

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

TO: District of Columbia Zoning Commission

FROM: *JLS*
Jennifer Steingasser, Deputy Director Historic Preservation Development Review

DATE: May 19, 2016

SUBJECT: ZC #15-13, Office of Planning Supplemental Report

I. SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS

This report provides the Office of Planning’s (OP) analysis of the Applicant’s May 12, 2016 submittal that was provided in response to Zoning Commission requests made at the April 4, 2016 public hearing.

The Applicant has provided a final list of project benefits and amenities at Exhibit B of the Post-Hearing Statement, which is dated May 12, 2016. The benefits and amenities state the Applicant’s commitment to plow the alley system from the project site to E Street, SE. The Applicant also has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with ANC 6B for development at 1309-1323 E Street SE. A copy of the MOU was entered into the record on April 3, 2016 at Exhibit 33.

Zoning Commission Comments	Applicant’s Response¹	OP Analysis
Provide a materials board.	The Applicant will provide a materials board at the June 13, 2016 meeting.	
Concern about the proposed location of the garage entry.	The Applicant evaluated alternate garage entry locations and found that the proposed location was best given alley widths, turning movements, pedestrian traffic, and other potential conflicts.	OP and DDOT believe that the proposal is acceptable and the Applicant demonstrated that turning movements work at the proposed location.
Address E Street, SE elevation, in particular treatment of the windows. Provide a new rendered elevation.	The Applicant has revised the E Street façade and provided a rendering of the elevation.	The Applicant has revised the windows on the E Street elevation to be one-over-one double-hung windows. The window surround has been enlarged and the mullion has been widened. The Applicant provided a rendered elevation. ²

¹ See Applicant’s Post-Hearing Statement, dated May 12, 2016, Exhibit 40 (40A, 40B, 40C1, and 40C2).

² See Applicant’s Post-Hearing Statement, dated May 12, 2016, Exhibit 40A, Sheet A.14.

Zoning Commission Comments	Applicant's Response ¹	OP Analysis
Revisit the window design on the industrial and alley buildings.	The Applicant has revised the windows to double hung units with a transom throughout. The muntins have been retained on the north courtyard building, as well as the three unique townhouse units on the southern courtyard.	<p>The Applicant is showing double hung, one-over-one and two-over-two windows on the alley building, as well as a bank of casement windows with multiple small lights on the north façade of the three interior units of the alley building.³ This results in a more unified façade. Exhibit 40.A, Sheet A.35 should be revised to reflect the two-over-two double hung windows.</p> <p>The Applicant is showing banks of two and three 12-light double-hung windows with transoms on the industrial building.</p>
Describe the need for the bridge connection and how the space would function. Evaluate opportunity for shared/community use.	The Applicant states that the connection is necessary for the project to function as a single building on a single record lot for zoning purposes. The Applicant is not proposing that the bridge be publically-accessible community space.	<p>The bridge provides an above-grade connection, which is required for the project to be treated as one building for zoning purposes.</p> <p>The bridge will serve as a sunroom for the unit to the north.</p>
Concern about layout of E Street units that back-up to one another.	The Applicant is not proposing to revise the layout and is showing the kitchen in the bay for the townhouse units fronting E Street, SE.	Although the Applicant is not proposing to revise the floor plans, the Applicant has indicated that an alternate layout could be provided as an option at the time of purchase.
Revise drawings to show all skylights.	The Applicant has provided revised drawings.	All skylights are accurately reflected on the drawings, including on the bird's eye view. ⁴
Show the experience for the outdoor space for each unit.	The Applicant has shown the outdoor space.	The revised drawings accurately reflect the locations for balconies at the upper levels.
Provide calculation demonstrating that the proposed courtyard space is equivalent to the space that would have been provided by providing the required rear yards.	The Applicant has indicated that the theoretical rear yard would have an area of 8,734 square feet and the provided courtyards have an area of 7,362 square feet. ⁵	Although not equivalent, the proposed courtyard space and balconies should provide sufficient open space for recreation for the residents.
Provide a clear breakdown of the IZ unit mix and evaluate IZ unit locations, as they appear to be clustered.	The Applicant has provided a revised IZ layout.	The IZ units appear to be better distributed throughout the project site. ⁶

³ See Applicant's Post-Hearing Statement, dated May 12, 2016, Exhibit 40A, Sheet A.33.

⁴ See Applicant's Post-Hearing Statement, dated May 12, 2016, Exhibit 40A, Sheet A.44.

⁵ See Applicant's Post-Hearing Statement, dated May 12, 2016, Exhibit 40A, Sheet A.42.

⁶ See Applicant's Post-Hearing Statement, dated May 12, 2016, Exhibit 40A, Sheet A.04.

Zoning Commission Comments	Applicant's Response¹	OP Analysis
Consider eliminating the "Watkins Alley" graphic on the southern building.	The Watkins Alley signage has been removed.	The revised drawings reflect the elimination of the Watkins Alley signage from the rear façade.
Describe the extent of alley repaving and provide material selection for alley resurfacing.	The Applicant has shown the alley in the renderings in a consistent material and will resurface a portion of the public alley adjacent to the project site.	The Applicant has agreed to resurface the portion of the alley west of the project site, up to a maximum cost of \$40,000. The final material will be selected in coordination with DDOT and shall not be inconsistent with the alley treatment in Square 1043.
Revisit the design of the arch at the E Street pedestrian connection.	The Applicant is showing buttressing at the arched pedestrian connection on the E Street façade.	The revised detailing for the arch shows the arch terminating in a supporting course of brick that runs down the wall of the adjoining townhouses. The Zoning Commission requested that the arch terminate at a pilaster.
Provide examples of brick work by proposed project mason.	The Applicant provided photos of brickwork completed by the proposed project mason at the Naylor Court Stables project.	
Provide a full set of landscape related plans.	The Applicant has provided a full set of landscape plans.	The submittal includes the Applicant's landscape plans. ⁷

JS/emv

⁷ See Applicant's Post-Hearing Statement, dated May 12, 2016, Exhibits 40A and 40B, Sheets A.05, A.06, and A.56-A.63.