

February 25, 2016

VIA IZIS

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

Re: Z.C. Case No. 15-12 – Applicant’s Post-Hearing Submission

Dear Chairman Hood and Members of the Commission:

The Commission held a public hearing for the above-referenced case on February 4, 2016. At the conclusion of that hearing, the Commission voted in proposed action to approve the application but requested that the Applicant respond to several outstanding issues.

Responses to the stated issues are discussed in turn below.

1. Material and Design Changes

A. *Rear elevation materials*

The Applicant removed the white EIFS and replaced it with light grey masonry. The rear elevation will now be composed entirely of light grey brick where there was EIFS. This change is shown in the drawings on pages 5-8, 15, and 16 in the attached Exhibit A.

B. *Small return wall at east side of Pennsylvania Avenue façade (north elevation)*

All visible areas of the return wall will be composed of iron-spot brick, as shown on page 16 of Exhibit A.

C. *Darker material for elevator overrun*

The elevator overrun (less than four feet above the roof) exterior will be composed of brake-formed dark grey metal panels. This is shown on pages 2-4, 6, and 14 of Exhibit A.

2. Additional Views and Drawings of Project

A. *Section of building in relation to Ives Place*

This section is shown on page 19 of Exhibit A.

B. *Section through pool deck*

A section through the pool deck as well as images showing the privacy screen at the southern edge of the building is shown on page 13 of Exhibit A. These images also include views of the planted buffer for the residential units that have direct access to the pool deck.

C. *Section through elevator overrun*

A section through the elevator overrun (which is less than four feet above the roof) is shown on page 18 of Exhibit A.

D. *Additional design changes in response to adjacent neighbor directly to the east*

The changes include: window size and proportion; addition of a planter at the edge of nonconforming court #2; elimination of retail doors on easternmost bay of north façade. These changes are shown on page 20 of Exhibit A.

3. Flexibility

A. *Court relief*

The Applicant requested relief from the width and area requirements for multiple courts in the building. The courts for which relief is requested are shown on pages 21-23 of Exhibit A.

B. *Pool*

The Applicant requests flexibility to remove the pool at the rear of the building and replace it with a deck, depending on market conditions at the time of construction.

4. Public Benefits and Project Amenities

A. *Affordable Housing (Inclusionary Zoning)*

Following suggestions from the Commission and OP, the Applicant revised its proffer of affordable housing to include units in the 50% AMI category. The Applicant worked with DHCD and OP to create a mix of 13 affordable units at different income categories that would best satisfy the needs of the District. The Applicant will provide 8% of its residential gross floor area for affordable units in the following unit mix that both DHCD and OP agreed is acceptable:

	Affordable (IZ) Units	
	80% AMI	50% AMI
Studio	2	0
1 Bedroom	6	1
2 Bedroom	1	2
3 Bedroom	0	1
TOTAL	9	4

These affordable units will be distributed evenly throughout the building, as shown on page 24 of Exhibit A, excluding the 7th floor. The three-bedroom unit will be located at the southeast corner of the building on the 4th floor and will have unobstructed windows in each bedroom; its floor plan is shown on page 25 of Exhibit A.

B. Potomac Avenue Metro Plaza Improvements

The Applicant continues to work with WMATA on developing a final plan for the improvements to the Metro plaza. The plan will be consistent with the scoping letter and plan attached as Exhibit B, but the final plan shall be subject to WMATA approval. The Applicant agrees that it will be not able to obtain a certificate of occupancy for the Project until WMATA certifies that the Applicant has completed its improvements.

C. Alley Improvements

The alley improvements that the Applicant will provide will be consistent with the plan attached as page 26 of Exhibit A.

5. Appropriateness of Project Scale

The scale of the Project is appropriate for its context and is consistent with moderate density commercial development. First, as a matter-of-right, a building in the C-2-A zone can achieve a height of 65 feet (including penthouse), of which 62 feet may be habitable. Similarly, as a matter-of-right, a building in the C-2-B zone can achieve a height of 83.5 feet (including penthouse), of which 77 feet may be habitable. The surrounding properties along Pennsylvania Avenue are zoned primarily C-2-A and C-2-B, and both zones are explicitly stated in the Comprehensive Plan as consistent with a moderate density commercial designation on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM).

Second, the Commission has previously found that projects of equal or greater scale in similar contexts are appropriate. The most notable example is the Hine School project located just six blocks to the northwest at Pennsylvania Avenue and 8th Street SE. Like this Project, that project site is surrounded by lower scale row dwellings and flats zoned R-4, and it is designated moderate density commercial/moderate density residential on the FLUM. In Z.C. Order No. 11-

February 25, 2016

Page 4

24, the Commission approved rezoning that site to C-2-B and a project with a maximum height of 94.5 feet (excluding penthouse). The Commission has found other similarly-situated projects with heights exceeding that proposed in this Project to be consistent with moderate density and appropriate for nearby lower scale residential neighborhoods.¹

Thus, the proposed Project in this case, with a maximum height of 78 feet (7 stories) and no penthouse is appropriate for the neighborhood context and the moderate density commercial development. The Project will include a setback for the entire 7th story on all sides, and additional setbacks, including at the southeast corner of the building, will minimize the appearance of height and allow the Project to transition, where appropriate, to lower scale adjacent properties.

We look forward to the Commission taking final action on this case at the March 14, 2016 public meeting.

Sincerely,

/s/ John Epting

John Epting

/s/ Cary Kadlecek

Cary Kadlecek

Attachments

gsdocs\8701519.2

¹ Z.C. Order No. 13-10 approved a project with a maximum height of 87 feet and a rezoning to GA/C-2-B on a property designated moderate density commercial/moderate density residential on the FLUM. Also, Z.C. Order No. 10-26 approved a project with a maximum height of 90 feet and a rezoning to GA/C-2-B on a property designated moderate density commercial/moderate density residential on the FLUM.