

November 8, 2021

BY IZIS

Mr. Anthony Hood, Chairperson
D.C. Zoning Commission
441 4th Street NW, Suite 200-S
Washington, DC 20001

Re: Z.C. Case No. 21-13: Application of The Douglass LLC (“Applicant”) for Design Review Approval of a Building located in the Northern Howard Road (“NHR”) Zone – Lot 97, in Square 5860 (the “Property”) – Post-Hearing Submission

Dear Chairperson Hood and Members of the Commission:

On November 1, 2021, the Zoning Commission held a public hearing on the above-referenced application for Design Review of a building located in the NHR Zone. The Applicant plans to construct a mixed-use building with approximately 758 residential units and approximately 45,000 square feet of retail, grocery, and restaurant space at the Property (the “**Project**”). The Applicant hereby responds to the Commission’s comments and questions from the hearing.

I. Updates to Plans

Attached as Exhibit A are additional plan sheets supplementing the plans in the record to address comments and questions from the public hearing (the “**Plans**”). First, in response to comments from the Office of Planning (“**OP**”) and the Commission, the Applicant has adjusted the distribution of the three-bedroom inclusionary zoning (“**IZ**”) units. Specifically, the Applicant has shifted 10 three-bedroom units from an inside corner on the north side of the Project to an outside corner along Howard Road. These new three-bedroom units replace what were previously large two-bedroom units with additional space taken from an adjacent unit. At this new location, each of the units will be provided with balcony. Therefore, the Project will provide 10 of the 28 three-bedroom units on an outside corner along Howard Road with balconies. At the inside corner, where these three-bedrooms were previously located, the

Applicant has created a pair of units, a studio and a one-bedroom. The updated IZ units and unit mix are shown on Sheets A1.01-A1.05 of the Plans.

The Commission also raised concerns regarding the southeast corner's architectural embellishment, noting it seemed too insubstantial. In response, the Applicant has removed the embellishment and replaced it with an eyebrow aligned with the roof edge. This feature maintains the same orienting effect of the tower in this corner in a manner that is more visually substantial. This change is shown on Sheets A2.01-A2.06 of the Plans.

The Applicant has also addressed the Commission's concerns about durability of the lighter materials in Façade Type 1. The Applicant chose the proposed cladding materials with durability and ease-of-maintenance in mind. Discoloration in lighter façade materials is most frequently caused by the use of porous cladding materials like precast or stone. Porous materials allow dirt to seep into the panel and cause staining. In addition, higher moisture content can lead to mold and mildew growth. The cement panels proposed are a non-porous, through-body material, with a smooth face. This material type prevents water and dirt from seeping into the panel and causing discoloration. The smooth surface also prevents dirt from building up and allows for easier cleaning. The Applicant is also committed to a robust maintenance program for the façade which will further reduce the risk of discoloration. However, understanding the Commission's continued concerns, the Applicant has changed the lightest material, which is the pearl white frame on Façade Type 1, to a metal panel. This metal panel has an even smoother surface than the cement panel to further reduce dirt build up. These updated materials are shown on Sheets A4.01-A4.02 of the Plans.

As discussed at the hearing, the Applicant is in discussions with a local brewer to open a brewery and restaurant on the east side of the Project. The potential tenant would like to locate a grain silo outside on the Property as a visual marker for the tenant and the Project. The Commission requested additional information about the potential grain silo, including height and overall size. Sheets A3.01 – A3.05 of the Plans show the relative size and scale of the grain silo at the southern end of the pedestrian promenade. The Applicant requests flexibility to finalize the design of the grain silo, if it is installed, with the tenant, provided it remains of a similar size and scale to what is shown in the Plans.

At the hearing, Commissioner May requested details on how the retail parking for the proposed grocery will be marked and laid out for customers. The proposed garage has been laid out with clear wayfinding and flow as a priority. This design includes the separation of residential and retail parking to avoid commingling. At the bottom of the parking garage ramp, retail patrons will turn left while residential patrons will turn right into separate parking areas. This direction will be reinforced with clear signage and environmental graphic elements. Additionally, retail parkers will have a clear line of sight to the elevators for easy wayfinding. The garage also provides wide drive aisles, full-size parking spaces, and a circulation loop with no dead-ends to allow for the smooth flow of traffic and easy ingress/egress. Finally, the garage will be painted, well-lit, and have clear signage throughout so parkers feel welcome and safe. Shown on Sheet A5.01 of the Plans are details regarding the garage that illustrate these points.

Finally, the Commission asked the Applicant to confirm the proposed promenade, including pedestrian and bicycle access, could be provided on the north side of the Property even if an agreement was not reached with the National Park Service (“NPS”). The Applicant

explained at the hearing that it has dedicated a 20-foot wide area on the north side of the Property to provide a promenade that could function on its own. While ideally the promenade will be a 60-foot area on both the Property and the adjacent NPS land, as shown on Sheets L1.01-L1.04 of the Plans, a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly promenade could be constructed on the Property alone.

II. Additional Exhibits

In addition to the updated Plans, the Applicant is also filing three additional exhibits per the Commission's request. Attached as Exhibit B is the Applicant's racial equity analysis, detailing how the Project furthers racial equity goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Attached as Exhibit C is the updated Transportation Demand Manage Plan ("TDMP") based on the Applicant's coordination with the District Department of Transportation ("DDOT"). As DDOT and the Applicant noted at the hearing, DDOT is in agreement with this revised TDMP. Finally, attached as Exhibit D is the Applicant's draft order for the Project.

III. Conclusion

The Applicant believes that this post-hearing submission addresses all of the outstanding issues raised by the Commission at the hearing and fills the record with all necessary evidence in support of the Project.

Please feel free to contact John at (202) 721-1108 or Meghan at (202) 721-1138 if you have any questions regarding the enclosed. We look forward to the Zoning Commission's consideration of the Project at the November 18, 2021 public meeting.

Sincerely,

/s/

John T. Epting
Meghan Hottel-Cox

Certificate of Service

The undersigned hereby certifies that copies of the foregoing document will be delivered by electronic mail to the following addresses on November 8, 2021.

Office of Planning

Matthew Jesick
matthew.jesick@dc.gov

District Department of Transportation

Aaron Zimmerman
aaron.zimmerman@dc.gov

ANC 8A

c/o Holly Muhammad – ANC 8A Chair
8A@anc.dc.gov
8A01@anc.dc.gov

Robin McKinney – ANC SMD 8A06

8A06@anc.dc.gov

ANC 8C

c/o Salim Adofo, ANC 8C Chair
8C@anc.dc.gov
8C07@anc.dc.gov

Kwasi Seitu – ANC SMD 8C01

8C01@anc.dc.gov

/s/

Meghan Hottel-Cox