


MEMORANDUM

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM:  Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director Development Review & Historic Preservation

DATE: September 15, 2014

**SUBJECT: Second Supplemental Report – Post Hearing Submission
McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Site Planned Unit Development
ZC Case 13-14**

At the July 28, 2014 public hearings on the proposed McMillan Slow Sand Filtration Site Planned Unit Development, the Zoning Commission requested that the Applicant provide additional information on various aspects of the proposed development. The Applicant provided the information in documents dated August 25, 2014 (Exhibit 849). The Office of Planning (OP) is supportive of the following proposed changes: 1) Parcel 1- Healthcare Building Height; 2) Parcel 4 – Reconfigured Loading Facility; and 3) Affordable Housing Mechanism, as detailed below. OP has also responded to the memorandum from National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC) staff under separate cover.

Parcel 1- Healthcare Building Height

The Zoning Commission recommended that the height of the western wing of the Healthcare building be reduced to between 110 feet and 115 feet. The Applicant has proposed to reduce the height from 130 feet (9 stories) to 115 feet (8 stories). With other adjustments, the overall building would now have a height ranging between 101 feet and 115 feet.

The reduction in height necessitated small changes to the design of the building in order to balance the design of its eastern and western wings. In the Applicant's August 25, 2014 submission, the reduction in height resulted in a decrease of 25,000 square feet. In response to concerns expressed by the National Capitol Planning Commission staff in their August 25, 2014 submission (Exhibit 850), regarding the view of the Capitol from Scott Statue at the Armed Forces Retirement Home-Washington (AFRH-W), the Applicant made design changes to the west wing which resulted in a further decrease of 10,000 square feet of space. The total decrease in the size of the building is therefore 35,000 square feet.

The Applicant references the square footage reduction in the written statement but it is not reflected in the FAR calculations in the table shown in Exhibit A, pages 20 and 21. The reduction of 35,000 square feet of space would reduce the overall FAR from 4.08 to 3.92 or 5.29 FAR when Cell 14, Half Street right-of-way and the 1st Street setback are excluded.

The rear yard calculations are based on the height of the building. With the reduction in height, the required rear yard is reduced from a minimum of 27.08 feet to a minimum of 24 feet. The proposal meets the requirement.

The height reduction and the desire to visually balance both wings of the building have resulted in a reconfiguration of the roof structure. However, the roof structures continue to meet the setback requirements.

The Table 1 below outlines the proposed changes.

Table 1

	Required under C-3-C PUD	Proposal	Revised Proposal	Flexibility
Height	130 ft.	102 ft. to 130 ft.	101 ft. to 115 ft.	No
FAR	8.0	4.08 for entire site (4.01 for office uses) (0.07 for retail use) 5.52 without Cell 14, Half Street r.o.w. and 1 st Street setback	3.92 for entire site (3.84 for office uses) (0.07 for retail use) 5.29 Without Cell 14, Half Street r.o.w. and 1st Street setback.	No
Rear Yard	2.5 in./ft. of height or 12 feet, whichever is greater	27.08 ft.	24. ft. minimum	No

OP is supportive of the proposed reduction to 115 feet. The resultant adjustments in FAR and rear yard have not resulted in any additional areas of flexibility being requested and the proposal continues to meet the requirements of the C-3-C PUD zone and the Comprehensive Plan for medium density commercial use.

Parcel 4 – Reconfigured Loading Facility

The Zoning Commission expressed a preference for the residential and grocery store loading to occur on the site with a below grade “drive-in/drive-out” configuration, to alleviate concerns about pedestrian sidewalk movements. The Applicant has stated that due to a number of factors, such as the need to provide a minimum number of parking spaces for a full service grocery store and the size of the block which has been largely dictated by historic preservation issues, the placement of the loading area cannot be placed fully underground. Therefore, the Applicant has sought ways to make Evarts Street more pedestrian friendly while retaining loading movements along the street.

The revised proposal includes the replacement of a large loading dock door with two smaller doors, extending the senior lobby further along Evarts Street and the replacement of the grocery trash and delivery area with new flex space. This should less the amount of blank wall, and result in more active and transparent spaces along Evarts Street. Further, the smaller loading entrances reduce the area of conflict with pedestrians. The turning movements on Evarts Street will be addressed in the DDOT Report.

The reconfiguration of the loading area and the relocation of the grocery trash and delivery areas have resulted in the loss of the residential 20 foot service/delivery space, five retail spaces and three residential parking spaces. The number of residential and retail spaces would continue to be above the requirement. The Applicant has requested flexibility to not provide the residential service/delivery space. The residential use will now share the retail 20 foot service/delivery space which would be monitored by a loading dock manager. OP is not opposed to this.

In the original proposal for the Mixed Use Building, the Applicant requested flexibility from the roof structure setback requirements due to the location of the elevators and the separated entrances for the senior residences and the general residences which results in two sets of stairs/elevators. The location of the over-run for the elevator serving the general residences did not meet the 18.5 foot setback from the edge of the roof on which it sits. In the revised proposal, the setback has been further reduced from 12.58 feet and 13.66 feet to 5.5 feet. The reconfiguration is a result of the adjusted locations of the elevators and the parking/loading areas. The reduction of the setback would not affect the light and air to adjacent building. Table 2 below shows the areas of revision.

	Required under CR PUD	Proposal	Revised Proposal	Flexibility
Parking	<u>Retail:</u> 1 for 1 st 3,000 sf + 1/750 sf. above 3,000 sf. = 68 spaces <u>Residential:</u> 1/3 du = 93 spaces	<u>Retail:</u> 159 spaces <u>Residential:</u> 178 spaces	<u>Retail:</u> 154 <u>Residential:</u> 175	No The proposed number of parking spaces is greater than that required.
Loading	<u>Retail:</u> 1-55 ft. deep berth 1-30 ft. deep berth; 1-200 sf. platform; 1-20 ft. service/delivery space <u>Residential:</u> 1-55 ft. deep berth 1-200 sf. platform; 1-20 ft. service/delivery space.	<u>Retail:</u> 2-73.5 ft. deep berth 2-200 sf. platform; 1-20 ft. service/delivery space <u>Residential:</u> 1-40 ft. deep berth 1-200 sf. platform; 1-20 ft. service/delivery space.	<u>Retail:</u> 2-73.5 ft. deep berth 2-200 sf. platform; 1-20 ft. service/delivery space <u>Residential:</u> 1-40 ft. deep berth 1-200 sf. platform;	Yes The residential use would share the 20 ft. service/delivery space with that provided for the retail use.
Roof Structure	1:1 setback from exterior wall – 18.5 ft.	12.58 ft. and 13.66 ft.	5.5 ft.	Yes The elevator locations have been relocated resulting in changes to the roof structures.

OP is supportive of the reduction in the parking spaces, the sharing of the service/delivery space and the flexibility to reduce the roof structure setback and does not believe they would result in any detrimental effect to the development or the future residents.

Parcel 5 - Affordable Housing Mechanism

In the original submission, the Applicant proposed to provide 10% of the gross residential floor area for persons with incomes of up to 80% of AMI as a proffered benefit. This equates to 18 units or 12% of the 146 rowhouse units.

Through its August 25, 2015 supplemental submission, the Applicant has increased the number of affordable units. Although Inclusionary Zoning would not apply, the Applicant is proposing to increase the number of units to 12.25% of the gross residential area, or 22 rowhouses. Nine of the rowhouses would be at or below 50% of Area Median Income (AMI) and 13 units would be at between 50% and 80% of AMI. OP is supportive of this increase in the number of affordable units as well as providing units at deeper affordable levels. The number of units and the levels of affordability would be for the life of the development.

Recommendation

The Office of Planning recommends approval of the application, including design revisions and all proffered benefits and amenities.