a "comprehensive public review" of the PUD application "in order to evaluate the flexibility or incentives requested in proportion to the proposed public benefits." X § 300.5. In deciding on the Application, this Commission must "judge, balance,

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

and reconcile the relative value of the public benefits project and amenities offered, the degree of development incentives requested, and any potential adverse effects according to the specific circumstances of the case.” X § 304.3.

16. This Commission heard the Application at the Public Hearing and followed the contested case procedures of the Zoning Regulations. This Commission therefore concludes that it has satisfied the procedural requirements in order to review the Application and evaluate the flexibility and Development Incentives requested and potential adverse effects against the proposed Public Benefits in light of the circumstances of the case.
17. The Commission's review of the Application has been comprehensive. The Commission has reviewed the entire record and has identified and examined the concerns and statements about the Project raised by the ANCs and District agencies. The Commission has appropriately considered the substantial evidence presented by the Applicant. The Commission grants appropriate weight to the reports and testimony of the various reviewing District agencies and the ANCs. There are no items in the record that the Commission has excluded from its consideration notwithstanding in some instances this Order does not contain precise citation to such items.
18. The Project warrants the Development Incentives (including the Map Amendment) and flexibility in light of the Project's extensive and comprehensive Public Benefits. The Commission concludes that the Project's Development Incentives are warranted in light of the Public Benefits and the Project's overall consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

DECISION

In consideration of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this Order, the Zoning Commission for the District of Columbia **ORDERS APPROVAL** of the application for consolidated approval of a PUD and related rezoning from the MU-14 Zone District to the MU-9 Zone District for property consisting of Lots 97, 1025-1031, 1036 and 1037 in Square 5860 and a portion of the alley to be closed, Lot 91 in Square 5861 (“Property”). This approval is subject to the following guidelines, conditions, and standards of this Order.

A. Project Development

1. This project shall be developed in accordance with the plans marked as Exhibit 38A1, 38A2, Exhibit 44A1- 44A10, and 51A of the record, as modified by guidelines, conditions, and standards herein and as may be modified by further refinement of the Project design and feedback from OP, DDOT, and the Commission (collectively, “Plans”).

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

2. The Property shall be rezoned from MU-14 to MU-9. Pursuant to 11-X DCMR §311.4, the change in zoning shall be effective upon the recordation of the covenant discussed in Condition No. D.1.
3. The Project shall include a five mixed-use buildings, containing approximately 52,120 gross square feet of retail use, 691,590 gross square feet of residential use comprising approximately 700 residential units, 1,614,670 gross square feet of office use, and approximately 983 vehicular parking spaces, as shown on the Plans
4. The Applicant shall be permitted to construct the Project to a maximum height of 130' and a maximum density of 8.99 FAR.
5. The Applicant shall have flexibility to vary the Phasing anticipated for the Project, vary interim uses at the Property while the other phases of the Project are being finalized, and adjust the parking downwards if needed to meet market demand, but not below the minimum required by the Zoning Regulations.

B. Public Benefits

1. Transit Based and Affordable Housing.
 - a. The Applicant shall provide approximately 700 new residential apartments and/or condos within a 1/8 mile from the newly improved Anacostia Metro station plaza entrance.
 - b. The Applicant shall devote 10% of the residential gross floor area to affordable Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) units at both 50% and 60% AMI. The unit mix and income distribution of the units shall be as follows: 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be programmed with 3BRs with half at 50% AMI and half at 60% AMI. The remaining 50% of the IZ gross floor area will be proportional to the gross floor area reflected in the market unit mix at 60% AMI. The market unit mix will be determined during the planning and design of Phase 2 with the delivery of the first residential building.
 - c. The Applicant shall provide residential penthouse IZ at 8% of the total habitable penthouse space at 50% AMI
 - d. The Applicant shall provide a housing trust fund payment for habitable space on the roof of the offices.
2. Mass Transit Improvements
 - a. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first building, the Applicant shall work with WMATA, OP, DDOT, DPR, ANC 8A and ANC 8C to complete or provide station plaza improvements. The determination of final

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

improvements shall include a public charrette collaborative process of the Applicant's design team, local neighborhood families within 200 feet of the Property, ANC Commissioners, NPS, WMATA and DC public agencies, including the Office of Planning (OP).

- b. Additional actions and improvements taken by the Applicant, in conjunction with WMATA, shall include at least three of the following proffers:
 - i. Facilitate the design of a new Metro Entrance plaza area by demolishing existing vacant buildings and parking deck vehicular ramp and moving the outdoor Kiss n' Ride parking lot
 - ii. Upgraded road, pedestrian and bicycle pathway improvements to Metrorail station from Howard Road SE
 - iii. Enhanced landscaping and hardscaping around the Metrorail entrance plaza area
 - iv. Metrostation amenities and features including DC Bikeshare Station, bike racks, benches, trash receptacles, local art installations
 - v. Integrated potential retail areas within the proposed metro entrance plaza area

3. Uses of Special Value to the Neighborhood.

- a. The Applicant shall incorporate retail use or other street activating uses into each of the Project's buildings. The Applicant has designed the Project to anticipate and foster future ground floor retail development to seamlessly connect the Project's PUD phases.
- b. The Project shall provide over 52,000 square feet of gross floor area of retail use. Retail for each building will be provided in location and size as shown the Plans.
- c. The Applicant anticipates offering neighborhood serving retail amenities and services or other street activating uses, examples include the following:
 - Affordable and Healthy Fast Casual Restaurants in Building A & C, Small Urban Format Grocery Store, Café/Coffee Shop/Eatery, Pharmacy, Bank/ATM, Dry Cleaner, and/or Full Service Day Care Center
- d. The Applicant anticipates offering pop-up retail amenities and services, or other street activating pop-up uses prior to the delivery of the first building, examples include the following:
 - Quarterly pop-up Farmer's Market, Pop-up food, entertainment and music events, Pop-up Diner associated with the farmer's market, Pop-Up Commuter

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Bike Service/Repair/Storage Hub to be offered after approval of the
Columbian Quarter PUD

e. Situated adjacent to Building A at the western gateway to the Columbian Quarter PUD, DDOT owns 40,689 SF of vacant land on Square 5860 /Lot 0937. The Applicant shall collaborate with DDOT and other DC agencies to determine viable options to transform the adjacent vacant property for future placemaking opportunities by incorporating buildings with ground floor retail or street activating uses that serves the neighborhood, activates the streetscape and seamlessly connects with the larger urban form.

4. Open Space and Recreation Space.

a. The Applicant shall provide significant open space at the Property, including in the private streets the Applicant is committing to create perpendicular to Howard Road. These private streets occupy approximately 11,000 square feet at the Property. Given the FAR of the Project, this foregoes almost 100,000 square feet of development potential to provide open space and connecting points to future development in the area. This open space will break up the massing of the Project and create a natural urban design that avoids a monolithic superblock.

b. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first building, the Applicant shall work with NPS WMATA, OP, DDOT, DPR, ANC 8A and ANC 8C to optimize open space and recreation placemaking opportunities throughout the Project as well as adjacent parks and underutilized land. The design of the open space and recreation improvements shall include a collaborative public charrette process of the Applicant's design team, local neighborhood families, ANC Commissioners, NPS, WMATA and DC public agencies, including OP.

c. The Applicant shall provide outdoor open space courts at and above grade in buildings A, B, D and E. In addition, all 5 building will have programmed rooftop amenities within the outdoor open spaces. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for each of these buildings, the Applicant shall deliver these open space courts and amenities.

d. As noted in the Mass Transit Improvements section, the Applicant shall create a community pocket park adjacent to the Metrostation plaza entrance.

e. The Project is directly adjacent to the 1,108- acre Anacostia Park managed by the National Park Service. On November 12, 2017, National Capital Region Director Bob Vogel signed a Finding of No Significant Impact selecting Alternative #3 of the

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

Anacostia Management Plan/Environmental Assessment as the final plan that provides a framework on how the National Park Service will manage Anacostia Park's natural and cultural resources and shape how people experience Anacostia Park for the next two decades. As a neighbor and partner with the National Park Service, the Applicant shall continue to work with the National Park Service on increasing the opportunities to leverage the Anacostia Park's natural, cultural and recreational amenities for the neighborhood's use and enjoyment.

5. Employment and Career Training Opportunities.

- a. Applicant shall engage in a partnership with DMPED's Ward 8 Works Program to connect Ward 8 residents with preconstruction and construction jobs on the Project in Ward 8. As one of the largest real estate and community developers in Ward 8, the Applicant is taking an active role in participating on the Ward 8 Works Program's Orange Core Team. Through a series of planning meetings in the summer and fall of 2017, the Applicant will be updating DMPED and participants on specific Ward 8 Works development and construction projects, with hiring timelines and the types of jobs that will be available at the Project.
- b. Applicant shall offer a one-year professional internship opportunity in the real estate professional field for a Ward 8 high school and college rising senior. By the end of the 2017-18 school year, the applicant will offer an internship to an Anacostia or Ballou 11th grade High School student living in Ward 8 and a college student who graduated from Anacostia or Ballou High School. The mentoring and internship program will focus on all aspects of Stage One PUD development, including acquisitions, zoning and land use law, design, development, pre-construction, construction, marketing and branding, leasing, property management and asset management. Through Redbrick LMD's departments and development partners, the high school and college student will be mentored and trained by the leading real estate experts in the Washington, DC area.
- c. The Applicant shall create construction jobs during the 5-10-year predevelopment and construction period build-out of the Project. Through the Ward 8 Works Program and Redbrick LMD's Construction Apprenticeship Program, Ward 8 residents will have the opportunity for immediate and long-term employment opportunities in the construction field.
- d. By the time of the first construction closing in Phase 1, the Applicant will commit to hiring a Ward 8 resident to participate in a hands-on, two-year apprenticeship program with the general contractor and developer that will focus on all aspects of construction during first construction phase of the Project.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- e. Through Redbrick LMD's Real Estate Professional Service Internship Program, Ward 8 residents will have the opportunity for long-term employment opportunities in the residential property management field. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first residential building, the Applicant will commit to hiring a Ward 8 resident to participate in a hands-on, one-year internship program with the property manager and developer that will focus on all aspects of residential property management during the leasing and stabilization of the first residential building at the Project.

6. Historic and Archaeological Preservation.

- a. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first building, Applicant shall work in partnership with the Historic Anacostia Preservation Society and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to support and implement solutions for the benefit of the Historic Anacostia District that preserve the historic character and fabric of the neighborhood, which include, but are not limited to:

- (i) Reducing displacement of existing residents and allowing low-income seniors to remain in their historic homes.

- (ii) Providing professional services expertise such as architectural, engineering and building sciences in a historic districtwide conditions assessment survey.

- (iii) Assisting in workforce development initiatives for historic preservation trades skill training to create employment opportunities for neighborhood residents.

- (iv) Providing professional expertise and support for the rehab and reuse of vacant and abandoned historic structures, both residential and commercial.

The applicant will leverage the employment and career training opportunities stated above to support and implement solutions for the benefit of the Historic Anacostia District.

- b. The Applicant shall complete a consolidated Phase IA Cultural Resources Investigation / Phase IB Archaeological Survey. The Applicant's archaeological Phase IA work plan, including cut-and-fill and geomorphology analysis, will be submitted for SHPO approval before the Phase IA assessment commences in 2018. The Applicant shall maintain the park or fund such maintenance for the life of the Project.
- c. Dr. Ruth Troccoli, District Archaeologist at the Office of Planning, requested that the Phase IB be completed prior to site grading work for bridge staging and other uses.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

The Applicant anticipates the completion of the consolidated Phase IA-B work plan and report by spring 2018.

- d. Depending on the Phase IA-B report findings, Dr. Troccoli and Applicant shall work together on a Phase II work plan, report and appropriate mitigation measures as part of the Project's archaeological public benefits. In coordination with solutions to benefit the Historic Anacostia District, potential benefits include providing historic neighborhood property markers and virtual web tour as a part of the existing African American Heritage Trail program, prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the first residential building.
- e. The Applicant's cost contribution to the historic and archaeological preservation amenities shall not exceed a value of \$125,000 in cash and in-kind services.

7. Environmental and Sustainable Benefits

- a. The Project shall be designed to satisfy a LEED v.4 Gold rating. The Applicant shall submit a LEED score card prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for each building.
- b. Prior to the issuance of an initial certificate of occupancy for each building's shell and core, the Applicant shall clean up the contaminated Property by removing hazardous materials, contaminated soils, and underground tanks in connection with each of the buildings within the defined development phases 1, 2 and 3.
- c. Applicant shall provide rooftop solar panels as shown on the plans attached hereto as Exhibit 51A that will generate an estimated 436,626 kwh.
- d. The Applicant shall follow a design and build strategy to avoid development in the 100- and 500-year floodplain for a sustainable and resilient Project, including the following: (i) As part of the current first-stage PUD application, the Applicant designed and engineered the building's conceptual footprints and elevations outside of the 100- and 500-year floodplain while simultaneously meeting all the requirements of local and federal regulations, as shown on the Plans.
- e. The Applicant shall refine the conceptual stormwater management plan to generate additional retention volume, capturing stormwater volume up to a 1.7" storm event.

8. Urban Design, Architecture, and Landscaping. The Project shall be developed in accordance with the Plans.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

9. Site Planning, and Efficient and Economical Land Utilization. The Project shall be developed in accordance with the Plans.
10. Effective and safe vehicular and pedestrian access, transportation management measures, connections to public transit service, and other measures.
 - a. The Applicant shall underground utilities at the Project.

C. Mitigation Measures

1. Transportation Demand Management Measures and Transportation Improvements
 - a. Prior to the issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for each building, as applicable, the Applicant shall establish a transportation demand management (TDM) program in cooperation with DDOT, including:
 - (i) Designate a transportation management coordinator
 - (ii) Install transit screens in a common space in each building
 - (iii) Include transportation information on property management website
 - (iv) Provide covered, secure bicycle parking
 - (v) Provide a bicycle repair station provided on P1 level of each garage
 - (vi) Provide two car sharing spaces, subject to agreement by the car sharing provider
 - (vii) Provide shower and changing facilities for office facilities
 - (viii) Designate parking for carpools or vanpools in the garage for the office component
 - (ix) Unbundle the cost of parking from leases
 - (x) Provide personalized outreach to new residents regarding transportation options
 - (xi) Install 19 electric car charging stations provided in the garage on the north and south parcel
 - (xii) Fund the installation and 1st year's operating cost for a new Capital Bikeshare station near the site
 - (xiii) Provide on shopping cart for every 50 resident units

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

- (xiv) Provide one cargo bike for every 100 residential units
 - (xv) Host a biannual meeting with goDCgo to inform residents and employers of commute alternatives
 - (xvi) Provide either one-year car share membership to all new residents over the age of 16 in the first three years after initial delivery of the residential building or provide one-year Capital Bikeshare membership to all new residents over the age of 16 in the first 3 years after initial delivery of the residential building.
- b. The Applicant shall implement the following transportation improvements prior to the initial certificate of occupancy for the phase of the project that triggers the need for the improvement, as determined by traffic studies conducted for each Stage 2 PUD.
- (i) Prepare a traffic signal warrant study for the Suitland Parkway/Howard Road intersection and, if warranted, install a traffic signal at the intersection, subject to DDOT permit approval.
 - (ii) Modify the traffic signal at the intersection of Howard Road and Firth Sterling Avenue to include a northbound advance left turn phase on Howard Road with a concurrent eastbound right turn overlap, subject to DDOT permit approval.
 - (iii) Modify the traffic signal at the intersection of Firth Sterling Avenue and Suitland Parkway to include a eastbound advance left turn phase on Firth Sterling Avenue and a southbound right turn overlap to run concurrently with the westbound left turn phase, subject to DDOT permit approval.
 - (iv) Restripe Sumner Road SE to provide separate eastbound left and right turn lanes at its approach to Martin Luther King Junior Avenue, subject to DDOT permit approval. The removal of approximately three to four parking spaces will be required to accommodate the separate turn lanes.

D. Miscellaneous

1. No building permit shall be issued for this project until the owner of the Property has recorded a covenant among the land records of the District of Columbia between the owner and the District of Columbia that is satisfactory to the Office of the Attorney General and the Zoning Division of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs. Such covenant shall bind the owner of the Property and all successors in title to construct on or use the Property in accordance with this Order and any amendment thereof by the Commission.

Applicant's draft findings of fact and conclusions of law

2. The application approved by this Commission shall be valid for a period of two years from the effective date of this Order. Within such time, an application must be filed for the building permit as specified in 11-Z DCMR §702.2. Construction must begin within three years after the effective date of this Order for the PUD to remain valid.
3. The Applicant shall file with the Zoning Administrator a letter identifying how it is in compliance with the conditions of this Order at such time as the Zoning Administrator requests and shall simultaneously file that letter with the Office of Zoning.
4. The Applicant is required to comply fully with the provisions of the Human Rights Act of 1977, as amended, D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.01, et seq. ("Act") and this Order is conditioned on full compliance with those provisions. In accordance with the Act, the District of Columbia does not discriminate on the basis of actual or perceived: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, familial status, family responsibilities, matriculation, political affiliation, genetic information, disability, source of income, or place of residence or business. Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination, which is also prohibited by the Act. In addition, harassment based on any of the above protected categories is also prohibited by the Act. Discrimination in violation of the Act will not be tolerated. Violators will be subject to disciplinary action.